



22 **Methods:** A cross-sectional survey involving 960 students was conducted from  
23 December 2023 to February 2024. The survey assessed participants' demographics,  
24 knowledge, perception, and attitudes toward PMSP using a structured questionnaire.

25 **Results:** Findings revealed that a significant portion of participants (39.4%) had poor  
26 knowledge of premarital screening programs, 35.9% had fair knowledge, and only  
27 24.7% had good knowledge. Despite limited knowledge, there was strong support for  
28 premarital screening programs, with 83.1% agreeing on its importance and 78.8%  
29 recognizing the need for premarital awareness. Most participants (65.8%) believed  
30 premarital screening programs could reduce genetic diseases, and 65.6% thought it  
31 could lower sexually transmitted diseases' prevalence. Cultural acceptance of marrying  
32 relatives was notable, with 59.7% disagreeing with the preference for not marrying  
33 relatives. Married participants showed significantly higher knowledge and attitude  
34 scores compared to single participants. Gender differences were observed, with males  
35 having higher knowledge scores. There were no significant differences in perception  
36 and attitude scores based on gender or residential area.

37 **Conclusion:** The study underscores the need for enhanced educational campaigns to  
38 improve premarital screening programs awareness and positively influence attitudes,  
39 especially targeting cultural aspects like accepting relative marriages. Comprehensive  
40 education and fostering positive attitudes toward premarital screening programs are  
41 vital for their broader acceptance and implementation.

42 **Keywords** (Premarital screening test, Knowledge, Perception, Attitude, Kurdistan  
43 region, University students)

44 **Introduction**

45 Premarital screening (PMS) programs are critical public health tools designed to  
46 identify and provide counseling for couples at risk of transmitting genetic diseases to  
47 their offspring or who may be at risk of sexually transmitted infections. Despite their  
48 importance, the awareness and knowledge regarding these screenings among university  
49 students remains a subject of interest and concern. This demographic represents a  
50 significant portion of society that is approaching or currently at the marriageable age,  
51 making their understanding of PMS vital for the well-being of future generations (1).  
52 Consequently, many nations and health organizations have embarked on educational  
53 campaigns to shed light on the significance of premarital tests, covering everything  
54 from inheritable diseases to reproductive health. However, the effectiveness of these  
55 programs is contingent upon the degree to which university students are engaged and  
56 informed about the purpose, procedures, and benefits of PMS. Research into this area  
57 often seeks to evaluate the awareness levels of these students and to identify  
58 opportunities to enhance education and outreach initiatives to improve the uptake and  
59 positive outcomes of premarital health practices (2–4).

60 Tests for common genetic blood disorders (primary hemoglobinopathy, such as  
61 thalassemia and sickle cell anemia) and infectious diseases (like hepatitis B, hepatitis  
62 C, and HIV/AIDS) are referred to as PMS if a couple plans to get married soon (5).  
63 PMS aims to give couples/partners options to help them plan a healthy family and  
64 medical advice regarding the likelihood of passing on the diseases above to the  
65 partner/spouse or other children. This process lowers the financial burden of treating  
66 sexually transmitted infections and some genetic disorders by reducing their  
67 prevalence. It lessens the workload for state-run hospitals and blood banks (6). It also  
68 raises awareness of a virtuous and well-being marriage. In addition, premarital  
69 examinations may involve blood tests, resuscitation factors, semen analysis, FSH,

70 prolactin, testosterone, and estrogen hormones, as well as tests for syphilis, gonorrhea,  
71 and other sexually transmitted diseases (7). Understanding the factors influencing  
72 students' knowledge about PMS—including cultural, religious, and socioeconomic  
73 backgrounds- and the role of university curriculum and public health interventions—is  
74 crucial for developing targeted strategies to boost their awareness and encourage  
75 proactive health behaviors. These endeavors not only support public health but also  
76 foster a culture of prevention, which is instrumental in reducing the burden of genetic  
77 and communicable diseases on individuals, families, and healthcare systems worldwide  
78 (4,8,9).

79 Premarital counseling is a type of therapy designed to help couples become better  
80 prepared for marriage, recognize issues in their relationship, and give them the tools to  
81 handle disagreements both now and in the future. Couples also communicate their  
82 unique needs, preferences, and expectations for their marriage and learn how to settle  
83 disagreements in ways that satisfy both parties (10). In three Kurdistan provinces in  
84 northern Iraq (Duhok, Erbil, and Sulaimaniyah), a PMS program to find  
85 hemoglobinopathy carriers was started in 2008. The passage of legislation by the  
86 regional parliament mandating PMS for hemoglobinopathies made the program easier  
87 to implement (11). The current study aimed to determine students' knowledge,  
88 perception, and attitude regarding PMS programs and find the important factors related  
89 to their knowledge.

90

## 91 **Methods**

### 92 **Design and setting**

93 This cross-sectional study was conducted in Kurdistan Region of Iraq, from December  
94 2023 to February 2024. The survey was based on a self-administered online survey  
95 using Google Forms.

## 96 **Participants**

97 The sample size for this study was calculated using Epi-info, using an estimated  
98 prevalence of household members who need care of 33.9%, with a confidence interval  
99 of 95% and  $\pm 5\%$  precision. Thus, a sample size of 344 individuals was calculated,  
100 which was increased to 500 to account for nonresponse. However, 960 students  
101 answered the questions. A convenience sample of students from the universities was  
102 recruited for this study.

## 103 **Study Tool and Data Collection**

104 The questionnaire used for data collection included three sections. The first section  
105 included information on participants' characteristics, such as age, gender, and economic  
106 status, and questions about hereditary diseases inside their families. The second section  
107 included participants' knowledge of the PMS test, which included nine questions to  
108 assess their knowledge. All the questions were answered with yes or no. In the third  
109 section, all the questions were related to the perception of the participants for PMS, and  
110 all of them were answered with disagree, neutral, and agree. This section included 12  
111 questions to evaluate their perception. The final section included questions related to  
112 participants' attitudes toward PMS. It contained four questions and answered with  
113 disagree, neutral, and agree. For all three sections of the questions, knowledge,  
114 perception, and attitude, less than 50% considered poor, 50%-75% considered fair, and  
115 more than 75% considered good (12).

116 The online Google form was shared with the participants through social media,  
117 WhatsApp groups, and email. The form began with a description of the study and its  
118 significance. Participants were asked to provide informed consent before completing  
119 the online Google form.

## 120 **Ethical aspects**

121 Participants provided written informed consent online after being informed that  
122 participation was voluntary and anonymity was guaranteed. The Research Ethics  
123 Committee of the authors' institute approved the study protocol. Koya University and  
124 Hawler Medical University.

## 125 **Data processing and statistical analysis**

126 Different statistical tests were used to determine the factors that affected three elements  
127 of the study. Kolmogorov Smirnov test was used to determine the normality of the  
128 continuous variables. Since the data was non-parametric, the Mann-Whitney U and  
129 Kruskal Wallis tests were used, and mean rank and mean with standard deviation were  
130 used to present the data. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the  
131 Social Sciences (version 27). A p-value equal to and less than 0.05 was considered to  
132 indicate statistical significance.

## 133 **Results**

134 In general, 960 persons answered the questions. 394 (41.1%) and 408 (42.5%) were  
135 less than 20 and 20 to 22 years old, respectively. The majority of the participants were  
136 female (n = 582, 60.6%). Most of them were single (n = 890 92.7%). Most (n = 907,  
137 94.5%) were from urban areas, and 753 (78.4%) had enough economic status for life.  
138 Over half answered yes to parental consanguinity (n = 571, 59.5%). Regarding personal  
139 and family history for hereditary diseases, most participants reported no diseases (n =

140 814, 84.8% and n = 620, 64.6)), respectively. 319 (33.2%) were from stage 4, and 280  
141 (29.2%) were from stage 1. The median and interquartile range was 3 (3), as shown in  
142 Table 1.

143 Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of the participants

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age group		
Less than 20	394	41.1
20-22	408	42.5
More than 22	157	16.4
Gender		
Female	582	60.6
Male	378	39.4
Marital status		
Single	890	92.7
Married	70	7.3
Resident place		
Urban area	907	94.5
Rural area	53	5.5
Economic status		
Not enough for daily life	79	8.2
Enough for daily life	753	78.4
Good	128	13.3
Parental consanguinity		
No	389	40.5

Yes	571	59.5
Personal history of hereditary diseases		
No	814	84.8
Yes	146	15.2
Family history of hereditary diseases		
No	620	64.6
Yes	340	35.4
In which stage do you study		
1	280	29.2
2	146	15.2
3	137	14.3
4	319	33.2
5	13	1.4
6	65	6.8
Median	3	
Inter quartile range	3	

144

145 Regarding the knowledge of the students, the vast majority of respondents have heard  
 146 of PMS (n = 905, 94.3%) and know its meaning (n = 850, 88.5%) and objectives (n =  
 147 895, 93.2%). Furthermore, A majority recognize that PMS focuses on infectious (n =  
 148 739, 77%) and hereditary diseases (n = 863, 89.9%). Less than half of the respondents  
 149 are aware of different places to perform PMS (n = 405, 42.2%), more than half (n =

150 507, 52.8%) know the specific tests included in PMS, and a similar proportion knows  
 151 about the physical examinations included in PMS (n = 496, 51.7%), as shown in Table  
 152 2.

153 Table 2. Knowledge of the participants regarding PMS

Questions	Frequency	Percentage
Did you hear PMS previously		
No	55	5.7
Yes	905	94.3
Do you know the meaning of PMS		
No	110	11.5
Yes	850	88.5
Do you know the objectives of PMS		
No	65	6.5
Yes	895	93.2
PMS focuses on infectious diseases		
No	221	23
Yes	739	77
PMS focuses on hereditary diseases		
No	97	10.1
Yes	863	89.9
Do you know different options of places to perform PMS		
No	555	57.8
Yes	405	42.2

Do you know the tests included in PMS		
No	453	47.2
Yes	507	52.8
Physical examinations included in PMS		
No	464	48.3
Yes	496	51.7

154

155 In terms of the sources of information that the students used, 477 (49.68%) of the  
 156 participants took information from their family, 109 (11.4%) from the internet, 73  
 157 (7.6%) from school, and 301 (31.4%) from all sources.

158

159 As shown in Table 3, most participants fall into the "Poor Knowledge" category (n =  
 160 378, 39.4%), followed by those with "Fair Knowledge" (n = 345, 35.9%), and the  
 161 fewest have "Good Knowledge" (n = 237, 24.7%).

162 Table 3. The knowledge, perception, and attitude of the participants

Variable	Poor		Fair		Good	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Knowledge	378	39.4	345	35.9	237	24.7
Perception	394	41	346	36	220	22.9
Attitude	776	80.8	155	16.1	29	3

163

164

165

166 The data represents survey responses on various statements regarding the importance  
167 and implications of Premarital Screening (PMS) for future couples. The attitude of the  
168 participants for PMS. A large majority (n = 798, 83.1%), agree that PMS is important  
169 for future couples, indicating strong support for its perceived value. Additionally, most  
170 respondents (n = 756, 78.8%), agree that awareness about PMS before marriage is  
171 important, suggesting a high level of perceived importance for premarital awareness. A  
172 majority (n = 632, 65.8%) believe that PMS can reduce the prevalence of some genetic  
173 diseases, though a notable portion is neutral (n = 216, 22.5%) or disagrees (n = 112,  
174 11.7%). A significant majority (n = 666, 69.4%), agreed that consanguinity increases  
175 the risk of hereditary diseases, while a substantial number were neutral (n = 288, 30%).  
176 A majority (n = 630, 65.6%) believed PMS would reduce the prevalence of some  
177 sexually transmitted diseases, but a considerable portion is neutral (n = 258, 26.9%).  
178 Most respondents (n = 558, 58.1%) agree on the confidentiality of PMS and genetic  
179 counseling, though a significant number are neutral (n = 331, 34.5%). However, the  
180 majority are either neutral (n = 430, 44.8%) or disagree (n = 371, 38.6%) that PMS  
181 causes psychological troubles, indicating that most do not see it as a significant  
182 psychological burden. Moreover, the majority (n = 616, 64.2%) believe religious people  
183 should adopt PMS ideas in their discussions, showing support for integrating PMS into  
184 religious dialogue. Also, a significant majority (n = 755, 78.6%) support legal  
185 obligation for PMS and genetic counseling, indicating strong support for mandated  
186 screening. While opinions are more divided here, with 382 (39.8%) agreeing that the  
187 decision should be left to the couple, while a significant number are neutral (n = 345,  
188 35.9%) or disagree (n = 223, 24.3%). A majority (n = 617, 64.3%) agree on the  
189 importance of medical counseling post-results, with a notable neutral stance (n = 276,  
190 28.7%). Additionally, a significant majority (n = 674, 70.2%) agree that any disease

191 detected should be treated before marriage, indicating strong support for premarital  
 192 treatment. Table 4 shows the details of the perception of participants toward PMS.

193 Table 4. Perception of the participants toward PMS

Question	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)
PMS is important for future couples	57 (5.9)	105 (10.9)	798 (83.1)
Awareness about PMS before marriage is important	53 (5.5)	151 (15.7)	756 (78.8)
PMS will reduce the prevalence of some genetic diseases	112 (11.7)	216 (22.5)	632 (65.8)
Consanguinity can increase the risk of hereditary diseases	6 (0.6)	288 (30)	666 (69.4)
PMS will reduce the prevalence of some sexual transmitted diseases	72 (7.5)	258 (26.9)	630 (65.6)
PMS and genetic counselling should be confidential	71 (7.4)	331 (34.5)	558 (58.1)
PMS cause psychological troubles to the couples	371 (38.6)	430 (44.8)	159 (16.6)
The religious people should adopt the ideas of PMS in their discussion	106 (11)	238 (24.8)	616 (64.2)
Law should obligate all future couples to do PMS and genetic counselling	90 (9.4)	115 (12)	755 (78.6)

In detecting Sexually Transmitted Diseases, marriage decision must be left for freedom of the couple	223 (24.3)	345 (35.9)	382 (39.8)
The medical counselling is important to be given after getting the results	67 (7)	276 (28.7)	617 (64.3)
Any disease appeared in one of the couple has to be treated before marriage	77 (8)	209 (21.8)	674 (70.2)

194

195 As shown in Table 3, most participants fall into the "Poor Perception" category (n =  
 196 394, 41%), followed by those with "Fair Perception" (n = 346, 36%), and the fewest  
 197 have "Good Perception" (n = 220, 22.9%). This indicates that the overall perception  
 198 of the topic among participants is more negative than positive, with a considerable  
 199 number of participants having only a fair or poor perception.

200

201 The table presents survey data showing participants' levels of agreement with various  
 202 statements related to PMS. The percentages reflect the proportion of participants who  
 203 disagree, are neutral or agree with each statement.

204 A significant majority (n = 781, 81.4%) of participants agree with carrying out PMS,  
 205 indicating strong support for this practice. Very few participants (n = 50, 5.2%)  
 206 disagree, while a modest portion (n = 129, 13.4%) remain neutral. Most participants  
 207 (n = 573, 59.7%) disagree with the preference for not marrying relatives, indicating a  
 208 cultural or social acceptance of relative marriages. Only a small percentage (n = 69,  
 209 7.2%) agree with this preference, and a significant portion (n = 318, 33.1%) are  
 210 neutral. Most participants (n = 788, 82.1%) agree that the appropriate time for PMS is

211 just before marriage, showing strong consensus. A few (n = 40, 4.2%) disagree, and a  
212 small percentage (n = 132, 13.8%) are neutral.

213

214 A majority (n = 585, 60.9%) agree that future couples should be advised to conduct  
215 PMS, indicating general support for promoting PMS. However, a notable minority (n  
216 = 173, 18%) disagree, and (n = 202, 21%) are neutral, suggesting some reservations  
217 or lack of strong opinion among these groups (Table 5).

218

219 Table 5. Attitude of the participants

Question	Disagree (%)	Neutral (%)	Agree (%)
Carryout PMS	50 (5.2)	129 (13.4)	781 (81.4)
Not- prefer relative marriage	573 (59.7)	318 (33.1)	69 (7.2)
Appropriate time for PMS just before marriage	40 (4.2)	132 (13.8)	788 (82.1)
Advise future couples to conduct PMS	173 (18)	202 (21)	585 (60.9)

220

221

222 Most participants (n = 776, 80.8%) exhibit a Poor Attitude. This category has the  
223 highest frequency by a significant margin, suggesting that most participants are not  
224 positively engaged or have negative feelings about the subject in question. A smaller  
225 but notable portion of participants (n = 155, 16.1%) have a Fair Attitude. Only 29  
226 (3%) participants have a Good Attitude, indicating a very small fraction of the total  
227 population has a positive outlook, as shown in Table 3.

228

229

230

231

232 Table 6. Correlation between student's stage and parameters

<b>Confidence Intervals of Spearman's Rho</b>				
	Spearman's rho	P value	95% Confidence Intervals	
			Lower	Upper
Students' stage-knowledge score	0.114	<0.001	0.049	0.178
Student's stage – perception score	0.132	<0.001	0.067	0.195
Student's stage – attitude score	0.004	0.897	-0.061	0.069

Kruskal Wallis test	Mean rank 1	Mean rank 2	Mean rank diff.	P value
<b>Knowledge Score and age group</b>				
less than 20 vs. 20-22	457.8	471.1	-13.35	>0.999
less than 20 vs. more than 22	457.8	562.0	-104.2	<0.001
20-22 vs. more than 22	471.1	562.0	-90.85	0.001
<b>Perception score and age group</b>				
less than 20 vs. 20-22	478.7	460.1	18.55	>0.999
less than 20 vs. more than 22	478.7	538.0	-59.35	0.067
20-22 vs. more than 22	460.1	538.0	-77.90	0.008

Attitude score and age group				
less than 20 vs. 20-22	485.6	456.3	29.31	0.356
less than 20 vs. more than 22	485.6	530.3	-44.70	0.225
20-22 vs. more than 22	456.3	530.3	-74.00	0.009

233

234 As shown in Table 6, knowledge and perception scores have weak but statistically  
235 significant positive correlations with the students' stage. Attitude score shows no  
236 significant correlation with the students' stage.

237

238 Regarding knowledge scores, significant differences exist between "less than 20" vs.  
239 "more than 22" and "20-22" vs. "more than 22" age groups, with the "more than 22"  
240 group scoring higher. Regarding perception scores, significant differences are found  
241 between "20-22" vs. "more than 22" age groups, with a near-significant difference  
242 between "less than 20" vs. "more than 22." Regarding attitude scores, significant  
243 differences exist between "20-22" vs. "more than 22" age groups. Other comparisons  
244 show no significant differences, as shown in Table 7.

245

246 Table 7. The results of Kruskal Wallis test

247

248

249

250 The mean score of knowledge in females was  $(4.809) \pm (1.696)$ , (95% C.I: 4.671-  
251 4.947), while in males was  $(5.175) \pm (1.739)$ , (95% C.I: 4.999-5.351) with a P value  
252 of  $<0.001$ . Males have a higher mean knowledge score compared to females. The P

253 value is less than 0.001, indicating a statistically significant difference in knowledge  
254 scores between genders.

255 Both genders have similar mean perception and attitude scores, and the P values were  
256 0.383 and 0.273, respectively. This indicates no statistically significant difference in  
257 perception and attitude scores between genders.

258 Regarding marital status and knowledge score, single participants' mean score was  
259  $(4.193) \pm (1.714)$ , (95% C.I: 4.801-5.026) while married individuals' mean score was  
260  $(5.457) \pm (1.759)$ , (95% C.I: 5.038-5.876) and the (P value 0.007). This mean score of  
261 married individuals has a higher mean knowledge score than single individuals.

262 The mean perception score for single was  $(6.07) \pm (4.5)$ , (95% C.I: 5.78-6.37), and the  
263 mean for married was  $(7.47) \pm (5.1)$ , (95% C.I: 6.25-8.69) the (P value <0.001). This  
264 means that married individuals have a significantly higher mean perception score than  
265 single individuals.

266 The mean attitude score for singles was  $(1.402) \pm (1.38)$ , (95% C.I: 1.311-1.493), and  
267 the mean of married was  $(1.986) \pm (1.749)$ , (95% C.I: 1.569-2.403) and (P value  
268 <0.001) This shows that married individuals have a significantly higher mean attitude  
269 score than single individuals.

270 Both rural and urban residents have similar mean knowledge scores since the P value  
271 was 0.944, indicating no statistically significant difference in knowledge scores  
272 between resident areas. Both rural and urban residents have similar mean perception  
273 scores, and the P value is 0.892, indicating no statistically significant difference in  
274 perception scores between resident areas. Rural residents have a slightly higher mean  
275 attitude score than urban residents; the P value is 0.133, indicating no statistically  
276 significant difference in attitude scores between resident areas (Table 8).

277 Table 8. Association knowledge, perception, and attitude with the demographics.

Variables	Knowledge score		Perception score		Attitude score	
	Mean ±(S.D)	95% C.I	Mean ±(S.D)	95% C.I	Mean ±(S.D)	95% C.I
Female	4.809	4.671-4.947	6.211	5.864-6.559	1.471	1.374-1.567
Male	5.175	4.999-5.351	6.119	5.617-6.622	1.405	1.231-1.579
P value	<0.001		0.383		0.273	
Single	4.193	4.801-5.026	6.07	5.78-6.37	1.402	1.311-1.493
Married	5.457	5.038-5.876	7.47	6.25-8.69	1.986	1.569-2.403
P value	0.007		<0.001		<0.001	
Rural	4.868	4.358-5.378	6.83	6.038-7.622	1.774	1.446-2.101
Urban	4.958	4.846-5.07	6.137	5.835-6.439	1.426	1.333-1.519
P value	0.944		0.892		0.133	

278

279

## 280 Discussion

281 The recent study stated that most participants fall into the "Poor Knowledge" category  
 282 378 (39.4%), followed by those with "Fair Knowledge," 345 (35.9%), and the least  
 283 number of participants have "Good Knowledge." 237 (24.7%). This result is in line  
 284 with regional findings. A recent population-based study conducted in Saudi Arabia  
 285 revealed that while 52.4% of participants (n = 3283) had a fair understanding of PMS  
 286 programs, only 9.2% of participants (n = 575) had satisfactory knowledge (1). Similar  
 287 results were obtained from another study conducted in Oman, which showed that  
 288 although most participants (79%) had heard of PMS, half were ignorant of premarital

289 testing (13). Another study in Qatar reported low student knowledge of PMS (14).  
290 Additionally, less than half, 139 (46.3%) respondents had a good understanding of  
291 PMS, as the study's results plainly showed (15). This result is consistent with a study  
292 from Ile-Ife, Nigeria, which found that 69% of respondents had an insufficient  
293 understanding of PMS (16). 34.1% of respondents in a different survey on PMS  
294 knowledge and attitudes among students at the State School of Nursing in Sokoto,  
295 Nigeria, indicated that they were well-versed in the practice (17).

296 These findings do highlight the necessity of health education initiatives to raise public  
297 awareness of PMS initiatives, which try to reduce the risk of certain genetic and  
298 sexually transmitted diseases among prospective spouses, particularly in nations  
299 where consanguineous marriages and inherited illnesses are highly common.

300

301 A recent study demonstrated that males have a higher mean knowledge score than  
302 females. However, the findings of some other studies indicated that women are more  
303 likely than men to have higher knowledge ratings. In Saudi Arabia and Kuwait,  
304 women were more knowledgeable than men (9,18). A different Nigerian study (19)  
305 showed that female students' results differed from those of male pupils. Premarital  
306 genetic testing was more widely known among Syrian university students (20). On the  
307 other hand, adult men in Oman knew more about premarital carrier screening than  
308 women, similar to the recent study (13). However, investigations in Qatar did not find  
309 gender differences (21). This could be because the target groups are different. The  
310 findings pertaining to gender differences in knowledge may differ, and this could be  
311 explained by socioeconomic and cultural factors. For example, because they are the  
312 focus of distinct education programs, women are traditionally better educated about  
313 PMS and marriage-related issues (22).

314 Relations between the fields in which students study can increase the knowledge score  
315 regarding PMS since the scientific or health and medical branches study much more  
316 about the different diseases; therefore, they know more about hereditary diseases than  
317 those who study other branches (22,23). The existence of hereditary illnesses in  
318 families or personal illnesses, which help students cope with these circumstances and  
319 get more knowledge about them, is another topic that can broaden their knowledge  
320 (9,22). This may be because families of affected individuals have access to tools like  
321 therapy sessions and educational materials that help them become more  
322 knowledgeable. Furthermore, people with a family history of a particular genetic issue  
323 are probably more curious to learn about the condition because they worry about how  
324 it can affect their families or future children.

325 According to a Kuwaiti study, partners who are not related to one another, such as  
326 cousins, know more about PMS. This could result from additional circumstances,  
327 such as parents' educational background, which probably increased their children's  
328 knowledge (9). Furthermore, compared to those who had heard of PMS, those who  
329 had never heard of it scored far worse on the knowledge test (14). This is expected  
330 and necessitates student education initiatives and awareness efforts (22). These  
331 initiatives, which can be carried out through academic courses and family members,  
332 which, in our survey, are rated as the source of PMS knowledge after academic  
333 courses and friends, are especially necessary for universities that are not health-  
334 related.

335

336 The information shows that the survey respondents answered various questions about  
337 the significance and consequences of PMS for prospective spouses. The participants'  
338 perspective on PMS. PMS is crucial for future couples, according to a great majority

339 of 798 (83.1%), suggesting substantial support for its perceived importance.

340 According to the survey, 41.4% of participants strongly agreed that the public would

341 benefit more from genetic testing than suffer harm (14). In a study conducted in

342 Qatar, 28% of participants believed that PMS would be beneficial and avoid

343 unanticipated consequences (21). Given that 66.9% of participants in Bener et al.'s

344 study had education levels below that of a university, the variation in the proportions

345 is probably caused by the participants' educational backgrounds in the two studies.

346 Additionally, a study evaluating young Jordanians' perceptions of premarital genetic

347 testing revealed that about 90% of participants had a positive perception of premarital

348 genetic screening because they thought it would help lower the likelihood of having

349 affected children, which could be emotionally and financially taxing (2).

350 Moreover, a strong majority, 616 (64.2%), believe religious people should adopt PMS

351 ideas in their discussions, showing support for integrating PMS into religious dialogue

352 in the current study. Similarly, a study reported that it is interesting to note that 24.8%

353 of participants, or nearly one-fourth, agreed that marriage should be prohibited if there

354 is a possibility that the kid may be born with a genetic condition (14). Additionally, a

355 recent Omani study revealed that 36% of participants believed that laws and

356 regulations should be put in place to stop high-risk marriages (24). Though PMS is

357 required in the Kurdistan region, couples have the option to stay married or dissolve

358 their union at any time, provided they first attend a genetic counseling session

359 wherein they are informed about the disease and its implications if their results

360 indicate incompatibility and they sign a consent form attesting to their understanding

361 of the session. The prohibition against marriage for high-risk couples presents a

362 significant moral dilemma about the right to choose a mate. Moreover, there is no

363 legal requirement to forbid the marriage of at-risk couples because there are

364 alternative ways to reduce the likelihood of having an afflicted child, such as  
365 preimplantation genetic testing and prenatal diagnosis, which are becoming more  
366 widely available and accessible.

367 Of all participants, 776 show a poor attitude, accounting for 80.8% of the total. This  
368 group has the largest frequency by far, indicating that most participants are either  
369 disengaged or have unfavorable opinions regarding the topic at hand. 155 (16.1), a  
370 smaller but significant portion of individuals have a Fair Attitude. Merely 39% of the  
371 participants exhibit a Good Attitude, suggesting that a minuscule portion of the  
372 population harbors a positive perspective.

373 Given incompatible PMS findings, just one-third (37.4%) of the participants were  
374 willing to call off their marriage (14). In additional research, this proportion was  
375 greater. For instance, in a study conducted at Taif University (25), in another study  
376 conducted in Saudi Arabia (22), it was 67.1%. In a population-based study conducted  
377 in Saudi Arabia (26), it was over 60%. As indicated by earlier studies (27), this might  
378 be because prenatal diagnosis and pregnancy termination (under certain conditions)  
379 are available in Qatar. In the current study, the attitude was not affected by any other  
380 factors. Other studies found that this may be a reflection of this highly educated  
381 population's level of religious knowledge and the significance of spreading  
382 unambiguous religious teachings endorsing PMS as a preventive measure for a  
383 healthy populace. According to a different survey conducted at Al-Taif University,  
384 only 5.2% of students disagreed that PMS taints fate (25).

385 This study was the first study conducted in Iraq and the Kurdistan region with a large  
386 sample size. It could be dependable for other studies and was key for educational and  
387 health programs. However, there are some limitations to the current study. Firstly, it  
388 could not be generalized to the whole population since only the university students

389 participated in the study. Secondly, people answered the self-reported questionnaire in  
390 a way that demonstrated their commitment to the ideal scenario, even though it was  
391 subject to social decrement. This might have overstated the sentiment toward ending a  
392 marriage when the PMS results were mismatched. Third, self-selection bias might  
393 exist, and the sample may not represent the broader population fairly. Lastly, since the  
394 design is cross-sectional in nature, causal inferences should not be made.

## 395 **Conclusion**

396 The participants widely acknowledge the importance and benefits of PMS;  
397 nevertheless, real knowledge regarding PMS is rather limited, and attitudes and  
398 perceptions are generally more negative than positive. The results emphasize the  
399 necessity of better education and awareness campaigns to increase understanding and  
400 modify attitudes and beliefs about PMS. In order to effectively address the important  
401 cultural component—particularly about the acceptance of marrying relatives—  
402 targeted educational initiatives may be necessary. Moreover, the notable distinctions  
403 in knowledge and attitude scores between married and single people imply that  
404 marital status and life experience are important factors in forming perspectives on  
405 PMS. Generally, for PMS to be more widely accepted and used, extensive education  
406 and the development of positive attitudes around it are crucial.

407

408

409

## 410 **References**

- 411 1. Al-Shroby WA, Sulimani SM, Alhurishi SA, Bin Dayel ME, Alsanie NA,  
412 Alhraiwil NJ. Awareness of Premarital Screening and Genetic Counseling among

- 413        Saudis and its Association with Sociodemographic Factors: a National Study.  
414        JMDH [Internet]. 2021 Feb [cited 2024 Mar 2];Volume 14:389–99. Available  
415        from: [https://www.dovepress.com/awareness-of-premarital-screening-and-](https://www.dovepress.com/awareness-of-premarital-screening-and-genetic-counseling-among-saudis-peer-reviewed-article-JMDH)  
416        [genetic-counseling-among-saudis-peer-reviewed-article-JMDH](https://www.dovepress.com/awareness-of-premarital-screening-and-genetic-counseling-among-saudis-peer-reviewed-article-JMDH)
- 417    2.    Altaany Z, Khabour OF, Alzoubi KH, Alkaraki AK, Al-Taani G. The Perception  
418        of Premarital Genetic Screening within Young Jordanian Individuals. Public  
419        Health Genomics [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2024 Mar 2];24(3–4):182–8. Available  
420        from: <https://www.karger.com/Article/FullText/517162>
- 421    3.    AlOtaiby S, Alqahtani A, Saleh R, Mazyad A, Albohigan A, Kutbi E.  
422        Comprehension of premarital screening and genetic disorders among the  
423        population of Riyadh. Journal of Taibah University Medical Sciences [Internet].  
424        2023 Aug [cited 2024 Mar 2];18(4):822–30. Available from:  
425        <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1658361223000069>
- 426    4.    Wang P, Wang X, Fang M, Vander Weele TJ. Factors influencing the decision to  
427        participate in medical premarital examinations in Hubei Province, Mid-China.  
428        BMC Public Health [Internet]. 2013 Dec [cited 2024 Mar 2];13(1):217. Available  
429        from: [https://bmcpublihealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-13-](https://bmcpublihealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-13-217)  
430        217
- 431    5.    Al-Shafai M, Al-Romaihi A, Al-Hajri N, Islam N, Adawi K. Knowledge and  
432        Perception of and Attitude toward a Premarital Screening Program in Qatar: A  
433        Cross-Sectional Study. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022 Apr 6;19(7):4418.
- 434    6.    Alhosain A. Premarital Screening Programs in the Middle East, from a Human  
435        Right’s Perspective. Divers Equal Health Care [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2023 Nov

- 436 7];15(2). Available from: <http://diversityhealthcare.imedpub.com/premarital->  
437 [screening-programs-in-the-middle-east-from-a-human-rights-](http://diversityhealthcare.imedpub.com/premarital-screening-programs-in-the-middle-east-from-a-human-rights-)  
438 [perspective.php?aid=22083](http://diversityhealthcare.imedpub.com/premarital-screening-programs-in-the-middle-east-from-a-human-rights-perspective.php?aid=22083)
- 439 7. Mohamady S H, Said S AE. Effect of Application of Health Belief Model on  
440 females' Knowledge and Practice regarding the premarital counseling. IOSR  
441 JNHS [Internet]. 2017 Feb [cited 2023 Nov 7];06(01):05–15. Available from:  
442 [http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jnhs/papers/vol6-issue1/Version-](http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jnhs/papers/vol6-issue1/Version-8/B0601080515.pdf)  
443 [8/B0601080515.pdf](http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jnhs/papers/vol6-issue1/Version-8/B0601080515.pdf)
- 444 8. Natarajan J, Joseph MA. Premarital screening for genetic blood disorders — an  
445 integrated review on the knowledge and attitudes of Middle Eastern university  
446 students. Middle East Fertil Soc J [Internet]. 2021 Dec [cited 2024 Mar  
447 2];26(1):19. Available from:  
448 <https://mej.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s43043-021-00065-4>
- 449 9. Al-Enezi K, Mitra AK. Knowledge, Attitude, and Satisfaction of University  
450 Students Regarding Premarital Screening Programs in Kuwait. European Journal  
451 of Environment and Public Health [Internet]. 2017 Dec 28 [cited 2024 Mar  
452 2];1(2). Available from: [http://www.ejeph.com/article/knowledge-attitude-and-](http://www.ejeph.com/article/knowledge-attitude-and-satisfaction-of-university-students-regarding-premarital-screening)  
453 [satisfaction-of-university-students-regarding-premarital-screening](http://www.ejeph.com/article/knowledge-attitude-and-satisfaction-of-university-students-regarding-premarital-screening)
- 454 10. Bittles AH, Black ML. The impact of consanguinity on neonatal and infant health.  
455 *Early Hum Dev.* 2010 Nov;86(11):737–41.
- 456 11. Al-Allawi NA, Al-Dousky AA. Frequency of haemoglobinopathies at premarital  
457 health screening in Dohuk, Iraq: implications for a regional prevention  
458 programme. *East Mediterr Health J.* 2010 Apr;16(4):381–5.

- 459 12. Hamed E, Eshra D, Qasem E, Khalil A. Knowledge, Perception, and Attitude of  
460 Future Couples towards Premarital Screening. *Menoufia Nursing Journal*  
461 [Internet]. 2022 Nov 1 [cited 2024 Jun 17];7(2):1–21. Available from:  
462 [https://menj.journals.ekb.eg/article\\_254007.html](https://menj.journals.ekb.eg/article_254007.html)
- 463 13. Al-Farsi OA, Al-Farsi YM, Gupta I, Ouhtit A, Al-Farsi KS, Al-Adawi S. A study  
464 on knowledge, attitude, and practice towards premarital carrier screening among  
465 adults attending primary healthcare centers in a region in Oman. *BMC Public*  
466 *Health* [Internet]. 2014 Dec [cited 2024 Jun 19];14(1):380. Available from:  
467 <http://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1471-2458-14-380>
- 468 14. Al-Shafai M, Al-Romaihi A, Al-Hajri N, Islam N, Adawi K. Knowledge and  
469 Perception of and Attitude toward a Premarital Screening Program in Qatar: A  
470 Cross-Sectional Study. *IJERPH* [Internet]. 2022 Apr 6 [cited 2024 Jun  
471 19];19(7):4418. Available from: <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/19/7/4418>
- 472 15. Oluwole EO, Okoye CD, Ogunyemi AO, Olowoselu OF, Oyedeji OA.  
473 Knowledge, attitude and premarital screening practices for sickle cell disease  
474 among young unmarried adults in an urban community in Lagos, Nigeria. *Pan Afr*  
475 *Med J* [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 Jun 19];42. Available from:  
476 <https://www.panafrican-med-journal.com/content/article/42/8/full>
- 477 16. Abioye -Kuteyi Emmanuel A., Osakwe C, Oyegbade O, Bello I. Sickle cell  
478 knowledge, premarital screening and marital decisions among local government  
479 workers in Ile-Ife, Nigeria : original research. *African Journal of Primary Health*  
480 *Care and Family Medicine* [Internet]. 2009 Jan [cited 2024 Jun 19];1(1):1–5.  
481 Available from: <https://journals.co.za/doi/abs/10.10520/EJC134460>

- 482 17. Isah, BA, Musa Y, Mohammed UK, Awosan K, Yunusa EU. Knowledge and  
483 Attitude Regarding Premarital Screening for Sickle Cell Disease among Students  
484 of State School of Nursing Sokoto. AIMDR [Internet]. 2016 Apr 25 [cited 2024  
485 Jun 19];2(3):29–34. Available from:  
486 [http://aimdrjournal.com/pdf/Vol2Issue3\\_9\\_OA\\_Musa\\_2\\_3\\_11.pdf](http://aimdrjournal.com/pdf/Vol2Issue3_9_OA_Musa_2_3_11.pdf)
- 487 18. Al-Aama JY, Al-Nabulsi BK, Alyousef MA, Asiri NA, Al-Blewi SM. Knowledge  
488 regarding the national premarital screening program among university students in  
489 western Saudi Arabia. Saudi Med J. 2008 Nov;29(11):1649–53.
- 490 19. Hussaini MA, Durbunde AA, Jobbi YD, Muhammad IY, Mansur AU, Umar M, et  
491 al. Assessment of Experience, Perception and Attitude Towards Premarital Sickle  
492 Cell Disease Screening among Students Attending Federal College of Education,  
493 Kano, Nigeria. International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology  
494 [Internet]. 2019 Mar 4 [cited 2024 Jun 19];2(1):15–26. Available from:  
495 <http://publications.openuniversitystm.com/id/eprint/1495/>
- 496 20. Gharaibeh H, Mater FK. Young Syrian adults' knowledge, perceptions and  
497 attitudes to premarital testing. International Nursing Review [Internet]. 2009 Dec  
498 [cited 2024 Jun 19];56(4):450–5. Available from:  
499 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1466-7657.2009.00736.x>
- 500 21. Bener A, Al-Mulla M, Clarke A. Premarital screening and genetic counseling  
501 program: Studies from an endogamous population. Int J App Basic Med Res  
502 [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2024 Jun 19];9(1):20. Available from:  
503 [https://journals.lww.com/10.4103/ijabmr.IJABMR\\_42\\_18](https://journals.lww.com/10.4103/ijabmr.IJABMR_42_18)

- 504 22. Ibrahim NKR, Al-Bar H, Al-Fakeeh A, Al Ahmadi J, Qadi M, Al-Bar A, et al. An  
505 educational program about premarital screening for unmarried female students in  
506 King Abdul-Aziz University, Jeddah. *Journal of Infection and Public Health*  
507 [Internet]. 2011 Mar [cited 2024 Jun 19];4(1):30–40. Available from:  
508 <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1876034110000833>
- 509 23. Alhowiti A, Shaqran T. Premarital Screening Program Knowledge and Attitude  
510 among Saudi University Students in TABUK City 2019. 2019 [cited 2024 Jun  
511 19]; Available from: <http://imsear.searo.who.int/handle/123456789/205161>
- 512 24. Al Kindi R, Al Rujaihi S, Al Kendi M. Knowledge and Attitude of University  
513 Students Towards Premarital Screening Program. *Oman Med J* [Internet]. 2012  
514 Jul 16 [cited 2024 Jun 19];27(4):291–6. Available from:  
515 [http://www.omjournal.org/fultext\\_PDF.aspx?DetailsID=263&type=fultext](http://www.omjournal.org/fultext_PDF.aspx?DetailsID=263&type=fultext)
- 516 25. Melaibari M, Shilbayeh S, Kabli A. University Students' knowledge, attitudes,  
517 and practices towards the National Premarital Screening Program of Saudi  
518 Arabia. *EPX* [Internet]. 2017 Mar 1 [cited 2024 Jun 19];92(1):36–43. Available  
519 from: [http://epx.journals.ekb.eg/article\\_7008.html](http://epx.journals.ekb.eg/article_7008.html)
- 520 26. Al Sulaiman A, Suliman A, Al Mishari M, Al Sawadi A, Owaidah TM.  
521 Knowledge and Attitude Toward the Hemoglobinopathies Premarital Screening  
522 Program in Saudi Arabia: Population-Based Survey. *Hemoglobin* [Internet]. 2008  
523 Jan [cited 2024 Jun 19];32(6):531–8. Available from:  
524 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03630260802508384>
- 525 27. AbdulAzeez S, Al Qahtani NH, Almandil NB, Al-Amodi AM, Aldakeel SA,  
526 Ghanem NZ, et al. Genetic disorder prenatal diagnosis and pregnancy termination

527 practices among high consanguinity population, Saudi Arabia. Sci Rep [Internet].

528 2019 Nov 21 [cited 2024 Jun 19];9(1):17248. Available from:

529 <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-019-53655-8>

530