

1 **Perceived disrespect and abuse among women delivering at**
2 **a tertiary care center in Nepal**

3 Sabika Munikar^{1¶*}, Mala Chalise^{2¶}, Ranjan Dhungana^{3¶}, Durga Laxmi Shrestha⁴, Naresh Pratap
4 KC³, Animesh Dhungana³, Robert B. Clark⁵, Michael K. Visick⁶, Kanchan Thapa^{3,7¶}

5 ¹ Post Basic Bachelor of Nursing Science Faculty, Om Health Campus, Kathmandu, Nepal

6 ² Independent Researcher from Kathmandu, Nepal.

7 ³ Helping Babies Breathe (HBB) Program, Safa Sunaulo Nepal, Kathmandu, Nepal

8 ⁴ Ministry of Health and Population, Nepal

9 ⁵ Department of Public Health, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, USA.

10 ⁶ Department of Pediatrics, University of Utah School of Medicine, Utah, USA.

11 ⁷ Central Department of Population Studies, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal.

12

13 ***Correspondence:** mesabika@gmail.com (SM)

14 [¶]These authors contributed equally to this work.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 **Abstract**

22 **Background**

23 Of the children born every year in Nepal, 57.4% are delivered in health facilities. Disrespect and
24 abuse of women during maternity care are problems that can significantly impact women's
25 willingness to seek out life-saving maternity care. However, evidence suggests ongoing
26 disrespectful maternity care worldwide. This study aims to identify perceived disrespect and
27 abuse during labor and delivery among postnatal women delivering at Bheri Hospital, Nepal.

28 **Methods**

29 A cross sectional study was conducted among 445 purposively selected women admitted in
30 postnatal ward of Bheri Hospital, Nepal from February to March 2020. Ethical approval was
31 obtained from Nepal Health Research Council. Informed written consent was obtained from each
32 participant and a face-to-face interview was conducted for data collection. A semi-structured
33 questionnaire consisting of demographic information and a pre-validated Respectful Maternity
34 Care (RMC) tool was used. The information was then checked, coded, and entered in SPSS for
35 descriptive and inferential analysis.

36 **Results**

37 In this study, the participants perceived very high friendly care, abuse-free care and
38 discrimination-free care but moderate timely care only. Timely care was found to be significantly
39 associated with age, ethnicity, occupation, monthly income, gravida, type of delivery, and
40 complications. On multinomial regression, monthly income and type of delivery were the only
41 factors found to be significant. Those mothers who had spontaneous vaginal delivery were 2.07
42 times more likely to have neutral RMC, and those who earn less than twenty thousand Nepalese
43 rupees per month were likely to perceive high timely RMC.

44 **Conclusion**

45 This study concludes that disrespectful or abusive maternal care is not perceived among women
46 delivering at Bheri Hospital in terms of friendly care, abuse-free care and non- discriminatory
47 care. However, timely care is less reported. Appropriate interventions to provide timely care to
48 delivering women must be instituted.

49 **Key words:** Delivery; Disrespect and abuse; Labor; Maternal health services; Respectful
50 maternity care; Midwives

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62 **Introduction**

63 With Maternal Mortality Ratio (MMR) at 239 per 100,000 live births in 2016- higher than its
64 South Asian neighbors- maternal mortality remains a formidable challenge in Nepal. Although
65 the country has witnessed considerable decline in MMR by 55% from 1996 to 2016 [1], it still
66 needs to go a long way to achieve the target of 70 per 100,000 live births as set out in the
67 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [2].

68 Ensuring access to quality skilled care before, during, and after childbirth is vital in reducing
69 maternal mortality [3]. In low resource settings such as Nepal the lack of availability of skilled
70 care services, mistreatment during childbirth, including abusive, neglectful, or disrespectful care
71 may result in compromised quality [4]. Women have experienced disrespect and abuse (D &A)
72 all over the world in various forms ranging from physical or verbal abuse, stigma or
73 discrimination [4], detention of babies [4], being shouted at [5], threatening comments [5],
74 withholding procedure related information and providing non-consented care [5]. For instance, a
75 study in Ghana revealed that only a few clients were encouraged to ask questions and explained
76 what to expect during labor [4]. Non-confidential care has also been reported [6], as identified in
77 a study conducted in India. Similarly, evidences suggest that women have also experienced poor
78 quality care in the form of restriction in their choice of birth position and movement, and
79 restriction of liquid drinks during delivery [7].

80 Although a growing body of evidence paints a disturbing picture of women's experience of care
81 during pregnancy and child birth, health care providers justify such acts on the grounds of
82 punishment for non-cooperation from women and good outcomes to babies[4]. Analyzed from
83 the perspective of health service delivery system, difficult circumstances in health facilities
84 under which maternity staffs work, system failures, and inadequate human resource management

85 have been found as important reasons for D&A during delivery [8]. However, justifying
86 disrespectful care and abuse based on these factors is a violation of women’s human rights.
87 RMC has been defined by World Health Organization (WHO) as “care organized for and
88 provided to all women in a manner that maintains their dignity, privacy, and confidentiality,
89 ensures freedom from harm and mistreatment, and enables informed choice, and continuous
90 support during labor and childbirth” [9]. In this sense, RMC focuses on expanding safe
91 motherhood beyond prevention of maternal mortality and morbidity to incorporate a human-
92 rights based approach, including respect to women’s autonomy, dignity, choices, privacy and
93 preferences [10]. RMC recognizes that all women need and deserve respectful care; and focuses
94 on eliminating D&A during pregnancy and childbirth.

95 Despite the existing evidences that suggest D&A during childbirth presents considerable
96 impediments to utilization of skilled birth care globally [9], only a few studies have been
97 undertaken to understand the phenomena in Nepal. The majority of these studies have used a
98 qualitative approach and only a limited number of studies have used a validated quantitative tool
99 to measure the level of D&A at the point of service provision, out of which the greater number
100 are based on health facilities in Kathmandu Valley.

101 This study aimed to identify perceived D&A during labor and deliveries among postnatal women
102 admitted at a remote hospital and also determine the factors affecting RMC. Understanding
103 women’s perspective of D&A during care is essential to identify factors that generate RMC in
104 the health facility and subsequently in the provision of RMC as envisioned in The Right to Safe
105 Motherhood and Reproductive Health Act of 2018.

106 **Methods**

107 **Study Design, Study Setting and Sample Size**

108 A cross-sectional study was done to identify the forms and associated risk factors of perceived
109 disrespect and abuse among women delivering at Bheri Hospital, Nepal. With 5083 deliveries
110 conducted in the year 2017-18 [11], Bheri Hospital in southwestern Nepal is a major referral
111 center for emergency obstetric care services for three out of seven provinces (Lumbini Province,
112 Karnali Province & Sudur Pachhim Province) of the country.

113 The sample size was calculated based on a study conducted in India, Ghana, and Kenya which
114 depicted an overall prevalence of verbal abuse to be 16% across all countries [6]. Considering
115 the prevalence of verbal abuse to be 16%, and level of significance to be 95%, the minimum
116 sample size for the proposed study was calculated to be 237. However, we were able to collect
117 the information from 445 women who delivered during the allocated period of data collection.

118 **Study Participants and Recruitment**

119 Purposive sampling technique was used to interview postnatal women admitted at the postnatal
120 ward of Bheri Hospital, within 24 hours of delivery. Those who were unwilling to participate in
121 the study, couldn't understand and/or speak the Nepali language or had a stillbirth or macerated
122 birth during delivery were excluded from the study.

123 **Data Collection**

124 Face-to-face interview technique was used to collect data. Each interview lasted for
125 approximately 20 minutes and conducted in the Nepali language. The data were collected from
126 February to March 2020. Informed written consent was obtained before data collection. Data
127 were collected from women in postnatal ward within 24 hours of delivery to avoid recall bias.

128 A semi-structured questionnaire, divided into two parts, was used as the tool for data collection.
129 The first part included questions relating to socio-demographic factors and obstetric history,
130 details of which are presented in Table 1. The second part of the questionnaire was based on a
131 validated RMC tool with 15 items used to measure women's perception regarding RMC. The
132 tool has four dimensions: friendly care, abuse-free care, timely care and non-discriminatory care
133 consisting of 7, 3, 3 and 2 items, respectively [12]. The construct validity of the scale is
134 confirmed by the high average factor loading of the four components ranging from 0.76 to 0.82
135 and a low correlation between the components. The scale has adequate reliability with $\alpha =$
136 0.845[13]. The instrument was translated into the Nepali language and validated by a Nepali
137 language expert. The content validity of the instrument was established by consultation with
138 subject experts. Consistency of the tool was checked by pre-testing among 10% of women
139 delivering at Bheri Hospital which was not included in the final study sample.

140 **Data Analysis**

141 The collected data was checked, organized and coded, and entered into Microsoft excel and then
142 exported to SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 17.0 version for analysis. The data
143 were analyzed by using descriptive statistics like frequency, percentage, mean, standard
144 deviation, and inferential statistics: chi-square test, and multinomial logistic regression.

145 Mean score (M) of four broad components i.e. friendly care, timely care, abuse free care, and
146 non- discriminatory care was used to describe the level of respectful maternity care experienced
147 by the postpartum women during childbirth in each component separately. To determine the
148 participant's degree of respectful maternity care, the following Likert- range conversion and
149 qualitative interpretation were used: 4.20- 5.00-Very High, 3.4- 4.19 -High, 2.60- 3.3 - Moderate,
150 1.80- 2.5 -Low and 1- 1.78 Very Low [12].

151 **Ethical Approval**

152 Ethical approval was obtained from the Nepal Health Research Council (Ref #1953, 18 March
153 2020). Written permission from Bheri Hospital administration was also obtained. Informed
154 written consent was obtained from the respondents. Participants were also assured that their
155 participation/non-participation would have no bearing on their treatment. Confidentiality of the
156 participants was maintained by assigning unique identification code to each participant.

157 **Results**

158 Table 2 depicts the socio-demographic information of the participants. The majority of them
159 (74.4%) were aged 20- 30 years, belonged to the Janjati ethnic group (46.1%), and most of them
160 (91.2%) followed the Hindu religion. The majority (86.7%) were educated. However, almost half
161 (50.8%) were unemployed. Approximately fifty-three percent of respondents were from joint or
162 extended family. Regarding the spouse's background, most of them (91.7%) were educated and
163 were involved in a non-formal occupation (71.5%).

164 Table 3 illustrates the obstetric history of participants. The majority of participants had less than
165 two gravidae (75.7%), were multiparous (64.7%) and most of them (95.7%) had term pregnancy.
166 Almost half of the participants (51.5%) delivered via spontaneous vaginal delivery (SVD) while
167 remaining delivered via augmented labor and/or lower section cesarean section. One third of
168 respondents (33.3%) had complications during labor.

169 Table 4 shows the perception of participants regarding RMC on a 5 points Likert scale. The
170 components of RMC are presented in four broad categories of Friendly Care, Abuse-free Care,
171 Timely Care, and Non-discriminatory Care.

172 Regarding Friendly Care, very few respondents disagreed that the health workers cared for them
173 with kind approach (0.9%), treated them in a friendly manner (2.6%), talked positively about the

174 pain and relief measures (2.0%), showed concern and empathy (0.2%), treated them with respect
175 as an individual (1.5%), and spoke in understandable language (10.5%). Of note, almost half of
176 the participants (47.2%) disagreed on being called by their name.

177 The table also presents the perception of participants towards Abuse-free Care. Nearly 32.6%
178 disagreed with the statement that health workers responded to their needs whether or not asked.
179 Also, 5.6% reported being slapped during delivery for different reasons, and a similar number of
180 participants (4.7%) reported being shouted at for not doing what they were told to do.

181 Regarding Timely Care, more than a quarter of participants (27.8%) agreed to being kept waiting
182 for a long time before receiving care, but a higher number of participants were not allowed to
183 practice cultural rituals (62%). Some agreed that service was delayed due to health facility's
184 internal problems (18.7%).

185 Perception towards Discrimination-free Care shows that few respondents (3.3%) agreed that the
186 health workers did not treat them well because of personal attributes. Also, 2.9% of participants
187 agreed that some health workers insulted them and their companions due to personal attributes.

188 The mean score shows that the participants' perceptions of Non-discrimination Care (4.67),
189 Friendly Care (4.42) and Abuse-free Care (4.29) were very high, whereas perception of Timely
190 Care (3.10) was comparatively moderate.

191 Table 4 presents the findings of the association between selected demographic and obstetric
192 characteristics and the Friendly Care component of RMC. This table shows that there is a
193 significant association between timely care and monthly income ($p<0.05$), gravida ($p<0.05$), para
194 ($p=0.004$), and week of gestation ($p=0.026$).

195 Table 6 reveals the association between Abuse-free Care and selected demographic and obstetric
196 characteristics. This table shows that there is a significant association between Abuse-free Care
197 and spouse's occupation ($p=0.002$), para ($p=0.010$), type of delivery ($p<0.05$).

198 Table 7 shows the association between Timely Care and selected characteristics which reveals
199 that there is a significant association between Timely Care and age ($P<0.05$), ethnicity ($p=0.002$),
200 occupation ($p=0.001$), monthly income ($p<0.05$), gravida ($p<0.05$), type of delivery ($p=0.002$),
201 and complications ($p=0.002$). However, there is no significant association between Timely Care
202 and educational status, spouse's occupation, or week of gestation ($P>0.05$).

203 As mentioned in Table 4, among the four components, women's perception of Timely Care was
204 found to be moderate whereas other dimensions of RMC were perceived very high. To determine
205 the factors resulting in moderate perception of Timely Care, multinomial logistic regression was
206 done. Table 8 shows that those who had SVD were 2.07 times as likely to have neutral RMC for
207 Timely Care. Similarly, those who earn less than twenty thousand Nepalese Rupees per month
208 were 2.36 (1.30-4.23) times as likely to have high Timely RMC in Nepal. We did not observe
209 any significant effects between gravida, complication during the delivery, and the number of
210 living children ($P>0.05$).

211 **Discussion**

212 This study aimed to identify perceived Disrespect & Abuse and its associated factors during
213 labor and delivery among postnatal women at a busy referral hospital in western Nepal. D&A are

214 evaluated based on four different dimensions of RMC i.e. Friendly Care, Abuse-free Care,
215 Timely Care and Discrimination-free Care. Very high degree of Friendly Care, Abuse-free Care
216 and Discrimination-free Care was identified, however, only moderate Timely Care was
217 perceived by the participants which is in contrast to the study in Egypt where only
218 Discrimination-free Care was perceived to be high and other dimensions to be moderate [12].
219 The reason for high rating of Abuse-free Care in this study could be normalization of the abuse
220 in the health care setting [14], where delivering women think that it is normal to be abused
221 physically and/or verbally for better labor outcomes. Also, despite the knowledge of principles of
222 RMC among health care providers, this knowledge may not translate to an improvement in
223 actual respectful care at the bedside [14].

224 Most of the women (91.3%) perceived that they were treated in a friendly manner which is
225 consistent with a direct observation of RMC in health facilities of five countries in East and
226 Southern Africa (86%) [7]. Talking positively about the pain and relief measures was one of the
227 components of Friendly Care where very few respondents (2.0%) disagreed with the statement.
228 The reasons for not addressing pain may be due to the lack of availability of a doctor [14] and/or
229 the shortage of health workers persistent in the country [15]. The shortage, however, might have
230 been more pronounced at the time of data collection due to the ongoing staff adjustment process
231 undertaken as part of implementing Federalism in the country [16].

232 WHO recommends communication between maternity care providers and women in labor, using
233 simple and culturally acceptable methods [17]. Evidence suggests that language barrier is a
234 critical factor that hinders effective communication and can also pose considerable risk to patient
235 safety and quality of care [18]. More than two third of the participants (84%) in this study
236 confirmed that the health worker spoke in a language understandable to them. A study conducted

237 in Egypt found that nearly 61% of the health workers did not communicate in an understandable
238 language. This suggests that language barrier was less common in our context. To ensure
239 respectful attitude and supportive environment during delivery, it is required to continue
240 emphasizing the importance of health care provider-client communication and client-centered
241 care [19].

242 One of the critical elements affecting patients' perception of RMC is the way in which a patient
243 is addressed by a name of her/his preference. Patients' preferred mode of address by healthcare
244 workers, to large extent, is influenced by ethnic and cultural factors. For instance, a study on
245 non-English speaking Australians shows that patients preferred to be called by their informal
246 name [20]. On the other hand, patients in countries like Iran [21] and Israel [22] preferred formal
247 address by title and surname. In this study, 47.2% respondents agreed that they were called by
248 their preferred name, which is similar to the study from Egypt [12]. However, with limited
249 evidence on Nepalese patients' preference of address by healthcare workers, the present study is
250 unable to provide contextual interpretation of the figure. Therefore, we recommend further study
251 on Nepalese patients' preferred mode of address by healthcare workers.

252 Neglect or abandonment during labor and delivery has been reported in varying degrees in
253 countries like Kenya (14.3%) [23] and Tanzania (3.45%)[24]. This neglect could be in form of
254 health workers not being present at the time of birth, not providing medications or not
255 communicating the progress of labor. More than a quarter of women in this study responded that
256 the health workers did not respond to their need whether or not asked, which is quite a large
257 figure compared to those reported previously. The reason for not responding to needs could be
258 the heavy workload of midwives and health care workers[25]. In an overburdened Nepali health
259 care system where patient to healthcare workers ratio is unimaginably high [26]. In a

260 communication with Shanti Kandel, RN (January 2021), six thousand delivery in Bheri Hospital
261 is attended by a group of only eleven staffs for the fiscal year 2076/77. Silence can be a way in
262 which a system defends itself against the many needs of patients. Silence from a care provider
263 can cause neglect, resulting to avoidable complications during delivery [25], negative impact on
264 the health of mother and / or baby [27] and also unwillingness to return or recommend others to
265 the health facility for next delivery [28]. Respondents with complications are generally more
266 likely to report D & A during delivery[29]. Although a third of respondents in this study had
267 complications, rates of D & A remained low.

268 Women, during the process of delivery, are vulnerable to being abused by health workers
269 whether it might be physical or verbal [28,30,31]. Such abuses are likely to result in a high rate
270 of traumatic birth experience for women [32]. Different forms of abuse like being slapped (5.6%)
271 or being shouted at (4.6%) has been reported in this study. Women experiencing physical and
272 verbal abuse was found to be dramatically higher in another study conducted in central Nepal,
273 which reported physical and verbal abuse to be 18.7% and 30% respectively [33]. The difference
274 in reported abuse thus requires extensive research to identify the prevalence and institute
275 appropriate interventions. A study has demonstrated that midwives feel a strong sense of
276 accountability and responsibility for labor and delivery outcomes and tend to do whatever it
277 takes to deliver a live baby to a healthy mother [34]. In addition, the midwives/ nurses ratio per
278 population for Nepal is lesser (31.08/10,000 population) than the recommended by WHO
279 (40/10,000 population) leading to overburden for health workers [35]. WHO recognizes that D
280 & A not only violate the rights of women to respectful care, but also threaten their rights to life,
281 health, bodily integrity and freedom from discrimination [36]. However, abuse in any form,
282 whether it be physical or verbal should never be tolerated during labor and delivery.

283 Nearly half of the respondents (48.3 %) agreed that they were kept waiting for a long time,
284 which is substantially higher than the study conducted in Ghana, Guinea, Myanmar, and Nigeria
285 where 22% reported waiting for long periods before being attended by health workers [4]. The
286 delay in care (27.8%) might be due to too few staff as compared to patients as revealed by a
287 study of midwives of Malawi [8]. The situation might be similar in Nepal as shortage of staffs in
288 the hospital setting has been reported [37], further worsened by the ongoing shifts in staff
289 allocation as a part of Federalism.

290 Few participants i.e. approximately three out of a hundred, agreed that the health workers did not
291 treat them well because of personal or their companions' attributes, which is in contrast to a
292 study conducted in Nigeria that showed a higher percentage of discrimination faced by
293 respondents at 8.1% [38]. Birth preparedness practice in Nepal tends to be higher as reported by
294 a study that denotes familiarization of pregnant women with the delivery setting. Early
295 communication and interpersonal relationship between care provider and patient could be a cause
296 for higher Discrimination-free Care [39].

297 Women with SVD were two times more likely to have a neutral response about RMC for Timely
298 Care as compared to those who had cesarean delivery. Women experiencing caesarian delivery
299 could have ultimately perceived the urgency of services for delivering a healthy baby, thus
300 women with SVD would be more likely to report neutral Timely Care. Similarly, those who earn
301 less than twenty thousand Nepalese Rupees were twice as likely to feel they had a high level of
302 timely RMC. Women of lower economic status may be more tolerant of a long wait in order to
303 receive care in a government facility with higher case load as opposed to delivering at home.

304 **Limitations**

305 This study has used a standardized tool to gather quantitative information about D & A faced by
306 women during labor and delivery. However in-depth insight regarding health workers'
307 perceptions and/or those of delivering women could not be obtained. Also, the potential for
308 generalization of the findings cannot be ascertained as only a single tertiary care center in
309 western Nepal has been included for the study.
310 Information bias and courtesy bias might have occurred as the information was collected by an
311 on- duty student nurse, although the respondents were assured prior to the study that their
312 opinion would have no impact on further treatment.

313 **Recommendations**

314 Any forms of D & A must be prohibited during labor and delivery so that women can enjoy their
315 experience of labor and delivery. Irrespective of the health system or staff-related issues; timely
316 care must be of priority in order to ensure quality maternity care. Timely Care is simply not
317 always possible in highly constrained settings such as Bheri Hospital, but the perception of
318 Timely Care might possibly be reduced by additional communication and explanations of the
319 cause of the delay.
320 Further studies should be conducted to determine RMC at all levels of the healthcare system
321 throughout the country, such that potential generalization of our findings and appropriate
322 interventions for improvement can be planned accordingly.
323 Sustained interaction with the health system are required to implement behavior change
324 intervention central to promoting respectful care [40]. The successful improvement in maternity
325 care environment for women and midwives needs broader interdisciplinary perspectives on the
326 wider drivers of midwives' disrespectful attitudes and behaviors [8].

327 **Conclusion**

328 This study concludes that RMC is practiced highly in western Nepal in terms of Friendly Care,
329 Abuse-free Care, and Discrimination-free Care. However, Timely Care is less reported.
330 Therefore, appropriate interventions to provide Timely Care to delivering women must be
331 instituted. Along with this, adequate communication and explanation of delay can reduce
332 perception of delayed care among care recipients. Physical or verbal abuse during labor and
333 delivery must not be tolerated, and while rates of abuse were shown to be low in this study, there
334 remains room for improvement. Further research on RMC in Nepal is required to clarify the
335 drivers for D & A and examine potential solutions.

336 **Abbreviations**

337 D&A- Disrespect & Abuse

338 LSCS – Lower Segment Caesarian Section

339 MMR - Maternal Mortality Ratio

340 NHRC- Nepal Health Research Council

341 RMC- Respectful Maternity Care

342 SDG – Sustainable Development Goals

343 SVD – Spontaneous Vaginal Delivery

344 WHO- World Health Organization

345 **Declaration**

346 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

347 **Funding:** The study was self-funded by the authors.

348 **Acknowledgments:** The authors are immensely thankful to the management of Bheri
349 Hospital and to the NHRC for ethical approval. We express sincere gratitude to all women who
350 participated in this study along with delivery room residents and midwives for providing support
351 during the study. At last but not the least, we are thankful to all the student nurses of Sushma
352 Koirala Memorial Hospital, Nepalgunj, Banke for their support during data collection.

353 **References**

- 354 [1] Aryal KK, Sharma SK, Khanal MN, et al. Maternal health care in Nepal: Trends and
355 determinants [Internet]. 2019. Available from:
356 <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FA118/FA118.pdf>.
- 357 [2] NHRC. Accelerating the safe motherhood program to avert preventable maternal deaths in
358 Nepal [Internet]. Kathmandu; 2016. Available from: [http://nhrc.gov.np/wp-](http://nhrc.gov.np/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Policy-Brief-on-Maternal-Mortality-in-Nepal.pdf)
359 [content/uploads/2019/07/Policy-Brief-on-Maternal-Mortality-in-Nepal.pdf](http://nhrc.gov.np/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Policy-Brief-on-Maternal-Mortality-in-Nepal.pdf).
- 360 [3] Leontine Alkema, Chou D, Hogan D, et al. National, regional, and global levels and trends
361 in maternal mortality between 1990 and 2015 with scenario-based projections to 2030: a
362 systematic analysis by the United Nations Maternal Mortality Estimation Inter-Agency
363 Group. *Lancet* [Internet]. 2016;387:462–474. Available from:
364 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5515236/pdf/nihms863926.pdf>.

- 365 [4] Bohren MA, Mehrtash H, Fawole B, et al. How women are treated during facility-based
366 childbirth in four countries□: a cross-sectional study with labour observations and
367 community-based surveys. *Lancet* [Internet]. 2019;394:1750–1763. Available from:
368 [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(19\)31992-0/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(19)31992-0/fulltext).
- 369 [5] Kruk ME, Kujawski S, Mbaruku G, et al. Disrespectful and abusive treatment during
370 facility delivery in Tanzania□: a facility and community survey. *Health Policy Plan*
371 [Internet]. 2018;33:e26–e33. Available from:
372 <https://academic.oup.com/heapol/article/33/1/e26/2907853>.
- 373 [6] Afulani PA, Phillips B, Aborigo RA, et al. Person-centred maternity care in low-income
374 and middle-income countries_ analysis of data from Kenya, Ghana, and India. *Lancet*
375 *Glob Heal* [Internet]. 2019;7:e96-109. Available from:
376 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2214109X18304030>.
- 377 [7] Rosen HE, Lynam PF, Carr C, et al. Direct observation of respectful maternity care in five
378 countries□: a cross-sectional study of health facilities in East and Southern Africa. *BMC*
379 *Pregnancy Childbirth* [Internet]. 2015;15:1–11. Available from:
380 <https://europepmc.org/article/PMC/4657214>.
- 381 [8] Bradley S, Chipeta E, Kamwendo F, et al. Too few staff , too many patients□: a
382 qualitative study of the impact on obstetric care providers and on quality of care in
383 Malawi. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* [Internet]. 2015;15:1–10. Available from:
384 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25880644>.
- 385 [9] WHO Reproductive Health Library. WHO recommendation on respectful maternity care
386 during labour and childbirth [Internet]. WHO Reprod. Heal. Libr. Geneva World Heal.

- 387 Organ. 2018. p. 1–11. Available from: [https://extranet.who.int/rhl/topics/preconception-](https://extranet.who.int/rhl/topics/preconception-pregnancy-childbirth-and-postpartum-care/care-during-childbirth/who-recommendation-respectful-maternity-care-during-labour-and-childbirth)
- 388 [pregnancy-childbirth-and-postpartum-care/care-during-childbirth/who-recommendation-](https://extranet.who.int/rhl/topics/preconception-pregnancy-childbirth-and-postpartum-care/care-during-childbirth/who-recommendation-respectful-maternity-care-during-labour-and-childbirth)
- 389 [respectful-maternity-care-during-labour-and-childbirth](https://extranet.who.int/rhl/topics/preconception-pregnancy-childbirth-and-postpartum-care/care-during-childbirth/who-recommendation-respectful-maternity-care-during-labour-and-childbirth).
- 390 [10] USAID. Respectful maternity care [Internet]. 2012. Available from:
- 391 https://toolkits.knowledgesuccess.org/sites/default/files/rmc_survey_report_0_0.pdf.
- 392 [11] Thapa K, Parajuli U. Trend of caesarean section in Bheri zonal hospital. J
- 393 NepalgunjMedical Coll Coll [Internet]. 2018;16:41–45. Available from:
- 394 [https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/JNGMC/article/view/24227?fbclid=IwAR1wEsxQkw](https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/JNGMC/article/view/24227?fbclid=IwAR1wEsxQkwOsBNcWF13t1P0Mhyt4CuRu0MeFCLMnn7FKLm2BRpRxxOtz9pI)
- 395 [OsBNcWF13t1P0Mhyt4CuRu0MeFCLMnn7FKLm2BRpRxxOtz9pI](https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/JNGMC/article/view/24227?fbclid=IwAR1wEsxQkwOsBNcWF13t1P0Mhyt4CuRu0MeFCLMnn7FKLm2BRpRxxOtz9pI).
- 396 [12] Mousa O, Turingan OM. Quality of care in the delivery room □: Focusing on respectful
- 397 maternal care practices. J Nurs Educ Pract [Internet]. 2019;9. Available from:
- 398 <http://www.sciedupress.com/journal/index.php/jnep/article/view/13634>.
- 399 [13] Sheferaw ED, Mengesha TZ, Wase SB. Development of a tool to measure women ’ s
- 400 perception of respectful maternity care in public health facilities. BMC Pregnancy
- 401 Childbirth [Internet]. 2016;16:1–8. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12884-016-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12884-016-0848-5)
- 402 [0848-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12884-016-0848-5).
- 403 [14] Lambert J, Etsane E, Bergh A. ‘ I thought they were going to handle me like a queen but
- 404 they didn ’ t ’: A qualitative study exploring the quality of care provided to women at the
- 405 time of birth ’. Midwifery [Internet]. 2018;62:256–263. Available from:
- 406 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2018.04.007>.
- 407 [15] Baral B, Prajapati R, Karki KB. Distribution and skill mix of health workforce in Nepal. J
- 408 Nepal Heal Res Counc [Internet]. 2013;11:126–132. Available from:

- 409 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/24362599/>.
- 410 [16] Poudel A. Staff adjustment affects health services across the country. Kathmandu Post
411 [Internet]. 2019 Dec 3; Available from:
412 [https://kathmandupost.com/health/2019/12/03/staff-adjustment-affects-health-services-](https://kathmandupost.com/health/2019/12/03/staff-adjustment-affects-health-services-across-the-country)
413 [across-the-country](https://kathmandupost.com/health/2019/12/03/staff-adjustment-affects-health-services-across-the-country).
- 414 [17] WHO. WHO recommendation on effective communication between maternity care
415 providers and women in labour. Reprod. Heal. Libr. Geneva; 2018.
- 416 [18] Moissac D De, Bowen S. Impact of language barriers on quality of care and patient safety
417 for official language minority francophones in Canada. J Patient Exp [Internet].
418 2019;6:24–32. Available from:
419 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2374373518769008>.
- 420 [19] Solomon S, Mark S, Merijn G, et al. Why do women prefer home births in Ethiopia?
421 BMC Pregnancy Childbirth [Internet]. 2013;13. Available from:
422 [http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=medl&NEWS=N&AN=](http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=medl&NEWS=N&AN=23324550)
423 [23324550](http://ovidsp.ovid.com/ovidweb.cgi?T=JS&PAGE=reference&D=medl&NEWS=N&AN=23324550).
- 424 [20] Parsons SR, Hughes AJ, Friedman ND. “Please don’t call me Mister”: Patient preferences
425 of how they are addressed and their knowledge of their treating medical team in an
426 Australian hospital. BMJ Open [Internet]. 2016;6:1–4. Available from:
427 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26739720/>.
- 428 [21] Najafi M, Khoshdel A, Kheiri S. Preferences of Iranian patients about style of labelling
429 and calling of their physicians. J Pakistan Med Assoc [Internet]. 2012;62:668–671.
430 Available from: <https://jpma.org.pk/article-details/3549>.

- 431 [22] Dekeyser FG, Wruble IAW, Margalith II. Patients voice issues of dress and address.
432 Holist Nurs Pract [Internet]. 2003;17:290–294. Available from:
433 https://journals.lww.com/hnpjjournal/Abstract/2003/11000/Patients_Voice_Issues_of_Dress_and_Address.3.aspx.
434
- 435 [23] Abuya T, Warren CE, Miller N, et al. Exploring the prevalence of disrespect and abuse
436 during childbirth in Kenya. PLoS One [Internet]. 2015;10:1–13. Available from:
437 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0123606>.
- 438 [24] Freedman LP, Kujawski SA, Mbuyita S, et al. Eye of the beholder? Observation versus
439 self-report in the measurement of disrespect and abuse during facility-based childbirth.
440 Reprod Health Matters [Internet]. 2018;26:107–122. Available from:
441 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09688080.2018.1502024>.
- 442 [25] Bradley S, Chipeta E, Kamwendo F, et al. Too few staff , too many patients: a
443 qualitative study of the impact on obstetric care providers and on quality of care in
444 Malawi. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth [Internet]. 2015;15. Available from:
445 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25880644>.
- 446 [26] Caffrey M, Chilvers R, Martineau T. Human resources for health Nepal country profile
447 [Internet]. 2013. Available from:
448 http://www.nhssp.org.np/NHSSP_Archives/human_resources/HRH_Nepal_profile_august_2013.pdf.
449
- 450 [27] Lappeman M, Swartz L. Rethinking obstetric violence and the “neglect of neglect”: the
451 silence of a labour ward milieu in a South African district hospital. BMC Int Health Hum
452 Rights [Internet]. 2019;19:30. Available from:

- 453 <https://bmcinthealthhumrights.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12914-019-0218-2>.
- 454 [28] D’Ambruoso L, Abbey M, Hussein J. Please understand when I cry out in pain: Women’s
455 accounts of maternity services during labour and delivery in Ghana. *BMC Public Health*
456 [Internet]. 2005;5:1–11. Available from:
457 <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1186/1471-2458-5-140.pdf>.
- 458 [29] Wassihun B, Zeleke S. Compassionate and respectful maternity care during facility based
459 child birth and women’s intent to use maternity service in Bahir Dar, Ethiopia. *BMC*
460 *Pregnancy Childbirth* [Internet]. 2018;18:1–9. Available from:
461 <https://bmcpregnancychildbirth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12884-018-1909-8#:~:text=Respondents who were facing complication during labor and,did not face complications %5BAOR%3D%202.38 %2895%25CI%3B 1.28%2C 4.45%29%5D>.
- 464 [30] Sando D, Ratcliffe H, Mcdonald K, et al. The prevalence of disrespect and abuse during
465 facility-based childbirth in urban Tanzania. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* [Internet].
466 2016;16. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12884-016-1019-4>.
- 467 [31] Orpin J, Puthussery S, Davidson R, et al. Women’s experiences of disrespect and abuse
468 in maternity care facilities in Benue State, Nigeria. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* [Internet].
469 2018 [cited 2019 Sep 27];18:1–9. Available from:
470 <https://bmcpregnancychildbirth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12884-018-1847-5>.
- 471 [32] Hodges S. Abuse in hospital-based birth settings? *J Perinat Educ* [Internet]. 2009;18:8–11.
472 Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2776520/>.
- 473 [33] Pathak P, Ghimire B. Perception of women regarding respectful maternity care during
474 facility-based childbirth. *Obstet Gynecol Int*. 2020;2020.

- 475 [34] Yakubu J, Health C, Initiative A, et al. It ' s for the greater good □: Perspectives on
476 maltreatment during labor and delivery in Rural Ghana. *J Obstet Gynecol* [Internet].
477 2014;4:383–390. Available from:
478 <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=46320>.
- 479 [35] WHO. Nursing and midwifery personnel (per 10000 population). 2018.
- 480 [36] United Nations. A human rights-based approach to mistreatment and violence against
481 women in reproductive health services with a focus on childbirth and obstetric violence
482 [Internet]. Geneva; 2019. Available from:
483 <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3823698?ln=en>.
- 484 [37] Thapa K, Clark RB. Helping babies breathe (HBB) program for reduction of neonatal
485 mortality □: A hospital based cost effective intervention in Nepal. *Med J Shree Birendra*
486 *Hosp* [Internet]. 2020; Available from:
487 <https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/MJSBH/article/view/25961>.
- 488 [38] Ijadunola MY, Olotu EA, Oyedun OO, et al. Lifting the veil on disrespect and abuse in
489 facility-based child birth care □: findings from South West Nigeria. *BMC Pregnancy*
490 *Childbirth* [Internet]. 2019;19:1–8. Available from:
491 <https://bmcpregnancychildbirth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12884-019-2188-8>.
- 492 [39] Silwal K, Poudyal JK, Shah R, et al. Factors influencing birth preparedness in Rapti
493 Municipality of Chitwan, Nepal. *Int J Pediatr* [Internet]. 2020;2020. Available from:
494 <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/ijpedi/2020/7402163/>.
- 495 [40] Ndwiga C, Warren CE, Ritter J, et al. Exploring provider perspectives on respectful
496 maternity care in Kenya □: “ Work with what you have .” *Reprod Health* [Internet].

497 2017;14:1–13. Available from: [https://reproductive-health-](https://reproductive-health-journal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12978-017-0364-8)
 498 [journal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12978-017-0364-8](https://reproductive-health-journal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12978-017-0364-8).

499

500 List of Tables

501 **Table 1.** Distribution of variables in the study

Part I- Socio-demographic characteristics and obstetric history	Demographic Information: Age of Mother, Ethnicity, Religion, Type of Family, Educational Status, Educational Level, Occupation, Spouse’s Educational Status, and Spouse’s Occupation
	Obstetric History: Gravida, Para, Week of Gestation, Type of Delivery, and Complication During Labor
Part II- Perceived Disrespect & Abuse ¹²	Friendly Care, Abuse-free Care, Timely Care, and Discrimination-free Care

502

503 **Table 2.** Distribution of participants according to socio-demographic information (n= 445)

Characteristics	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Age (Years)		
<20	88	19.8
20-30	331	74.4
30-40	26	5.8
Ethnicity		
Brahmin/Chhetri	136	30.6
Janjati	205	46.1
Madhesi/Dalit and others	104	23.4
Religion		
Hindu	406	91.2
Others	39	8.8

Educational Status		
Educated	386	86.7
Uneducated	59	13.3
Occupation		
Unemployed	226	50.8
Employed	219	49.2
Family type		
Nuclear	208	46.7
Joint& Extended	237	53.3
Monthly income		
<=20000	263	59.1
>20000	182	40.9
Spouse's educational status		
Educated	408	91.7
Uneducated	37	8.3
Spouse's Occupation		
Foreign employment	25	5.6
Non-formal employment	318	71.5
Formal employment	102	22.9

504

505

506 **Table 3.** Distribution of participants according to obstetric history (n=445)

Characteristics	Frequency (n)	Percent (%)
Gravida		
<=2	337	75.7
>2	108	24.3
Para		
Primi para	157	35.3
Multipara	288	64.7

Week of gestation		
Preterm	19	4.3
Term	426	95.7
Type of delivery		
Spontaneous vaginal delivery	229	51.5
Augmented	63	14.2
Lower section cesarean section	153	34.4
Complications during labor		
Yes	148	33.3
No	148	66.7

507

508

509 **Table 4** Participant reports of RMC (n=445)

Components of RMC	SD f (%)	D f (%)	N f (%)	A f (%)	SA f (%)	Mean (SE)	CM (SE)
Friendly care: The health worker/s							
Cared with a kind approach	3 (0.7)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	141 (31.7)	299 (67.2)	4.64 (.027)	4.42 (.028)
Treated in a friendly manner	10 (2.2)	2 (0.4)	27 (6.1)	185 (41.6)	221 (49.7)	4.36 (.038)	
Talked positively about pain and relief	5 (1.1)	4 (0.9)	14 (3.1)	200 (44.9)	222 (49.9)	4.42 (.033)	
Showed his/her concern and empathy	-	1 (0.2)	38 (8.5)	187 (42)	219 (49.2)	4.40 (.031)	
Treated with respect as an individual	1 (0.2)	6 (1.3)	66 (14.8)	181 (40.7)	191 (42.9)	4.25 (.036)	
Spoke in a language that I could understand	18 (4)	29 (6.5)	24 (5.4)	174 (39.1)	200 (44.9)	4.14 (.05)	

Called me by my name	113 (25.4)	97 (21.8)	46 (10.3)	130 (29.2)	59 (13.3)	2.83 (.068)	
Abuse free care:							
The health worker/s							
Responded to my needs whether or not I asked	51 (11.5)	94 (21.1)	89 (20.0)	90 (20.2)	121 (27.2)	3.31 (.065)	4.29 (.044)
Slapped me during delivery for different reasons (R)	267 (60.0)	121 (27.2)	32 (7.2)	19 (4.3)	6 (1.3)	4.40 (0.43)	
Shouted at me because I hadn't done what I was told to do (R)	249 (56.0)	125 (28.1)	50 (11.2)	17 (3.8)	4 (0.9)	4.34 (.042)	
Timely Care							
Kept waiting for a long time before receiving service (r)	98 (22.0)	117 (26.3)	106 (23.8)	78 (17.5)	46 (10.3)	3.32 (.061)	3.10 (.057)
Allowed to practice cultural rituals in the facility	169 (38.0)	107 (24.0)	87 (19.6)	19 (4.3)	63 (14.2)	2.33 (.066)	
Service provision was delayed due to the health facility's internal problems (r)	172 (38.7)	102 (22.9)	88 (19.8)	51 (11.5)	32 (7.2)	3.74 (.060)	
Discrimination- free care: Some of the health workers							
Did not treat me well because of my personal attributes (R)	330 (74.2)	89 (20.0)	11 (2.5)	9 (2.0)	6 (1.3)	4.64 (.036)	4.67 (.032)
Insulted me and my companions due to my personal attributes (R)	316 (71.0)	112 (25.2)	4 (0.9)	5 (1.1)	8 (1.8)	4.62 (.035)	

510 SA- Strongly agree, A- Agree, N- Neutral/ Indifferent, D- Disagree, SD- Strongly disagree

511 SE- Standard error, CM- Cumulative mean

512 **Table 5.** Distribution of Friendly RMC by different socio-demographic and obstetric
513 characteristics (n=445)

Characteristics	Friendly care			χ^2	p-value
	Moderate RMC	High RMC	Very high RMC		

	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)		
Age					
<20	1 (1.1)	41 (46.6)	46 (52.3)	8.958 _a	.062
20-30	24 (7.3)	149(45.0)	158 (47.7)		
30-40	1 (3.8)	16 (61.5)	9 (34.6)		
Ethnicity					
Brahmin/Chhetri	10 (7.4)	58 (42.6)	68 (50.0)	6.754	.149
Janjati	8 (3.9)	92 (44.9)	105 (51.2)		
Madhesi/Dalit & others	8 (7.7)	56 (53.8)	40 (38.5)		
Educational Status					
Educated	25 (6.5)	177(45.9)	184 (47.7)	2.817 _a	.244
Uneducated	1 (1.7)	29 (49.2)	29 (49.2)		
Occupation					
Unemployed	9 (4.0)	115(50.9)	102 (45.1)	5.529	.063
Employed	17 (7.8)	91 (416)	111 (50.7)		
Monthly income					
<=20000	5 (1.9)	126(47.9)	132 (50.2)	18.188	.000
>20000	21 (11.5)	80 (44.0)	81 (44.5)		
Spouse's Occupation					
Foreign	0(.0)	13(52.0)	12(48.0)	3.605 _a	.462
Non-formal	21(6.6)	146(45.9)	151(47.5)		
Formal employment	5(4.9)	47(46.1)	50(49.0)		
Gravida					
<=2	7 (2.1)	146(43.3)	184 (54.6)	49.498	.000
>2	19 (17.6)	60 (55.6)	29 (26.9)		
Para					
Primi para	2 (1.3)	83 (52.9)	72 (45.9)	11.135	.004
Multi para	24 (8.3)	123(42.7)	141 (49.0)		

Week of gestation					
Preterm	0	14 (73.7)	5 (26.3)	7.302 _a	.026
Term	26 (6.1)	192(45.1)	208 (48.8)		
Type of delivery					
SVD	10 (4.4)	100(43.7)	119 (52.0)	6.112 _a	.191
Augmented	6 (9.5)	34 (54.0)	23 (36.5)		
LSCS	10 (6.5)	72 (47.1)	71 (46.4)		
Complications					
Yes	7 (4.7)	69 (46.6)	72 (48.6)	0.504	.777
No	19 (6.4)	137(46.1)	141 (47.5)		

514 _a - likelihood ratio

515

516 **Table 6.** Distribution of Abuse-free RMC by different socio-demographic and obstetric
517 characteristics (n=445)

Characteristics	Abuse Free Care					χ^2	p-value
	Very Low RMC f (%)	Low RMC f (%)	Moderate RMC f (%)	High RMC f (%)	Very High RMC f (%)		
Age							
<20	-	2(2.3)	13(14.8)	39(44.3)	34(38.6)	11.606 _a	.212
20-30	4(1.2)	12(3.6)	71(21.5)	94(28.4)	150(45.3)		
30-40	-	1(3.8)	5 (19.2)	11(42.3)	9 (34.6)		
Ethnicity							
Brahmin/Chhetri	0(.0)	2(1.5)	32(23.5)	42(30.9)	60(44.1)	11.214	.186
Janjati	1(.5)	8(3.9)	36(17.6)	66(32.2)	94(45.9)		.190
Madhesi/Dalit & others	3(2.9)	5(4.8)	21(20.2)	36(34.6)	39(37.5)		
Educational Status							

Educated	3(.8)	10(2.6)	74(19.2)	129(33.4)	170(44.0)	11.214 _a	.190
Uneducated	1(1.7)	5(8.5)	15(25.4)	15(25.4)	23(39.0)		
Occupation							
Unemployed	3(1.3)	6 (2.7)	40(17.7)	81(35.8)	96(42.5)	4.713 _a	.318
Employed	1 (.5)	9 (4.1)	49(22.4)	63(28.8)	97(44.3)		
Monthly income							
<=20000	1(.4)	11(4.2)	50(19.0)	79(30.0)	122(46.4)	5.981 _a	.201
>20000	3(1.6)	4(2.2)	39(21.4)	65(35.7)	71(39.0)		
Spouse's Occupation							
Foreign	0(.0)	0(.0)	4(16.0)	3(12.0)	18(72.0)	24.143 _a	.002
Non-formal	3(.9)	15(4.7)	61(19.2)	99(31.1)	140(44.0)		
Formal employment	1(1.0)	0(.0)	24(23.5)	42(41.2)	35(34.3)		
Gravida							
<=2	2(.6%)	14(4.2)	69(20.5)	103(30.6)	149(44.2)	6.223 _a	.183
>2	2(1.9)	1(.9)	20(18.5)	41(38.0)	44(40.7)		
Para							
Primi para	1(.6)	9(5.7)	40(25.5)	54(34.4)	53(33.8)	13.184 _a	.010
Multipara	3(1.0)	6(2.1)	49(17.0)	90(31.2)	140(48.6)		
Week of gestation							
Preterm	0(.0)	0(.0)	7(36.8)	7(36.8)	5(26.3)	5.592 _a	.232
Term	4(.9)	15(3.5)	82(19.2)	137(32.2)	188(44.1)		
Type of delivery							
SVD	3(1.3)	4(1.7)	50(21.8)	69(30.1)	103(45.0)	29.030 _a	.000
Augmented	1(1.6)	9(14.3)	12(19.0)	25(39.7)	16(25.4)		
LSCS	0(.0)	2(1.3)	27(17.6)	50(32.7)	74(48.4)		
Complications							
Yes	1(.7)	1(.7)	32(21.6)	45(30.4)	69(46.6)	7.391 _a	.117

No	3(1.0)	14(4.7)	57(19.2)	99(33.3)	124(41.8)		
----	--------	---------	----------	----------	-----------	--	--

518 a_ likelihood ratio

519 **Table 7.** Distribution of Timely RMC by different socio-demographic and obstetric
 520 characteristics (n=445)

Characteristics	Timely Care					χ^2	p-value
	Very Low RMC	Low RMC	Moderate RMC	High RMC	Very high RMC		
Age							
<20	0(.0)	8(9.1)	37(42.0)	25(28.4)	18(20.5)	55.822a	.000
20-30	38(11.5)	33(10.0)	179(54.1)	73(22.1)	8(2.4)	54.618	.000
30-40	3(11.5)	1(3.8 0)	13(50.0)	9(34.6)	0(.0)		
Ethnicity							
Brahmin/Chhetri	19(14.0)	13(9.6)	75(55.1)	29(21.3)	0(.0)	24.939a	.002
Janjati	12(5.9)	17(8.3)	101(49.3)	53(25.9)	22(10.7)		
Madhesi/Dalit & others	10(9.6)	12(11.5)	53(51.0)	25(24.0)	4(3.8)		
Educational Status							
Educated	38(9.8)	39(10.1)	198(51.3)	90(23.3)	21(5.4)	4.089a	.394
Uneducated	3(5.1)	3(5.1)	31(52.5)	17(28.8)	5(8.5)	4.420	.352
Occupation							
Unemployed	10(4.4)	29(12.8)	113(50.0)	61(27.0)	13(5.8)	18.888a	.001
Employed	31(14.2)	13(5.9)	116(53.0)	46(21.0)	13(5.9)		
Monthly income							
≤20000	18(6.8)	23(8.7)	129(49.0)	68(25.9)	25(9.5)	20.616a	.000
>20000	23(12.6)	199(10.4)	100(54.9)	39(21.4)	1(.5)		
Spouse's Occupation							

Foreign	6(24.0)	2(8.0)	13(2.0)	4(16.0)	0(.0)	13.692a	.090
Nonformal	25(7.9)	31(9.7)	159(50.0)	79(24.8)	24(7.5)	14.218	.076
Formal employment	10(9.8)	9(8.8)	57(55.9)	24(23.5)	2(2.0)		
Gravida							
<=2	17(5.0)	32(9.5)	185(54.9)	85(25.2)	18(5.3)	30.782a	.000
>2	24(22.2)	10(9.3)	44(40.7)	22(20.4)	8(7.4)		
Para							
Primi para	8(5.1)	18(11.5)	87(55.4)	39(24.8)	5(3.2)	9.255a	.055
Multi para	33(11.5)	24(8.3)	142(49.3)	68(23.6)	21(7.3)		
Week of gestation							
Preterm	2(10.5)	0(.0)	10(52.6)	5(26.3)	2(10.5)	2.703a	.609
Term	39(9.2)	42(9.9)	219(51.4)	102(23.9)	24(5.6)	4.355	.360
Type of delivery							
SVD	20(8.7)	14(6.1)	129(56.3)	56(24.5)	10(4.4)	22.359a	.004
Augmented	10(15.9)	7(11.1)	32(50.8)	14(22.2)	0(.0)	24.612	.002
LSCS	11(7.2)	21(13.7)	68(44.4)	37(24.2)	16(10.5)		
Complication							
Yes	10(6.8)	22(14.9)	68(45.9)	33(22.3)	15(10.1)	16.957a	.002
No	31(10.4)	20(6.7)	161(54.2)	74(24.9)	11(3.7)		
No. of living child							
≤2	22(5.8)	37(9.8)	204(54.0)	92(24.3)	23(6.1)	35.113a	.000
>2	19(28.4)	5(7.5)	25(37.3)	15(22.4)	3(4.5)	26.558	.000

521 a_ likelihood ratio

522 **Table 8.** Associated factors for Timely RMC during delivery (n=445)

Predictors	Neutral RMC		High RMC	
	OR(CI)	P-Value	OR(CI)	P-Value
Type of Delivery				
SVD	2.07(1.15-3.72)	0.01	1.38(0.74-2.59)	0.30
Augmented	0.99(0.47-2.10)	0.99	0.56(0.23-1.36)	0.18
LSCS	0 ^b	-	0 ^b	-
Gravida				
Primi	2.28(0.92-6.29)	0.07	2.20(0.82-5.90)	0.12
Multi	0 ^b		0 ^b	-
Monthly income (NPR)				
≤20000	1.33(0.78-2.24)	0.289	2.36(1.3-4.23)	0.004
>20000	0 ^b	-	0 ^b	
Complication during delivery				
Yes	0.81(0.43-1.53)	0.52	0.63(0.31-1.27)	0.63
No	0 ^b	-	0 ^b	
Living Children				
≤2	1.86(0.74-2.59)	0.048	1.52(0.52-4.39)	0.43
≥2	0 ^b	-	0 ^b	-

523 Model fitting information= Chi-square= 3.68,df=12 p-value=0.000, Pseudo R² Nagelkerke=0.096

524 a. The reference category is 1.00 Low RMC, b This parameter set zero because it is redundant,

525