

1 Determinants of timely administration of the birth dose of hepatitis B vaccine in Senegal in  
2 2019: Secondary analysis of the demographic and health survey

3 Oumar Bassoum <sup>1,2</sup> , Mouhamadou Faly Ba <sup>2</sup> , Ndeye Mareme Sougou <sup>1,2</sup> , Adama Sow <sup>1,2</sup> ,  
4 Ibrahima Seck <sup>1,2</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> Department of preventive medicine and public health, faculty of medicine, pharmacy and  
6 odontology, Cheikh Anta Diop University, Dakar, Senegal

7 <sup>2</sup> Institute of Health and Development, Cheikh Anta Diop University, Dakar, Senegal

8 Corresponding author: Oumar Bassoum, [oumar.bassoum@ucad.edu.sn](mailto:oumar.bassoum@ucad.edu.sn)

9 Contribution of the authors

10 Conceptualization: Oumar Bassoum, Mouhamadou Faly Ba

11 Data curation: Mouhamadou Faly Ba

12 Formal analysis: Oumar Bassoum, Mouhamadou Faly Ba

13 Methodology: Oumar Bassoum

14 Software: Mouhamadou Faly Ba.

15 Supervision: Ndeye Mareme Sougou, Ibrahima Seck.

16 Writing – original draft: Oumar Bassoum.

17 Writing – review & editing: Oumar Bassoum, Mouhamadou Faly Ba, Ndeye Mareme Sougou,

18 Adama Sow, Adama Sow, Ibrahima Seck

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

26 **Abstract**

27 In developing countries, hepatitis B is spread primarily by the perinatal or horizontal route.  
28 Thus, the Senegalese government recommends administering the birth dose of the hepatitis B  
29 vaccine (HepB0) within 24 hours of birth. The objective was to identify the determinants of  
30 timely administration of HepB0 in Senegal in 2019. A secondary analysis of the demographic  
31 and health survey was carried out. The study population consisted of children aged 12 to 23  
32 months. A cluster survey, stratified in urban and rural areas, drawn at two stages, was carried  
33 out. Individual interviews were conducted. Logistic regression was applied to estimate the  
34 adjusted odds ratio (aOR) and their 95% confidence interval. In total, 1130 children were  
35 included. Among them, 48.1% were born to mothers aged 25 to 34, 46.8% were male and 82.6%  
36 were born in health facilities. The average time between birth and HepB0 administration was  
37  $13.1 \pm 46.6$  days. Among 747 children vaccinated, only 65.2% were vaccinated within 24 hours  
38 of birth. The determinants were maternal age of at least 35 years (aOR= 2.03 [1.29 – 3.20]),  
39 primary education of the mother (aOR=1.94 [1.13 – 3.35]), at least four antenatal care  
40 (aOR=1.74 [1.12 – 2.69]), belonging to the central (ORa=0.22 [0.11 – 0.44]) and northern  
41 regions (aOR= 0.18 [0.08 – 0.40]), and delivery in a health facility (aOR=3.42 [1.90 – 6.15]).  
42 Education and keeping girls in school, local postnatal care in hard-to-reach regions, promotion  
43 of antenatal care and delivery in a health facility should improve the timeliness of HepB0  
44 vaccination.

45 **Keywords:** Vaccination, Hepatitis B, Timeliness, Birth, Senegal

46  
47  
48  
49  
50

## 51 **1. Introduction**

52 Hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection is a public health concern. A recent study estimates that 296  
53 million people will be chronically infected and 820,000 will die worldwide in 2019 [1] . The  
54 severity of the infection is linked to the transition to chronicity which can be complicated by  
55 cirrhosis or hepatocellular carcinoma which are mainly responsible for deaths [2] . Another fact  
56 that explains the worrying nature of HBV infection is that several studies have shown gaps in  
57 terms of knowledge and practices of the population regarding the disease [3,4] or vaccination  
58 at birth [5] ; thereby limiting engagement and demand for vaccination services [6] .

59 Hepatitis B endemicity is classified according to the seroprevalence of hepatitis B virus surface  
60 antigen (HBsAg). It is classified as low (<2%), low to intermediate (2% to 4.9%), intermediate  
61 high (5% to 7.9%), and high ( $\geq 8\%$ ) [7,8] . In areas of high endemicity, HBV is transmitted  
62 mainly at the time of childbirth (perinatal transmission) or during early childhood (horizontal  
63 transmission) [7] . However, infection in infants exposes them to a high risk of chronicity. In  
64 such a context, WHO recommends that all infants , including those who are low birth weight  
65 or premature, receive their first dose of hepatitis B vaccine (HepB0) as soon as possible after  
66 birth, preferably within 24 hours [9] . Hepatitis B vaccination is an essential care that should  
67 take place between 90 minutes and 6 six hours after birth after weighing the newborn [10] .

68 Timely administration of HepB0, i.e. within 24 hours of birth, should serve as a performance  
69 indicator for any expanded program on immunization (EPI) [9] . Indeed, the administration of  
70 HepB0 within this time frame is not only an entry point into the EPI but also a quality indicator.  
71 Despite this, the vaccination time is relatively neglected. Vaccination targets are largely focused  
72 on gross coverage of recommended vaccines before a certain age without regard to whether  
73 these are administered at the appropriate age or not [11] .

74 The fight against hepatitis B is at the heart of the 2030 agenda [12] . It is expected to reduce  
75 new infections by 90% and mortality by 65% compared to 2015 [13] . To this end, the “Global

76 health sector strategies against, respectively, HIV, viral hepatitis and sexually transmitted  
77 infections for the period 2022-2030” aim to increase the percentage of newborns benefiting  
78 from HepB0 in time intended and other interventions aimed at preventing mother-to-child  
79 transmission of HBV to 70% in 2025 and 90% in 2030 [14] .

80 In Senegal, according to a modeling study, the seroprevalence of HBsAg is 8.1% (95%  
81 confidence interval: 7.5%-9%) [15] . Therefore, it is a country of high endemicity [16] . From  
82 1999 to 2004, vaccination against hepatitis B was carried out as part of the national hepatitis  
83 control program. In 2005, vaccination is carried out within the framework of the EPI in a  
84 combined form called pentavalent which protects against diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough,  
85 *Haemophilus influenzae* type b (Hib) infections and hepatitis B. Pentavalent is administered at  
86 6, 10 and 14 weeks of age. Then, in 2016, HepB0 (monovalent vaccine), was introduced into  
87 the EPI [17] . The vaccine comes in liquid form in a ten-dose vial [17] . Depending on the  
88 opened vial policy, the vaccine can be used for a maximum of four weeks after opening.  
89 Conservation takes place at a temperature between +2°C and +8°C. The dose is administered  
90 intramuscularly in the anterolateral part of the left thigh [18] .

91 The 2019-2023 comprehensive multi-year plan (cMYP) aims for HepB0 vaccination coverage  
92 greater than 90% by 2023 [19] . The demographic and health survey (DHS) conducted in 2019  
93 revealed that HepB0 coverage was 81.3% [20] . Two studies carried out respectively in Podor  
94 and Niakhar estimate vaccination coverage within 24 hours of birth at 42.1% in 2020 and 66.8%  
95 in 2017-2018 [21] [22] . Factors negatively associated with HepB0 vaccination are home  
96 delivery, delivery in the dry season, and delivery in 2016 [22] . Favorable factors are delivery  
97 in a health facility, access to television, weighing immediately and hospitalization of the  
98 newborn immediately after birth [21] . These studies have shortcomings. First, the DHS does  
99 not explicitly mention whether it is vaccination coverage within 24 hours or not. Second, the  
100 geographic scope of the studies done in Podor and Niakhar is limited; making the

101 generalizability of the results questionable. Thus, it appeared necessary to fill these gaps  
102 through this study whose objective is to highlight the determinants of the timely administration  
103 of HepB0 in Senegal.

## 104 **2. Materials and methods**

### 105 **2.1. Study framework**

106 Senegal, located in West Africa, is between 12°8 and 16°41 north latitude and 11°21 and 17°32  
107 west longitude. Its surface area is 196,722 km<sup>2</sup> . In 2019, the population was estimated at  
108 16,209,125 inhabitants. Children aged 0–4 years accounted for 16.39% [23] . Vaccination is  
109 provided to children according to a fixed strategy (population residing within a health facility),  
110 advanced strategy (population residing within a radius of between 5 and 15 km) and mobile  
111 strategy (population residing within a radius greater than 15 km) [17] .

### 112 **2.2. Type of study**

113 This was a secondary analysis of DHS data conducted in 2019 [20] . The DHS is a cross-  
114 sectional survey. The data was collected throughout Senegal, between April and December  
115 2019 with a 30-day break, i.e. a period of eight months of collection. DHS are carried out under  
116 the DHS Program established by the United States Agency for International Development  
117 (USAID) in 1984 [24] .

### 118 **2.3. Study population and sampling**

119 The study population consisted of children aged 12 to 23 months residing in Senegal at the time  
120 of the survey. Eligible subjects were those who had spent the night preceding the survey in the  
121 selected household [25] . This was a two-stage, stratified, cluster sampling. Each region was  
122 separated into urban and rural parts to form the sampling strata. Senegal has 14 regions. Thus,  
123 28 strata were created. Sampling is carried out independently within each stratum. At the first  
124 stage, 214 census districts (CD) were drawn with a probability proportional to their size. This  
125 was the number of resident households in the CD. The list of CD is established during the

126 General Census of Population and Housing, Agriculture and Livestock (RGPHAE) carried out  
127 in 2013. At the second level, in each of the CD selected at the first level, 22 Households were  
128 selected by the coordination team using systematic equal probability sampling. Replacements  
129 of pre-selected households were not authorized on the spot, even for non-responding  
130 households, to avoid selection bias.

131 In summary, the necessary number of clusters was 214. In each of them, 22 households were  
132 selected according to a systematic sampling with equal probability in both urban and rural areas.  
133 The number of households is 4,708 including 1,848 in urban areas and 2,860 in rural areas. The  
134 sample size was 1130 children aged 12 to 23 months [20] .

#### 135 **2.4. Collection of data**

136 Data collection was conducted in two ways: a face-to-face interview with the mother or  
137 caregiver and consultation of the child's health record. It was carried out by 20 interviewers  
138 trained in the technique of administering questionnaires using tablets. The team members  
139 exchanged data using Bluetooth while the transfer of data to the servers, by the team leaders,  
140 was done via the Internet. At the end of each day, team leaders had to transfer the data to the  
141 central server [20] .

#### 142 **2.5. Variables studied**

143 The dependent variable is timely administration of HepB0. It is defined as the administration  
144 of HepB0 within 24 hours of birth. It is binary (HepB0 $\leq$ 24 hours/HepB0 $>$ 24 hours) [26] . The  
145 choice of this operational definition is explained by the fact that in Senegal HepB0 is  
146 recommended from birth, preferably within 24 hours following birth [17] . The independent  
147 variables relate to the individual and the context. The individual characteristics are: age of the  
148 mother, **mother's education level**, marital status of the mother, birth order, sex of the child.  
149 The contextual characteristics are: area of residence, type of residence, household size, sex of  
150 household head, wealth quintile, father's education level, antenatal care (ANC), tetanus toxoid

151 (TT) injection, place of birth, mode of delivery, checking of the child's health before leaving  
152 the health facility, possession of home-based record (HBR).

## 153 **2.6. Statistical analyzes**

154 The data were described in the form of numbers and percentages (qualitative variables) but also  
155 in the form of mean±standard deviation (quantitative variables). The chi-square test was used  
156 to compare the proportions of children who received HepB0 on time according to the levels of  
157 the independent variables. Then, logistic regression was applied with the variables for which  
158 the p-value is less than 0.25 during the univariate analysis. The top-down step-by-step  
159 procedure has been completed. The collinearity hypothesis was tested but was not significant.  
160 Model adequacy was analyzed using the Hosmer-Lemeshow test.

## 161 **2.7. Ethical considerations**

162 The survey protocol and questionnaires were sent to the National Ethics Committee for analysis  
163 and approval. Verbal consent was obtained before inclusion. Verbal consent is justified by the  
164 high illiteracy rate among Senegalese women, especially in rural areas. The person surveyed  
165 was informed of the non-obligatory nature of participation and of the possibility of interrupting  
166 the survey at any time. Data collection was anonymous and confidential. Access to the database  
167 was authorized by “The Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) Program”. The data were  
168 accessed for research purposes on 18 May 2021. Authors had no access to information that  
169 could identify individual participants during or after data collection

## 170 **3. Results**

### 171 **3.1. Participant characteristics**

172 The children were born to mothers aged under 35, illiterate and married in 76%, 60.1% and  
173 94.5 of cases respectively. The male gender represented 53.2%. In addition, 30.1% resided in  
174 the western part of the country and 62.1% in rural areas. Births in health establishments reached  
175 82.6% (Table 1).

176 Table 1: Characteristics of participants, DHS, 2019, N=1130

| <b>Characteristics</b>            | <b>n (%)</b>     |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Individual characteristics</b> |                  |
| <b>Age of mother (years)</b>      |                  |
| < 25                              | 315 (27.9%)      |
| [25 to 34]                        | 544 (48.1%)      |
| ≥35                               | 272 (24.0%)      |
| <b>Mother's education level</b>   |                  |
| None                              | 679 (60.1%)      |
| Primary                           | 233 (20.6%)      |
| Secondary/tertiary                | 219 (19.3%)      |
| <b>Marital status of mother</b>   |                  |
| Unmarried                         | 59 (5.2%)        |
| Married                           | 1,072<br>(94.8%) |
| <b>Birth order</b>                |                  |
| 1-2                               | 505 (44.7%)      |
| > 2                               | 625 (55.3%)      |



| <b>Characteristics</b>            | <b>n (%)</b> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Sex of the child</b>           |              |
| Female                            | 602 (53.2%)  |
| Male                              | 528 (46.8%)  |
| <b>Contextual characteristics</b> |              |
| <b>Area of residence</b>          |              |
| West                              | 349 (30.9%)  |
| Center                            | 397 (35.2%)  |
| South                             | 198 (17.5%)  |
| North                             | 186 (16.4%)  |
| <b>Type of residence</b>          |              |
| Rural                             | 702 (62.1%)  |
| Urban                             | 428 (37.9%)  |
| <b>Household size</b>             |              |
| ≤ 6 persons                       | 207 (18.3%)  |
| > 6 persons                       | 923 (81.7%)  |
| <b>Sex of household head</b>      |              |

| <b>Characteristics</b>          | <b>n (%)</b> |
|---------------------------------|--------------|
| Female                          | 301 (26.6%)  |
| Male                            | 829 (73.4%)  |
| <b>Wealth quintile</b>          |              |
| The poorest/poorer              | 490 (43.3%)  |
| Middle                          | 215 (19.0%)  |
| Richer/richest                  | 426 (37.7%)  |
| <b>Father's education level</b> |              |
| None                            | 799 (74.5%)  |
| Primary                         | 87 (8.1%)    |
| Secondary/tertiary              | 187 (17.4%)  |
| Missing                         | 57           |
| <b>TT injection</b>             |              |
| Yes                             | 997 (91.4%)  |
| No                              | 94 (8.6%)    |
| Missing                         | 40           |
| <b>Number of ANC</b>            |              |

| <b>Characteristics</b>  | <b>n (%)</b> |
|---|--------------|
| <4  | 497 (45.6%)  |
| ≥4  | 593 (54.4%)  |
| Missing   | 40           |
| <b>Place of birth</b>   |              |
| Health facility   | 933 (82.6%)  |
| Outside health facility   | 197 (17.4)   |
| <b>Mode of delivery</b>   |              |
| Caesarean section   | 50 (4.4%)    |
| Low way   | 1080(95.6%)  |
| <b>Checking the child's health before leaving the health facility</b> |              |
| No/don't know   | 6 (0.7%)     |
| Yes   | 894 (99.3%)  |
| Missing   | 230          |
| <b>Possession of HBR</b>  |              |
| No  | 25 (2.3%)    |

| <b>Characteristics</b> | <b>n (%)</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|
| No longer has a HBR    | 110 (9.8%)   |
| Yes, not seen          | 53 (4.7%)    |
| Yes, seen              | 941(83.3%)   |

177

### 178 **3.2. Vaccination coverage**

179 Among the 1130 children included, 921 received HepB0, representing crude coverage of  
180 81.5%. However, only 747 children had a vaccination card indicating the date of vaccination.  
181 The average time between the day of birth and that of vaccination is 13.1±46.6 days. Among  
182 them, 65.2% (487/747) were vaccinated on time, i.e. within 24 hours of birth (Fig. 1).

### 183 **3.3. Bivariate analysis**

184 The results of the bivariate analysis indicate that the percentages of children vaccinated within  
185 24 hours of birth varied significantly depending on the age of the mother, the **mother's**  
186 **education level**, the area of residence, the type of residence, wealth quintile, number of ANC,  
187 place of birth, exposure to media such as newspapers and television, access to mobile phones  
188 and access to the Internet (Table 2).

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197 Table 2: Bivariate analysis of timely HepB0 vaccination, DHS, 2019, N=747.

| <b>Characteristics</b>            | HepB0 $\leq$ 24<br>hours,<br>N = 487 | HepB0 $>$ 24<br>hours<br>N = 260 | p-value |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| <b>Individual characteristics</b> |                                      |                                  |         |
| Age of the mother                 |                                      |                                  | 0.016   |
| <25                               | 142 (63.3%)                          | 82 (36.7%)                       |         |
| [25 to 34]                        | 219 (61.5%)                          | 137(38.5%)                       |         |
| $\geq$ 35                         | 126 (75.6%)                          | 41 (24.4%)                       |         |
| Mother's education level          |                                      |                                  | <0.001  |
| None                              | 248 (57.6%)                          | 183(42.4%)                       |         |
| Primary                           | 139 (81.2%)                          | 32 (18.8%)                       |         |
| Secondary/tertiary                | 100 (69.0%)                          | 45 (31.0%)                       |         |
| Marital status of the mother      |                                      |                                  | 0.067   |
| Not married                       | 29 (78.9%)                           | 8 (21.1%)                        |         |
| Bride                             | 458 (64.5%)                          | 252(35.5%)                       |         |
| Birth order                       |                                      |                                  | 0.780   |
| 1-2                               | 231 (65.9%)                          | 120(34.1%)                       |         |

| <b>Characteristics</b>            | HepB0 $\leq$ 24<br>hours,<br>N = 487 | HepB0 $>$ 24<br>hours<br>N = 260 | p-value |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| 2                                 | 256 (64.6%)                          | 140(35.4%)                       |         |
| Sex of the child                  |                                      |                                  | 0.326   |
| Female                            | 266 (67.1%)                          | 130(32.9%)                       |         |
| Male                              | 221 (63.1%)                          | 129(36.9%)                       |         |
| <b>Contextual characteristics</b> |                                      |                                  |         |
| Area of residence                 |                                      |                                  | <0.001  |
| West                              | 210 (85.8%)                          | 35 (14.2%)                       |         |
| Center                            | 131(51.9%)                           | 121(48.1%)                       |         |
| South                             | 88 (66.0%)                           | 45 (34.0%)                       |         |
| North                             | 59 (50.0%)                           | 59 (50.0%)                       |         |
| Type of residence                 |                                      |                                  | <0.001  |
| Rural                             | 258 (58.0%)                          | 187(42.0%)                       |         |
| Urban                             | 229 (75.9%)                          | 73 (24.1%)                       |         |
| Household size                    |                                      |                                  | 0.125   |
| $\leq$ 6 persons                  | 90 (72.5%)                           | 34 (27.5%)                       |         |

| <b>Characteristics</b>   | HepB0 $\leq$ 24<br>hours,<br>N = 487 | HepB0 $>$ 24<br>hours<br>N = 260 | p-value |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| > 6 persons              | 397 (63.7%)                          | 226(36.3%)                       |         |
| Wealth quintile          |                                      |                                  | <0.001  |
| Poor                     | 155 (52.8%)                          | 138(47.2%)                       |         |
| Middle                   | 94 (65.2%)                           | 50 (34.8%)                       |         |
| Rich                     | 239 (76.9%)                          | 72 (23.1%)                       |         |
| Sex of household head    |                                      |                                  | 0.891   |
| Female                   | 127 (64.7%)                          | 70 (35.3%)                       |         |
| Male                     | 359 (65.4%)                          | 190(34.6%)                       |         |
| Father's education level |                                      |                                  | 0.143   |
| None                     | 316 (61.5%)                          | 198(38.5%)                       |         |
| Primary                  | 52 (76.2%)                           | 16 (23.8%)                       |         |
| Secondary/tertiary       | 92 (70.9%)                           | 38 (29.1%)                       |         |
| Missing                  | 27                                   | 8                                |         |
| TT injection             |                                      |                                  | 0.064   |
| No                       | 30 (50.8%)                           | 29 (49.2%)                       |         |

| <b>Characteristics</b>  | HepB0 $\leq$ 24<br>hours,<br>N = 487 | HepB0 $>$ 24<br>hours<br>N = 260 | p-value |
|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| Yes   | 438 (66.2%)                          | 224(33.8%)                       |         |
| Missing   | 18                                   | 7                                |         |
| Number of ANC   |                                      |                                  | <0.001  |
| <4  | 181 (55.9%)                          | 143(44.1%)                       |         |
| $\geq$ 4  | 287 (72.3%)                          | 110(27.7%)                       |         |
| Missing   | 18                                   | 7                                |         |
| Place of birth  |                                      |                                  | <0.001  |
| Outside health facility   | 34 (33.8%)                           | 66 (66.2%)                       |         |
| Health facility   | 453 (70.1%)                          | 194(29.9%)                       |         |
| Mode of delivery  |                                      |                                  | 0.397   |
| Low way   | 461 (64.8%)                          | 250(35.2%)                       |         |
| Caesarean section   | 26 (73.0%)                           | 10 (27.0%)                       |         |
| <b>Checking the child's health before<br/>leaving the health facility</b> |                                      |                                  | 0.802   |
| No/don't know   | 2 (76.4%)                            | 1 (23.6%)                        |         |



| <b>Characteristics</b>       | HepB0 $\leq$ 24<br>hours,<br>N = 487 | HepB0 $>$ 24<br>hours<br>N = 260 | p-value |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| Yes                          | 435 (69.8%)                          | 189(30.2%)                       |         |
| Missing                      | 50                                   | 71                               |         |
| Access to newspaper/magazine |                                      |                                  | 0.013   |
| No                           | 377 (62.0%)                          | 232(38.0%)                       |         |
| Yes                          | 109 (79.6%)                          | 28 (20.4%)                       |         |
| Radio access                 |                                      |                                  | 0.251   |
| No                           | 89 (59.4%)                           | 61 (40.6%)                       |         |
| Yes                          | 398 (66.7%)                          | 199(33.3%)                       |         |
| Access to television         |                                      |                                  | 0.001   |
| No                           | 78 (50.9%)                           | 76 (49.1%)                       |         |
| Yes                          | 408 (68.9%)                          | 184(31.1%)                       |         |
| Mobile phone access          |                                      |                                  | <0.001  |
| No                           | 132 (54.0%)                          | 113(46.0%)                       |         |
| Yes                          | 355 (70.7%)                          | 147(29.3%)                       |         |
| Internet access              |                                      |                                  | <0.001  |

| <b>Characteristics</b>   | HepB0 $\leq$ 24<br>hours,<br>N = 487 | HepB0 $>$ 24<br>hours<br>N = 260 | p-value |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| No   | 245 (57.7%)                          | 180(42.3%)                       |         |
| Yes  | 242 (75.1%)                          | 80 (24.9%)                       |         |
| <sup>1</sup> n (%)   |                                      |                                  |         |
| <sup>2</sup> Chi <sup>2</sup> test with the second order correction of Rao & Scott |                                      |                                  |         |

198

### 199 3.4. Multivariate analysis

200 The multivariate analysis showed that individual characteristics such as age  $\geq$  35 years and  
 201 maternal primary education increased the probability of timely vaccination of the child by 2.03  
 202 respectively [1.29 – 3.20] and 1.94 [1.13 – 3.35]. As for contextual characteristics, regions  
 203 located in the center and the north reduced the chance of getting vaccinated on time by 78%  
 204 (0.22; [0.11 – 0.44]) and 82% (0.18; [ 0.08 – 0.40]). On the other hand, this chance increased  
 205 by 1.74 [1.12 – 2.69] and 3.42 [1.90 – 6.15] times when the child was born to a mother who  
 206 had completed at least four ANC or was born in a health facility (Table 3).

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214 Table 3: Multivariate analysis of determinants of timely HepB0 vaccination, DHS, 2019,  
215 N=747

| Features  | aOR [95%CI]         |
|---|---------------------|
| <b>Individual characteristics</b>                                 |                     |
| Age of mother: $\geq 35$ years versus $< 35$ years                | 2.03; [1.29 – 3.20] |
| Mother's education level: primary versus none                     | 1.94; [1.13 – 3.35] |
| <b>Contextual characteristics</b>                                 |                     |
| Area of residence: Center versus West                             | 0.22; [0.11 – 0.44] |
| Area of residence: North versus West                              | 0.18; [0.08 – 0.40] |
| Number of ANC: $\geq 4$ versus $<4$                               | 1.74; [1.12 – 2.69] |
| Place of delivery: health facility versus outside health facility | 3.42; [1.90 – 6.15] |

216

## 217 4. Discussion

### 218 4.1. Strengths and limitations of the study

219 The study is distinguished by three main strengths. First, the sufficiently large sample size and  
220 the prior determination of the number of clusters and the number of households to be surveyed  
221 improve the precision of the estimates. The second strength is the low risk of selection bias  
222 because the subjects were selected, not by the investigators, but by a coordination team. The  
223 selection was made according to a random procedure guaranteeing representativeness not only  
224 at the national and regional level but also according to the urban and rural area of residence.  
225 Finally, the risk of information bias is also low because the vaccination status and date of  
226 vaccination are extracted from the vaccination card.

227 On the other hand, the study has limitations. First, the consultation of the health facility registry  
228 was not carried out contrary to the WHO recommendation. This led to the exclusion of several  
229 children whose vaccination status was neither recorded nor dated in the HBR. The second

230 limitation is that the data were not collected specifically for this study; making it impossible to  
231 identify other determinants of timely vaccination.

## 232 **4.2. Vaccination coverage**

233 Vaccination coverage within 24 hours of birth is lower than that recommended in the cMYP  
234 which is 90%. It is higher than those that have been highlighted in the world (42%) and in  
235 Africa according to administrative data (6%) [27] and surveys (1.3%) [28] . These results  
236 highlight the challenges facing the Senegalese health system in implementing timely HepB0  
237 vaccination. As a result, the road ahead to achieve the goal of eliminating hepatitis B by 2030  
238 is long. This present study identified factors associated with timely administration of HepB0.

## 239 **4.3. Determinants**

240 Maternal age of at least 35 years was significantly associated with vaccination within 24 hours  
241 of birth. This may be because older mothers may have experience and better knowledge of the  
242 effect and importance of vaccination than younger ones. An identical result was demonstrated  
243 in Ethiopia [29] . On the other hand, raising awareness among young mothers through social  
244 networks is necessary because it has been shown that the use of these communication tools to  
245 constantly disseminate reliable information creates a strong image of vaccination, thus  
246 improving coverage vaccination [30] .

247 Maternal education level predisposes to timely vaccination. Indeed, children whose mothers  
248 had a primary education were almost twice as likely to receive HepB0 within 24 hours  
249 compared to their counterparts whose mothers were not educated. In Ethiopia, a similar result  
250 was found [31] . In China, the higher level is a favorable factor compared to the primary level.  
251 In contrast, in the United States and Israel, the opposite effect was observed because children  
252 born to more educated mothers were less likely to receive HepB0 on time [32] . These two  
253 situations are contradictory. However, they reveal the significant role of education in access to  
254 care. Strategies may vary from one context to another. In developed countries, the schooling

255 rate for women is high. They are exposed to disinformation online; thus leading to vaccine  
256 hesitancy. On the other hand, in developing countries, women are less educated and therefore  
257 less exposed to social networks. Therefore, promoting vaccination will involve education and  
258 keeping girls in school.

259 This study showed that at least four ANC increases the chance of receiving HepB0 on time by  
260 1.74. This result clearly shows the importance of prenatal education on the prevention of  
261 hepatitis B from birth. In Senegal, the 2019-DHS shows that 98% of women received ANC  
262 provided by a trained provider [20] . But only 55.5% received at least four. This situation calls  
263 for two actions. The first is that women should be made aware of the importance of using ANC  
264 services according to national recommendations. Next, healthcare professionals should be  
265 trained to address hepatitis B birth vaccination during ANC [26] . According to a qualitative  
266 study, Nigerian women attending ANC services suggest that health professionals include  
267 education on HepB0 during ANC [33] .

268 Furthermore, the study revealed that birth that takes place in a health facility triples the  
269 probability of receiving HepB0 on time. Several studies have shown low coverage of primary  
270 vaccination at birth when births take place outside a healthcare facility [32] . Childbirth,  
271 particularly that carried out by qualified personnel, constitutes an opportunity not only to  
272 administer HepB0 but also to provide advice on the importance of birth registration and  
273 compliance with the vaccination schedule [10] . In a context marked by a high rate of home  
274 childbirth, the WHO recommends two actions. The first is to make home visits to provide  
275 postnatal care, including administration of HepB0. The second action is to bring newborns to  
276 the health facility as soon as possible. However, Boisson A et al. showed that geographic  
277 distance prevents the timely delivery of newborns to health facilities. Therefore, the second  
278 option involves raising awareness among pregnant women during ANC or in the community  
279 using community health workers [32] . According to the 2019-DHS, the percentage of births

280 that took place in a health facility is 80.3 [20] %. This result, although encouraging, suggests a  
281 missed opportunity for vaccination against hepatitis B and could be explained by a lack of  
282 communication between vaccination services and maternal health services.

283 Area of residence is another factor associated with timely administration of HepB0. Children  
284 from distant regions, located in the north and center, are disadvantaged compared to those  
285 residing in regions located to the west such as Dakar and Thiès. The latter are better off in terms  
286 of health infrastructure and human resources in health [23] . In Nigeria, a similar result was  
287 found [34] . Overall, this study highlights the existence of inequity in timely vaccination  
288 because coverage varies significantly in terms of social and geographic characteristics. This  
289 inequity could be avoided through structural measures by improving geographic access to  
290 vaccination services [35] .

## 291 **5. Conclusion**

292 This study shows that HepB0 vaccination coverage at the appropriate age remains significantly  
293 lower than crude vaccination coverage, suggesting that using the latter as the main indicator is  
294 likely to overestimate actual protection. Timely vaccination should therefore be considered as  
295 an indicator of vaccination performance.

296 Given the limitations of the study, further additional studies with all three sources (maternal  
297 recall, register, card) and contextual variables would be necessary.

## 298 **Acknowledgments**

299 We thank “The Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) Program” for authorizing access to  
300 the database. We also thank the ‘Société africaine de santé publique’ for allowing us to present  
301 this study at its first congress held from November 15 to 17 in Grand Bassam, Ivory Coast.

302

303

304

305 **Reference**

- 306 1. Jeng WJ, Papatheodoridis GV, Lok ASF. Hepatitis B. *Lancet* (London, England). 2023  
307 Mar;401(10381):1039–52.
- 308 2. World Health Organization. Global hepatitis report 2017 [Internet]. Geneva: WHO;  
309 2017 [cited 2020 Sep 3]. Available from:  
310 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/255016/9789241565455-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/255016/9789241565455-eng.pdf?sequence=1)  
311 [eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/255016/9789241565455-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
- 312 3. Eni AO, Soluade MG, Oshamika OO, Efekemo OP, Igwe TT, Onile-Ere OA.  
313 Knowledge and Awareness of Hepatitis B Virus Infection in Nigeria. *Ann Glob Heal*.  
314 2019 Apr;85(1).
- 315 4. Eyong EM, Yankam BM, Seraphine E, Ngwa CH, Nkfusai NC, Anye CS, et al. The  
316 prevalence of HBsAg, knowledge and practice of hepatitis B prevention among  
317 pregnant women in the Limbe and Muyuka Health Districts of the South West region  
318 of Cameroon: a three-year retrospective study. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2019;32:122.
- 319 5. Okenwa UJ, Dairo MD, Bamgboye E, Ajumobi O. Maternal knowledge and infant  
320 uptake of valid hepatitis B vaccine birth dose at routine immunization clinics in Enugu  
321 State - Nigeria. *Vaccinated*. 2020 Mar;38(12):2734–40.
- 322 6. World Health Organization. Immunization Agenda 2030 - A global strategy to leave no  
323 one behind [Internet]. Geneva: WHO; 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 26]. Available from:  
324 [https://www.who.int/immunization/IA2030\\_draft\\_4\\_WHA\\_FR.pdf?ua=1](https://www.who.int/immunization/IA2030_draft_4_WHA_FR.pdf?ua=1)
- 325 7. Locarnini S, Hatzakis A, Chen DS, Lok A. Strategies to control hepatitis B: Public  
326 policy, epidemiology, vaccine and drugs. *J Hepatol*. 2015 Apr;62(1 Suppl):S76-86.
- 327 8. Schillie S, Vellozzi C, Reingold A, Harris A, Haber P, Ward JW, et al. Prevention of  
328 Hepatitis B Virus Infection in the United States: Recommendations of the Advisory  
329 Committee on Immunization Practices. *MMWR Recomm reports Morb Mortal Wkly*


- 330 report Recomm reports [Internet]. 2018 Jan 12;67(1):1–31. Available from:  
331 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29939980>
- 332 9. World Health Organization. Hepatitis B vaccines: WHO summary note – July 2017.  
333 Weekly epidemiological report. 2017;92(27):369–92.
- 334 10. World Health Organization. Essential first aid for newborns. Pocket guide to clinical  
335 practice [Internet]. Geneva: WHO; 2017. Available from:  
336 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/260404/9789290618355-](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/260404/9789290618355-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)  
337 [eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/260404/9789290618355-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- 338 11. Newcomer SR, Glanz JM, Daley MF. Beyond Vaccination Coverage: Population-  
339 Based Measurement of Early Childhood Immunization Schedule Adherence. *Acad*  
340 *Pediatr.* 2023;23(1):24–34.
- 341 12. United Nations. Sustainable Development Goals [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2020 Sep 24].  
342 Available from: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/fr/>
- 343 13. World Health Organization. Global health sector strategy for viral hepatitis 2016-2021  
344 [Internet]. Geneva: WHO; 2016 [cited 2020 Sep 23]. Available from:  
345 <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/250577/WHO-HIV-2016.06-fre.pdf>
- 346 14. World Health Organization. Global health sector strategies against HIV, viral hepatitis  
347 and sexually transmitted infections, respectively, for the period 2022-2030. [Internet]. 1  
348 ed. WHO, editor. WHO. Geneva: WHO; 2022. 136 p. Available from:  
349 <https://www.who.int/fr/publications-detail/9789240053779>
- 350 15. Razavi-Shearer D, Gamkrelidze I, Nguyen MH, Chen DS, Van Damme P, Abbas Z, et  
351 al. Global prevalence, treatment, and prevention of hepatitis B virus infection in 2016:  
352 a modeling study. *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* [Internet]. 2018 Jun 1;3(6):383–403.  
353 Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253\(18\)30056-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-1253(18)30056-6)
- 354 16. Djaogol T, Périères L, Marcellin F, Diouf A, Carrieri MP, Diallo A, et al. Hepatitis B



- 355 prevention and treatment needs in women in Senegal (ANRS 12356 AmBASS survey).  
356 BMC Public Health. 2023 May;23(1):825.
- 357 17. Ministry of Health and Social Action. Management guide for the expanded vaccination  
358 program and epidemiological surveillance. Dakar:MSAS; 2017.
- 359 18. Ministry of Health and Social Action. Introduction of the hepatitis B vaccine at birth in  
360 Senegal: Training manual. Dakar: MSAS; p. 43.
- 361 19. Ministry of Health and Social Action. Complete Multi-Annual Plan (PPAC 2019-  
362 2023). Dakar: MSAS; 2018.
- 363 20. National Agency for Statistics and Demography. Demographic and Continuous Health  
364 Survey (EDS-Continuous) 2019 [Internet]. Dakar: ANSD/ICF; 2020. Available from:  
365 <https://www.dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR368/FR368.pdf>
- 366 21. Bassoum O, Sougou NM, Ba MF, Anne M, Bocoum M, Dieye A, et al. Vaccination  
367 against tuberculosis, polio and hepatitis B at birth in Podor health district, Northern  
368 Senegal: cross-sectional study of vaccination coverage and its associated factors. BMC  
369 Public Health. 2022 Jan;22(1):110.
- 370 22. Périères L, Marcellin F, Lo G, Protopopescu C, Ba E, Coste M, et al. Hepatitis B  
371 Vaccination in Senegalese Children: Coverage, Timeliness, and Sociodemographic  
372 Determinants of Non-Adherence to Immunization Schedules (ANRS 12356 AmBASS  
373 Survey). Vaccines. 2021;9(5):510.
- 374 23. National Agency for Statistics and Demography. Economic and social situation of  
375 Senegal 2019 [Internet]. Dakar: ANSD; 2022 [cited 2022 May 21]. Available from:  
376 [http://www.ansd.sn/ressources/ses/SES\\_2019.pdf](http://www.ansd.sn/ressources/ses/SES_2019.pdf)
- 377 24. Rutstein SO, Rojas G. Guide to DHS Statistics: Demographic and Health Surveys  
378 Methodology [Internet]. DHS Publications. Calverton, Maryland: DHS Publication;  
379 2006. Available from:

- 380 [https://www.dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/DHSG1/Guide\\_to\\_DHS\\_Statistics\\_29Oct2012](https://www.dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/DHSG1/Guide_to_DHS_Statistics_29Oct2012)  
381 [\\_DHSG1.pdf](#)
- 382 25. Babirye JN, Engebretsen IMS, Makumbi F, Fadnes LT, Wamani H, Tylleskar T, et al.  
383 Timeliness of Childhood Vaccinations in Kampala Uganda: A Community-Based  
384 Cross-Sectional Study. *PLoS One*. 2012 Apr 23;7(4):e35432.
- 385 26. World Health Organization. Preventing perinatal transmission of hepatitis B virus:  
386 Guide for introducing and scaling up hepatitis B birth vaccination [Internet]. Geneva:  
387 WHO; 2016 [cited 2020 Oct 7]. Available from:  
388 [http://www.who.int/about/licensing/copyright\\_form/en/index.html](http://www.who.int/about/licensing/copyright_form/en/index.html)
- 389 27. World Health Organization. Vaccination coverage [Internet]. WHO: Geneva; 2022  
390 [cited 2022 Apr 22]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/immunization-coverage)  
391 [sheets/detail/immunization-coverage](https://www.who.int/en/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/immunization-coverage)
- 392 28. Bassoum O, Kimura M, Dia AT, Lemoine M, Shimakawa Y. Coverage and timeliness  
393 of birth dose vaccination in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review and meta-  
394 analysis. *Vaccines*. 2020;8(2):1–16.
- 395 29. Hailu S, Astatkie A, Johansson KA, Lindtjørn B. Low immunization coverage in  
396 Wonago district, southern Ethiopia: A community-based cross-sectional study. *PLoS*  
397 *One*. 2019;14(7):e0220144.
- 398 30. My V, Is TC, My P. Practical guide 1. Promotion of vaccination on social networks  
399 [Internet]. UNICEF, editor. UNICEF; Available from: [https://s3.amazonaws.com/wp-](https://s3.amazonaws.com/wp-agility2/measles/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/1-Guide-Pratique-Promotion-de-la-Vaccination-sur-les-reseaux-sociaux.pdf)  
400 [agility2/measles/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/1-Guide-Pratique-Promotion-de-la-](https://s3.amazonaws.com/wp-agility2/measles/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/1-Guide-Pratique-Promotion-de-la-Vaccination-sur-les-reseaux-sociaux.pdf)  
401 [Vaccination-sur-les-reseaux-sociaux .pdf](https://s3.amazonaws.com/wp-agility2/measles/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/1-Guide-Pratique-Promotion-de-la-Vaccination-sur-les-reseaux-sociaux.pdf)
- 402 31. Dejene H, Girma D, Geleta LA, Legesse E. Vaccination timeliness and associated  
403 factors among children aged 12-23 months in Debre Libanos district of North Shewa  
404 Zone, Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia. *Front Pediatr*. 2022;10:867846.

- 405 32. World Health Organization. Practices that improve coverage of hepatitis B vaccination  
406 at birth [Internet]. Geneva: WHO; 2014 [cited 2019 Sep 12]. Available from:  
407 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/112532/WHO\\_IVB\\_12.11\\_eng.pdf;jsessionid=D4A770E870420A32F504A23DFCD0E992?sequence=1](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/112532/WHO_IVB_12.11_eng.pdf;jsessionid=D4A770E870420A32F504A23DFCD0E992?sequence=1)  
408
- 409 33. Freeland C, Kanu F, Mohammed Y, Nwokoro UU, Sandhu H, Ikwe H, et al. Barriers  
410 and facilitators to hepatitis B birth dose vaccination: Perspectives from healthcare  
411 providers and pregnant women accessing antenatal care in Nigeria. *PLOS Global*  
412 *Public Heal.* 2023;3(6):e0001332.
- 413 34. Olakunde BO, Adeyinka DA, Olakunde OA, Ogundipe T, Oladunni F, Ezeanolue EE.  
414 The coverage of hepatitis B birth dose vaccination in Nigeria: Does the place of  
415 delivery matter? *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2022 Apr;116(4):359–68.
- 416 35. Moffatt H, Ndumbe-Eyoh S. Health equity. Let’s talk about it [Internet]. Antigonish:  
417 National Collaborating Center for Determinants of Health; 2013. p. 6. Available from:  
418 [https://nccdh.ca/images/uploads/comments/Lequite\\_en\\_sante\\_Parlons-en\\_2013.pdf](https://nccdh.ca/images/uploads/comments/Lequite_en_sante_Parlons-en_2013.pdf)
- 419 36. Kaboré R, Nebié E, Sidibé A, Lohmann J, Brenner S, Badolo H, et al. Vaccination  
420 coverage within the recommended time frame and its determinants in Burkina Faso.  
421 *Rev Epidemiol Public Health.* 2022;70:S177.  
422



**Fig. 1: Flow chart of vaccination status with HepB0**

Figure