

# Spatial Differences in Knowledge and Perception of Key Danger Signs of Pregnancy among Mothers in Ebonyi State, Nigeria

<sup>1,2</sup>Edmund Ndudi Ossai, <sup>1,2</sup>Chihurumnaya Alo, <sup>1,2</sup>Benedict Ndubueze Azuogu, \*<sup>1,2</sup>Irene Ifeyinwa Eze.

Department of Community Medicine, <sup>1</sup>College of Health Sciences, Ebonyi State University Abakaliki, <sup>2</sup>Alex Ekwueme Federal University Teaching Hospital Abakaliki, Nigeria.

## Abstract

**Background:** To determine knowledge and perception of key danger signs of pregnancy among mothers in urban and rural communities of Ebonyi state, Nigeria.

**Methodology:** A comparative cross-sectional study design was used. The two-stage sampling technique was used to select 660 women in four of thirteen local government areas in the state. The women have delivered in last one year irrespective of place of delivery. Outcome measure included good knowledge of danger signs and was assessed by proportion of respondents who recalled four of eight danger signs. Positive perception was assessed by proportion who were aware that danger signs of pregnancy were capable of causing death of women if unattended to immediately.

**Results:** The mean age of respondents was urban, 29.6±6.2 and rural, 28.6±5.1 years. The most recalled danger sign was bleeding before labour; urban, 280 (84.8%); rural, 267 (80.9%). Comparable proportions - urban, 272 (82.4%); rural, 287 (87.0%) had good knowledge of danger signs. (p=0.105). Predictors of good knowledge of danger signs included residing in urban, (AOR=0.4; 95%CI:0.2-0.9), being <30 years, (AOR=0.6; 95%CI:0.3-0.9), having 2-4 children, (AOR=2.4; 95%CI:1.2-4.7) and not receiving antenatal care from a skilled provider. (AOR=0.2; 95%CI:0.08-0.4). There was an association between good knowledge and positive perception of danger signs. (p<0.001).

**Conclusions:** Majority of respondents in study area had good knowledge and positive perception of danger signs of pregnancy. Consolidating the understanding of danger signs will enhance maternal health outcome thus improving the maternal death burden in Nigeria. There is need to ensure that all women receive antenatal care from a skilled provider.

**Keywords:** Danger signs; Pregnancy; Knowledge and Perception; Ebonyi State; Nigeria.

## Introduction

The sub-Saharan African region bears the highest burden of pregnancy complications. This is because about 66% of global maternal deaths occur in this region. <sup>[1]</sup> At the country level, maternal deaths are highest in Nigeria as the country accounts for about 19% of the total maternal deaths in the world. <sup>[1]</sup> The first target of the third Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) aims to reduce global maternal mortality to less

than 70 deaths per 100, 000 live births by the year 2030. <sup>[2]</sup> Suffice it to say that for countries with high maternal mortality including Nigeria, this appears to be a tall order. <sup>[3]</sup> This is because the global maternal

**Corresponding Author:** \*Irene Ifeyinwa Eze

Department of Community Medicine, <sup>1</sup>College of Health Sciences, Ebonyi State University Abakaliki, <sup>2</sup>Alex Ekwueme Federal University Teaching Hospital Abakaliki, Nigeria. Email: jorenebiz@yahoo.com

Access this article online

Quick Response Code:



Website:

www.nigerianmedjournal.org

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

**How to cite this article:** Ossai EN, Alo C, Azuogu BN, Eze I. Spatial Differences in Knowledge and Perception of Key Danger Signs of Pregnancy among Mothers in Ebonyi State, Nigeria. Niger Med J 2021; 62; (2):66 - 73.



mortality ratio decreased by only 44% from 385 to 216 maternal deaths per 100,000 live births between 1990 and 2015. <sup>[1]</sup> It has been postulated that to realize this SDG goal especially in low income countries where the burden of maternal deaths is greatest, there is the need to improve the awareness and knowledge of the signs and symptoms of pregnancy complications. <sup>[4]</sup> Thus affirming the concept that increasing the knowledge of obstetric danger signs among women, their families and in the community is one of the strategies for reducing maternal deaths.

Danger signs of pregnancy are not the real obstetric complications but symptoms that are easily identified by non-medical personnel. The key danger signs of pregnancy signs are eight in number and includes amongst others bleeding before labour. <sup>[5]</sup> It has been found that raising awareness of pregnant women on key danger signs of pregnancy is of good effect in improving early detection of complications thus reducing the delay in deciding to seek obstetric care. <sup>[6]</sup> There is evidence that every pregnancy is faced with a measure of risk. <sup>[7]</sup> Also, for every maternal death that occurs between 15 and 30 women who survive childbirth suffer from short and long term disabilities. <sup>[8]</sup> Thus awareness and knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy have been identified as a step towards improving maternal health. <sup>[9]</sup>

It has been ascertained that the assessment of women's awareness of obstetric danger signs also contribute to increasing the awareness of these danger signs. <sup>[10]</sup> Also, increasing the knowledge of these danger signs among women has been identified as a way of strengthening primary health care. <sup>[11]</sup> Furthermore, studies have shown that women with knowledge of at least one danger sign of pregnancy were more likely to be birth prepared than others, <sup>[12,13]</sup> and this if sustained has the capacity of decreasing maternal morbidity and mortality in low income countries. This study was designed to determine the knowledge and perception of key danger signs of pregnancy among mothers in urban and rural communities of Ebonyi State, Nigeria.

## Materials and Methods

### Study setting

The study was conducted in Ebonyi State which is one of the five states in southeast geo-political zone of Nigeria. The inhabitants are mainly of Igbo ethnic nationality with mixture of other tribes and are predominantly Christians. Ebonyi State has 13 local government areas of which three are designated as urban while the remaining ten local government areas

are classified as rural.

### Study Design

This was a cross-sectional comparative study.

### Study Population

The study population were mothers who have delivered babies within one year preceding the study, which was indicated by the first day of data collection irrespective of place of delivery. Also the women must be permanent residents of the selected communities for at least one year. Those that refused consent to participate in the study were excluded.

### Sample Size Determination

The minimum sample size for the study was determined by the formula used to compare two independent proportions. <sup>[14]</sup> From a study in an urban community in Nigeria, 19.6% of the respondents knew at least four key danger signs during labour, <sup>[15]</sup> while from a rural community in Nigeria, 24.2% had good knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy. <sup>[16]</sup> A total of 330 respondents were estimated for each study group based on type 1 error ( $\alpha$ ) of 0.05 in a two sided test with power of 0.8 and a design effect of 2.0.

### Sampling Technique

A two stage (cluster) sampling technique was used to select the mothers for inclusion in the study. In the first stage, two local government areas each were selected from the three urban and ten rural local government areas of the state using a simple random sampling technique of balloting. In the second stage, two communities each were selected from a list of communities in the selected local government areas using a simple random sampling technique of balloting. In the selected communities, any woman that meets the inclusion criteria were consecutively recruited until the sample size was reached. The first respondent was selected by spinning a bottle in an agreed center of each of the selected communities and following the direction of the bottle the researchers moved from house to house.

### Study Instrument

A pretested, semi-structured, interviewer administered questionnaire which was designed by the researchers was used to obtain information from the respondents.

### Data Analysis

Data entry and analysis were done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) statistical

software version 22. Frequency distribution and cross tabulations were generated. Chi square test of statistical significance and multivariate analysis using binary logistic regression were used in the analysis and the level of statistical significance was determined by a p value of less than 0.05.

The outcome measures of the study were good knowledge and positive perception of danger signs of pregnancy. Good knowledge of danger signs was determined by proportion of respondents in either the urban or rural areas who recalled four or more of the eight key danger signs of pregnancy. Good perception of danger signs was determined by the proportion of respondents who perceived that danger signs of pregnancy was capable of causing the death of a pregnancy woman if not attended to on time.

### Ethical approval

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Research and Ethics Committee of Ebonyi State University Abakaliki, southeast Nigeria. The respondents signed a written informed consent form before participating in the study. The participants were assured by the researchers that participation in the study was voluntary, and that information obtained for the study will be treated anonymously and confidentially.

### Results

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. The mean age of the respondents in the urban area, 29.6±6.2 years was significantly higher than that of the rural, 28.6±5.1 years, (Student  $t=2.691$ ,  $p=0.007$ ). Majority of respondents in urban area, 53.6% have attained tertiary education while in the rural, majority, 61.2% have attained secondary education and the difference in proportions of the respondents on educational attainment was found to be statistically significant, ( $\chi^2=208.961$ ,  $p<0.001$ ).

Table 2 shows the knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy among the respondents. Comparable proportions of respondents in urban, 88.8% and rural area, 92.7% were informed about danger signs of pregnancy during antenatal care, ( $\chi^2=3.053$ ,  $p=0.081$ ). Also, comparable proportions of respondents in urban, 84.8% and rural, 80.9% recalled vaginal bleeding before labour, ( $\chi^2=1.805$ ,  $p=0.179$ ). A significantly higher proportion of respondents in rural area, 82.1% recalled swollen hands and feet when compared with those in the urban, 68.2%, ( $\chi^2=17.169$ ,  $p<0.001$ ).

Table 3 shows good knowledge and positive perception of danger signs of pregnancy among the respondents. Comparable proportions of respondents in rural area, 87.0% and those in the urban, 82.4% had good knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy, ( $\chi^2=2.630$ ,  $p=0.105$ ). A significantly higher proportion of respondents in the rural area, 85.5% had positive perception of danger signs when compared with those in the urban 76.4%, ( $\chi^2=8.828$ ,  $p=0.003$ ).

Table 4 shows the factors affecting good knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy among the respondents. The respondents who reside in urban area were about three times less likely to have good knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy when compared with those in the rural. (AOR=0.4, 95% CI: 0.2-0.9). The respondents who were less than 30 years were about two times less likely to have good knowledge of danger signs when compared with those who were 30 years and above, (AOR=0.6, 95%CI:0.3-0.9). The respondents who had 2-4 children were twice more likely to have good knowledge of danger signs when compared with those who had five children and more, (AOR=2.4, 95%CI: 1.2-4.7). The respondents who attended antenatal care with a traditional birth attendant or at home were five times less likely to have good knowledge of danger signs when compared with those who attended antenatal care in a private or mission hospital, (AOR=0.2, 95%CI: 0.1-0.4).

Table 5 shows the relationship between good knowledge and positive perception of danger signs. A significantly higher proportion of respondents who had good knowledge of danger signs, 86.2% had positive perception of danger signs when compared with those who had poor knowledge, 51.5%, ( $\chi^2=66.839$ ,  $p<0.001$ ).

**Table 1:** Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents

| Variable                            | Urban<br>(n=330)<br>N (%) | Rural<br>(n=330)<br>N (%) | $\chi^2$ | p value |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|----------|---------|
| <b>Age of respondents (years)</b>   |                           |                           |          |         |
| Mean±(SD)                           | 29.6±6.2                  | 28.6±5.1                  | 2.691*   | 0.007   |
| <b>Age of respondents in groups</b> |                           |                           |          |         |
| <25 years                           | 59 (17.9)                 | 64 (19.4)                 | 3.334    | 0.343   |
| 25-29 years                         | 109 (33.0)                | 127 (38.5)                |          |         |
| 30-34 years                         | 99 (30.0)                 | 85 (25.8)                 |          |         |
| –                                   | 63 (19.1)                 | 54 (16.4)                 |          |         |
| <b>Number of children</b>           |                           |                           |          |         |
| One child                           | 59 (17.9)                 | 89 (27.0)                 | 18.152   | <0.001  |
| 2-4 children                        | 232 (70.3)                | 179 (54.2)                |          |         |
| >5 children                         | 39 (11.8)                 | 62 (18.8)                 |          |         |



| <b>Marital status</b>                       |            |            |         |        |
|---|------------|------------|---------|--------|
| Never married                               | 18 (5.5)   | 30 (9.1)   | 3.990   | 0.136  |
| Married                                     | 310 (93.9) | 296 (89.7) |         |        |
| Separated/divorced                          | 2 (0.6)    | 4 (1.2)    |         |        |
| <b>Socio-economic status</b>                |            |            |         |        |
| Low socio-economic class                    | 93 (28.2)  | 237 (71.8) | 127.673 | <0.001 |
| High socio-economic class                   | 237 (71.8) | 93 (28.2)  |         |        |
| <b>Educational attainment of respondent</b> |            |            |         |        |
| No formal education                         | 4 (1.2)    | 8 (2.4)    | 208.961 | <0.001 |
| Primary education                           | 12 (3.6)   | 100 (30.3) |         |        |
| Secondary education                         | 137 (41.5) | 202 (61.2) |         |        |
| Tertiary education                          | 177 (53.6) | 20 (6.1)   |         |        |
| <b>Employment status of respondent</b>      |            |            |         |        |
| Unemployed                                  | 69 (20.9)  | 57 (17.3)  | 98.143  | <0.001 |
| Self-employed                               | 129 (39.1) | 242 (73.3) |         |        |
| Salaried employment                         | 132 (40.0) | 31 (9.4)   |         |        |

\*Student t test

**Table 2: Knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy**

| Variable  | Urban (n=330) N (%) | Rural (n=330) N (%) | $\chi^2$ | p value |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|----------|---------|
| <b>Health talks were given during pregnancy</b> |                     |                     |          |         |
| Yes   | 309 (93.6)          | 311 (94.2)          | 0.106    | 0.744   |
| No  | 21 (6.4)            | 19 (5.8)            |          |         |
| <b>Informed about danger signs of pregnancy</b> |                     |                     |          |         |
| Yes   | 293 (88.8)          | 306 (92.7)          | 3.053    | 0.081   |
| No  | 17 (11.2)           | 24 (7.3)            |          |         |
| <b>Danger signs recall**</b>                    |                     |                     |          |         |
| Vaginal bleeding before labour                  | 280 (84.8)          | 267 (80.9)          | 1.805    | 0.179   |
| Malpresentation                                 | 260 (78.8)          | 276 (83.6)          | 2.542    | 0.111   |
| Unduly long labour                              | 240 (72.7)          | 262 (79.4)          | 4.027    | 0.045   |
| Heavy bleeding during or after labour           | 230 (69.7)          | 259 (78.5)          | 6.638    | 0.010   |
| Swollen hands and feet                          | 225 (68.2)          | 271 (82.1)          | 17.169   | <0.001  |
| Severe headache and fits                        | 208 (63.0)          | 244 (73.9)          | 9.098    | 0.003   |
| Fever   | 207 (62.7)          | 180 (54.5)          | 4.554    | 0.033   |
| Smelly vaginal discharge                        | 196 (59.4)          | 248 (75.2)          | 18.609   | <0.001  |
| Recalled one danger sign                        | 320 (97.0)          | 314 (95.2)          | 1.441    | 0.230   |
| Recalled two or more danger signs               | 314 (95.2)          | 309 (93.6)          | 0.716    | 0.398   |

\*\*Multiple responses encouraged

**Table 3: Good knowledge and perception of danger signs of pregnancy**

| Variable                          | Urban (n=330) N (%) | Rural (n=330) N (%) | $\chi^2$ | p value |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------|---------|
| <b>Knowledge of danger signs</b>  |                     |                     |          |         |
| Good                              | 272 (82.4)          | 287 (87.0)          | 2.630    | 0.105   |
| Poor                              | 58 (17.6)           | 43 (13.0)           |          |         |
| <b>Perception of danger signs</b> |                     |                     |          |         |
| Positive                          | 252 (76.4)          | 282 (85.5)          | 8.828    | 0.003   |
| Negative                          | 78 (23.6)           | 48 (14.5)           |          |         |

**Table 4: Factors affecting good knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy**

| Variable  | Knowledge of danger signs (n=660) |            | **P value | AOR(95%CI)***  |
|---|-----------------------------------|------------|-----------|----------------|
|   | Good N (%)                        | Poor N (%) |           |                |
| <b>Location</b>                                 |                                   |            |           |                |
| Urban   | 272 (82.4)                        | 58 (17.6)  | 0.105     | 0.4 (0.2-0.9)  |
| Rural   | 287 (87.0)                        | 43 (13.0)  |           | 1              |
| <b>Age of respondents</b>                       |                                   |            |           |                |
| <30 years                                       | 288 (80.2)                        | 71 (19.8)  | <0.001    | 0.6 (0.3- 0.9) |
| ≥ 30 years                                      | 271 (90.0)                        | 30 (10.0)  |           | 1              |
| <b>Number of children</b>                       |                                   |            |           |                |
| One child                                       | 114 (77.0)                        | 34 (23.0)  | 0.003     | 2.0 (0.9- 4.7) |
| 2-4 children                                    | 363 (88.3)                        | 48 (11.7)  |           | 2.4 (1.2- 4.7) |
| ≥5 children                                     | 82 (81.2)                         | 19 (18.8)  |           | 1              |
| <b>Marital status</b>                           |                                   |            |           |                |
| Single*   | 33 (61.1)                         | 21 (38.9)  | <0.001    | 0.5 (0.2- 1.2) |
| Married   | 526 (86.8)                        | 80 (13.2)  |           | 1              |
| <b>Employment status of respondent</b>          |                                   |            |           |                |
| Unemployed                                      | 91 (72.2)                         | 35 (27.8)  | <0.001    | 0.7 (0.3- 1.6) |
| Self-employment                                 | 322 (86.8)                        | 49 (13.2)  |           | 1.4 (0.7- 2.9) |
| Salaried employment                             | 146 (89.6)                        | 17 (10.4)  |           | 1              |
| <b>Employment status of husband</b>             |                                   |            |           |                |
| Unemployed                                      | 8 (80.0)                          | 2 (20.0)   | 0.585     | NA             |
| Self-employment                                 | 341 (86.1)                        | 55 (13.9)  |           |                |
| Salaried employment                             | 177 (88.5)                        | 23 (11.5)  |           |                |
| <b>Educational attainment of respondent</b>     |                                   |            |           |                |
| Tertiary education                              | 180 (91.4)                        | 17 (8.6)   | 0.002     | 2.0 (0.9- 4.2) |
| Others^   | 379 (81.9)                        | 84 (19.1)  |           | 1              |
| <b>Educational attainment of husband</b>        |                                   |            |           |                |
| Tertiary education                              | 202 (89.4)                        | 24 (10.6)  | 0.148     | NA             |
| Others^   | 334 (85.3)                        | 56 (14.7)  |           |                |
| <b>Socio-economic status</b>                    |                                   |            |           |                |
| Low socio-economic class                        | 267 (80.9)                        | 63 (19.1)  | 0.007     | 0.7 (0.4- 1.3) |
| High socio-economic class                       | 292 (88.5)                        | 38 (11.5)  |           | 1              |
| <b>Place respondent attended antenatal care</b> |                                   |            |           |                |
| Home/Traditional birth attendant                | 21 (42.0)                         | 29 (58.0)  | <0.001    | 0.2 (0.1- 0.4) |
| Primary healthcare                              | 241 (88.9)                        | 30 (11.1)  |           | 1.2 (0.5- 2.9) |
| Secondary healthcare level                      | 23 (88.5)                         | 3 (11.5)   |           | 0.7 (0.2- 3.4) |
| Tertiary healthcare level                       | 167 (90.3)                        | 18 (9.7)   |           | 1.4 (0.7- 2.9) |
| Private/Mission hospital                        | 107 (83.6)                        | 21 (15.3)  |           | 1              |

\*Never married, separated/divorced; \*\*p value on bivariate analysis, NA Not applicable

\*\*\*Adjusted odds ratio, 95% Confidence interval on multivariate analysis ^Secondary education and less

**Table 5: Association between knowledge and perception of danger signs**

| Variable                         | Perception of danger signs (n=660) |            | $\chi^2$ | p value |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|----------|---------|
|                                  | Good N (%)                         | Poor N (%) |          |         |
| <b>Knowledge of danger signs</b> |                                    |            |          |         |
| Good                             | 482 (86.2)                         | 77 (13.8)  | 66.839   | <0.001  |
| Poor                             | 52 (51.5)                          | 49 (48.5)  |          |         |

## Discussion

Majority of respondents in urban, 88.8% and rural areas, 92.7% were informed of the danger signs of pregnancy during the pregnancy period. From the results of Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey, a higher proportion of women in urban area, 75.5% received information on signs of pregnancy complications when compared with those residing in rural area, 59.2%.<sup>[17]</sup> From the results of that survey also, majority of the women in Ebonyi state, 64.1% also received information on signs of pregnancy complications.<sup>[17]</sup> In a study among women who received antenatal care in primary health centers in southeast Nigeria, 85.9% of the respondents in urban area and 88.1% in rural also received information on the danger signs of pregnancy.<sup>[9]</sup> This may be an indication that in Nigeria, information on danger signs of pregnancy is part of routine antenatal care service delivery.

The most recalled danger sign among the respondents in the two study groups was vaginal bleeding before labor, (urban, 84.8% and rural, 80.9%). Bleeding per vagina has consistently remained the most recalled danger sign by women. In a study among women of reproductive age in rural communities of Enugu state, bleeding before labour was the most recalled danger sign [16]. Similar result was also obtained among women who attended antenatal care in the three levels of health care delivery in Nigeria. These included women who utilized primary health centers in urban and rural areas of southeast Nigeria<sup>[9]</sup> and secondary and tertiary health facilities in southwest Nigeria.<sup>[18,19]</sup> Similar results were also obtained from other parts of the African continent.<sup>[20,21,22,23]</sup>

Comparable proportions of respondents in urban (82.4%), and rural, (87.0%) areas had good knowledge of key danger signs of pregnancy. This is an indication of a high level of understanding of danger signs of pregnancy among mothers in the study area. It has been observed that fear of complications occasioned by the understanding of danger signs of pregnancy by mothers necessitated that women in rural areas of Ebonyi state, Nigeria register for antenatal care in more than one health facility.<sup>[24]</sup> This was because the women were not sure of the ability of health workers in the primary health centers which are the predominant health facilities in the rural area to handle these emergencies should they occur.<sup>[24]</sup> Studies from other regions of Nigeria also revealed that majority of respondents had good knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy.<sup>[9,18,19,25]</sup> These results are at

variance with that obtained from a study in rural communities of Enugu state, southeast Nigeria where only a minor proportion of respondents, 14.2% had good knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy.<sup>[16]</sup> This may be because the study in those rural communities involved women of reproductive age and not mothers. In Nigeria, health education is an integral part of antenatal care service delivery and this includes counselling on danger signs of pregnancy.<sup>[17]</sup> This may have accounted for the differences in the result of this study that involved women of reproductive age group and those that have previously attended antenatal care. In a study in Nepal, majority of respondents, 66% had adequate knowledge of obstetric danger signs.<sup>[26]</sup> However, in similar studies in urban Tanzania<sup>[23]</sup> and Somali region of Ethiopia<sup>[20]</sup> only minor proportions of respondents had good knowledge of danger signs. Suffice it to say that both studies concluded on the need for intervention efforts aimed at improving the knowledge of danger signs among the women.

From the results of this study when compared with respondents in urban area, residing in the rural area increased the probability of having good knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy. There is evidence that the burden of maternal mortality is higher in the rural area than the urban.<sup>[17]</sup> Also, the primary health centers which are less equipped both in personnel and equipment than the other levels of care are the main health facilities in the rural hence the providers of healthcare in primary health centers may have placed priority on knowledge of danger signs among the women attending antenatal care. Similar results were obtained among women who utilized primary health centers for antenatal care in Enugu state, southeast Nigeria<sup>[9]</sup> and in Tigray Region of Ethiopia.<sup>[27]</sup> Studies in other regions of Ethiopia<sup>[20,28]</sup> however, revealed that urban residents were more likely to have good knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy.

The respondents who were less than 30 years were about twice less likely to have good knowledge of danger signs when compared with those who were 30 years and above thus signifying that respondents in the older age group were more likely to have good knowledge of danger signs. This result is in agreement with that obtained among women in urban Tanzania.<sup>[23]</sup> It however varies with that obtained among women that utilized antenatal care in primary health centers of Enugu state, southeast Nigeria.<sup>[9]</sup>

The respondents in the study area who had 2-4 children were twice more likely to have good



knowledge of danger signs when compared with those who had five children and more. This signifies that with increasing parity, the women rely more on their experience in child bearing which is not the same for women of less parity. Thus, women of less parity may exercise more caution than those of higher parity hence their better understanding of the danger signs of pregnancy. This result is at variance with that obtained in the Somali region of Ethiopia where women who were pregnant on five or more occasions were six times more likely to have good knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy.<sup>[20]</sup>

The respondents who attended antenatal care with a traditional birth attendant or at home were five times less likely to have good knowledge of danger signs when compared with those who attended antenatal care in a private or mission hospital. It has been identified that health education is an important aspect of antenatal care service delivery and the contents of such education includes information of the danger signs of pregnancy.<sup>[17]</sup> This necessitates the need for women to receive antenatal care from a skilled provider. From studies in Ethiopia, it was found that women who attended antenatal care from a skilled provider were more likely to have good knowledge of danger signs when compared to those who did not.<sup>[20,21,29]</sup> Similarly, women who delivered in health institutions were more likely to have good knowledge of danger signs when compared with those who delivered at home.<sup>[27,30]</sup> This emphasizes the relevance of skilled providers in care of pregnant women in developing countries where the burden of maternal mortality is high.

A significantly higher proportion of respondents in the rural area had positive perception of danger signs of pregnancy when compared with those in the urban. In a study in Zambia, majority of the respondents also had good perception of danger signs of pregnancy.<sup>[31]</sup> Emphasis on positive perception of danger signs of pregnancy is important as it has been identified that some women are of the opinion that danger signs of pregnancy are caused by witchcraft and based on that they prefer to receive treatment first from traditional healers.<sup>[32]</sup> Thus there was a call for the involvement of traditional birth attendants and traditional healers in health education concerning the danger signs since they have a role to play in ensuring that women with such signs are referred to formal health facilities for appropriate care.<sup>[32]</sup>

Furthermore, it has been revealed that increasing the knowledge of obstetric danger signs among women is necessary but not sufficient to overcome cultural preferences for traditional treatments for pregnancy danger signs.<sup>[33]</sup> For example, it has been found that community perception of bleeding is at variance with the views of health professionals hence the understanding of the concept of bleeding during pregnancy depends on who is involved in the community.<sup>[34]</sup> This may likely increase the maternal death burden. From the results of this study, a significantly higher proportion of respondents who had good knowledge of danger signs had positive perception of danger signs when compared with those who had poor knowledge. Thus, there is the need to emphasize that the danger signs of pregnancy are capable of causing the death of the woman and as such there is the need to seek early and appropriate care as this is capable of improving the maternal death burden in developing countries.

### Conclusion

Majority of respondents in urban and rural areas had good knowledge and positive perception of danger signs of pregnancy. Consolidating the understanding of danger signs of pregnancy will enhance the health status of the woman thus improving the maternal death burden in Nigeria. There is the need to ensure that all women receive antenatal care from a skilled provider.

### References

1. World Health Organization. Trends in Maternal Mortality: 1990–2015. Estimates developed by WHO. UNICEF. UNFPA and the World Bank Group and the United Nations Population Division. 2015. Geneva. World Health Organization.
2. United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Available at <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300>. Accessed 1st July 2019.
3. Alkema L, Chou D, Hogan D, Zhang S, Moller AB, Gemmill A, Fat DM, Boerma T, Temmerman M, Mathers C, Say L. Global, regional, and national levels and trends in maternal mortality between 1990 and 2015, with scenario-based projections to 2030: a systematic analysis by the UN Maternal Mortality Estimation Inter-Agency Group. *The Lancet*. 2016;**387**:462-74.
4. Okour A, Alkhateeb M, Amarin Z. Awareness of danger signs and symptoms of pregnancy



- complication among women in Jordan. *Int J Gynecol Obstetr.* 2012;**118**:11-14.
5. Lucas AO, Gilles HM. Short textbook of Public Health Medicine for the Tropics. (4<sup>th</sup> edition), Bookpower, London.
  6. Hailu M, Gebremariam A, Alemseged F. Knowledge about obstetric danger signs among pregnant women in Aleta Wondo District, Sidama Zone, Southern Ethiopia. *Ethiop J Health Sci.* 2010;**20**:25-32.
  7. Graham W. Every pregnancy faces risks. *Plan Parent Chall.* 1998;**1**:13-4.
  8. World Health Organization. The World Health Report 2005. Make every mother and child counts. 2005. Geneva. WHO.
  9. Ossai EN, Uzochukwu BS. Knowledge of danger signs of pregnancy among clients of maternal health service in urban and rural primary health centers of southeast Nigeria. *J Community Med Health Educ.* 2015;**5**:337.
  10. Solomon AA, Amanta NW, Chirkose EA, Badi MB. Knowledge about danger signs of pregnancy and associated factors among pregnant women in Debra Birhan Town, Central Ethiopia. *Sci J Public Health.* 2015;**3**:269-273.
  11. Hoque M, Hogue ME. Knowledge of danger signs for major obstetric complications among pregnant KaZulu-Natal women implications for health education. *Asia Pacific J Publ Health.* 2011;**23**:946-56.
  12. Doctor HV, Findley SE, Cometto G, Afenyadu GY. Awareness of critical danger signs of pregnancy and delivery preparations for delivery and utilization of skilled birth attendants in Nigeria. *J Health Care Poor Underserved.* 2013;**24**:152-70.
  13. Bayou NB, Gacho YH. Utilization of clean and safe delivery package of health services extension program and associated factors in rural kebeles of Kafa zone, southwest Ethiopia. *Ethiop J Health Sci.* 2013;**23**:79-89.
  14. Taofeek I. Research methodology and dissertation writing for health and allied health professionals. 1<sup>st</sup> edition. Abuja: *Cress Global Link Ltd.* 2009.
  15. Emma-Ukaegbu UC, Nwokeukwu HI, Uzochukwu BSC. An assessment of birth preparedness and complication readiness in antenatal women in Umuahia North Local Government Area, Abia State, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences.* 2014;**13**:90-94.
  16. Agunwa CC, Nnebue CC, Duru CB, Aniebue PN, Aniebue UU, Ifeadike CO. Knowledge of obstetric danger signs among women of reproductive age in rural communities in Enugu state, Nigeria. *American Journal of Health Research.* 2015;**3**:376-380.
  17. National Population Commission, ICF International. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2013. Abuja, Nigeria. Rockville, Maryland USA. 2014. NPC. ICF International.
  18. Oni B, Odukoya OO, Okunowo AA, Ojo OY, Abatan YO. A comparative assessment of the awareness of danger signs and practice of birth preparedness and complication readiness among pregnant women attending rural and urban general hospitals in Lagos State. *Sahel Med J.* 2016;**19**:206-14.
  19. Morhason-Bello IO, Fagbamigbe AF, Mumuni TO, Adesina OA, Abdus-Salam AR, Ifemeje A, Ojengbede OA. Evaluation of correct knowledge of key danger signs in pregnancy among antenatal clinic attendees at a tertiary health facility in Nigeria. *Niger J Clin Pract.* 2016;**19**:227-32.
  20. Maserasha N, Woldemichael K, Dube L. Knowledge of obstetric danger signs and associated factors among pregnant women in Erer district, Somali region, Ethiopia. *BMC Women's Health.* 2016;**16**:30.
  21. Bogale D, Markos D. Knowledge of obstetric danger signs among child bearing age women in Goba district, Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth.* 2015;**15**:77.
  22. Billign N, Mulatu T. Knowledge of obstetric danger signs and associated factors among reproductive age women in Raya Kobo district of Ethiopia: a community based cross-sectional study. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth.* 2017;**17**:70.
  23. Mwilike B, Nalwadda G, Kagawa M, Malima K, Mselle L, Horiuchi S. Knowledge of danger signs during pregnancy and subsequent healthcare seeking actions among women in urban Tanzania: a cross sectional study. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth.* 2018;**18**:4-11.
  24. Ossai EN, Eke PC, Agu PA, Nwonwu EU. Multiple antenatal care bookings among pregnant women in urban and rural communities of Ebonyi State, Nigeria: a mixed method study. *AJPCB.* 2019;**2**:1-12.
  25. Gobir AA, Sambo MN, Bashir SS, Olorukobo AA, Ezeh OH, Bello M, Usman B, Joseph S, Bashir J. Knowledge of obstetric danger signs and its determinants among women of

- reproductive age in Kwaba community in North-western Nigeria. *Int. J Med Health Dev.* 2017;**22**:37-44.
26. Thapa B, Manandhar K. Knowledge on obstetric danger signs among antenatal mothers attending a tertiary level hospital, Nepal. *JCMS Nepal.* 2017;**13**:383-7.
  27. Haliu D, Berhe H. Knowledge about obstetric danger signs and associated factors among mothers in Tsegedie District, Tigray Region Ethiopia 2013: community based cross-sectional study. *PLoS ONE.* 2014;**9**: e83459.
  28. Abayneh AS, Negash WA, Endeshaw AC, Marta BB. Knowledge about danger signs of pregnancy and associated factors among pregnant women in Debra Birhan Town, Central Ethiopia. *Science Journal of Public Health.* 2015;**3**:269-273.
  29. Liben ML, Wuneh AG, Zepro NB. Knowledge of pregnancy danger signs and associated factors among pastoral women in Afar Regional State, Ethiopia. *Cogent Medicine.* 2019;**6**:1612133.
  30. Amenu G, Mulaw Z, Seyoum T, Bayu H. Knowledge about danger signs of obstetric complications and associated factors among postnatal mothers of Mechekel District Health Centers, East Gojjamm Zone, Northwest Ethiopia, 2014. *Scientifica.* 2016;**7**.
  31. Nambala BS, Ngoma C. Knowledge and perception of women towards danger signs in pregnancy in Choma rural District, Zambia. *Medical Journal of Zambia.* 2013;**40**:43-47.
  32. Bakar RR, Mmbaga BT, Nielsen BB, Mamongi RN. Awareness of danger signs during pregnancy and post-delivery period among women of reproductive age in Unguja Island, Zanzibar: a qualitative study. *Afr J Reprod Health.* 2019;**23**:27-36.
  33. Aborigo RA, Moyer CA, Gupta Mira, Adongo PB, Williams J, Hadgson A, Allote P, Engmann CM. Obstetric danger signs and factors affecting health seeking behavior among the Kassena-Nankani of Northern Ghana: a qualitative study. *Afr J Reprod Health.* 2014;**18**:78-86.
  34. Matsuyama A, Moji K. Perception of bleeding as a danger sign during pregnancy, delivery and the postpartum period in rural Nepal. *Qualitative Health Research.* 2008;**18**:196-208