TYPE Original Research
PUBLISHED 27 September 2022
DOI 10.3389/fpubh.2022.949943



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

Alexandra P. Leader, Eastern Virginia Medical School, United States

REVIEWED BY

Yitagesu Sintayehu, Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia Subrata Kumar Palo, Regional Medical Research Center (ICMR), India

*CORRESPONDENCE Teshale Mulatu woyesag@gmail.com

SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to Public Health Policy, a section of the journal Frontiers in Public Health

RECEIVED 21 May 2022 ACCEPTED 09 September 2022 PUBLISHED 27 September 2022

CITATION

Mengistie T, Mulatu T, Alemayehu A, Yadeta TA and Dheresa M (2022) Respectful maternity care among women who gave birth at public hospitals in Hadiya Zone, Southern Ethiopia

Front. Public Health 10:949943. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.949943

COPYRIGHT

© 2022 Mengistie, Mulatu, Alemayehu, Yadeta and Dheresa. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Respectful maternity care among women who gave birth at public hospitals in Hadiya Zone, Southern Ethiopia

Tilahun Mengistie¹, Teshale Mulatu²*, Afework Alemayehu², Tesfaye Assebe Yadeta² and Merga Dheresa²

¹Department of Midwifery, Wochamo University College of Health Science, Hossana, Ethiopia, ²School of Nursing and Midwifery, College of Health and Medical Science, Haramaya University, Harar, Ethiopia

Background: A compassionate and respectful care during pregnancy and childbirth is one of the essential components of safe motherhood. However, most of the women in developing countries experience disrespectful and abusive maternity care during childbirth. Hence, this study assessed the status of respectful maternity care and associated factors to bridge the gap.

Methodology: Facility-based cross-sectional study was conducted among mothers who delivered in public Hospitals in the Hadiya Zone, South Ethiopia from March 01 to 30, 2020. Data were collected using a pretested questionnaire through face-to-face interviews. Descriptive statistics was computed and multivariable logistic regression was fitted to identify predictors. Adjusted Odds Ratio (AOR) with 95% Confidence Interval was used to show the strength of association and level of significance was declared at *P*-value < 0.05.

Result: This study showed that 67.8 % (95% CI: 62.4–70.8%) of mothers received respectful maternal care. Being married [AOR: 2.17, 95% CI (1.03-6.93)], Cesarean section delivery [AOR: 2.48, 95% CI (1.03-5.97)], and absence of complications during child birth [AOR: 4.37, 95% CI (1.41-13.56)], were significantly associated with respectful maternity care.

Conclusions: The level of RMC in this study was moderate. Being married, Cesarean section delivery, and absence of complications during child birth were identified predictors of respectful maternity care. Therefore, tailored interventions aimed at improving respectful maternity care should target unmarried women, and women with complications of labor regardless of mode of delivery.

KEYWORDS

respectful maternity care, childbirth, public hospitals, Hadiya Zone, Southern Ethiopia

Background

Pregnancy and childbirth are critical events in the reproductive life of women and denote a period of high susceptibility. Thus, compassionate and respectful care should be given for all pregnant women during labor and child birth to promote safe motherhood. Respectful maternity care refers to harmonized care given to all women to the highest possible standard and safeguards them from harm and mistreatment during labor and childbirth (1, 2).

Globally, averting maternal mortality has remained unfinished agenda of sustainable development goals (SDG) (3, 4). Despite the tremendous effort to reduce maternal mortality, the rate is still as high as 239 per 100,000 live births in low-income countries. Furthermore, MMR in Ethiopia is still 412/per 100,000 live births. This figure is very far from the target under the SDG by 2030, which is <70/100,000 (5). Even though skilled birth attendance (SBA) prevents a toll of maternal death, about 75% of mothers do not deliver in health institution in developing countries (5, 6).

Disrespectful and abusive maternity care is one of the main reasons for not utilizing maternal health services. Mistreatment and humiliation during labor and delivery can hinder women from accessing maternal health care for subsequent deliveries (7-8)

Despite the negative effect of disrespectful and abusive care on the use of skilled birth care, there is currently no international consensus on how disrespect and abuse should be scientifically defined and measured (9, 10). In the perspective of this gap, Bowser and Hill identified seven categories of traits that describe disrespectful and abusive care during facility based child birth. The categories are physical abuse, non-consented care, non-confidential care, non-dignified care, discrimination, abandonment/neglect of care, and detention in facilities until hospital bills are paid (11).

Studies in Ethiopia portrayed the prevalence of disrespectful and abusive care ranging from 21.1 to 98.9% and the pooled prevalence found to be 49.4% (12–14), which are unacceptably high levels of obstetric violence and mistreatment.

The Ethiopian government in its 5-year health sector transformation plan tailored compassionate and respectful maternity care incorporating it in maternal health services packages (15). Although such investment was in place to alleviate this burning problem, their implementation in the national context is not promising.

Abbreviations: ANC, Antenatal Care; AOR, Adjusted Odds Ratio; CI, Confidence interval; D&A, Disrespect and Abuse; RMC, Respectful Maternity Care; MMR, Maternal Mortality Rate; SDG, Sustainable Development Goal; SBA, Skilled Birth Attendant.

TABLE 1 Sociodemographic characteristics on respectful maternity care among mothers who gave birth at Hadiya Zone public hospitals Southern Ethiopia, 2020 (n = 451).

Variables	Category	Frequency (%)
Maternal age	15-19	36 (7.9)
	20-24	142 (31.2)
	25-29	178 (39.1)
	30-35	76 (16.9)
	>35	19 (4.2)
Residence	Urban	214 (47.9%)
	Rural	237 (52.1%)
Marital status	Single	28 (6.2)
	Married	398 (88.2)
	*Others	25 (4.5)
Religion	Protestant	319 (70.7)
	Orthodox	91 (20.2)
	Muslim	35 (7.8)
	**Others	6 (1.3)
Ethnicity	Hadiya	280 (62.1)
	Kambata	88 (19.5%)
	Siltie	26 (5.8 %)
	Gurage	36 (8%)
	***Others	21 (4.6%)
Educational status	No formal education	103 (22.8%)
	Primary education	159 (35.3%)
	Secondary education	81 (18%)
	College and above	108 (23.9%)
Occupation	House wife	203 (45.01%)
	Government employee	100 (22.2%
	Private employee	68 (15.1%)
	Merchant	58 (12.8%)
	****Others	22 (4.8%)
Average monthly income	<2,000 birr	152 (33.6)
	2,001-3,000 birr	130 (29.2)
	3,001-4,000	113 (24.8)
	4,001-5,000	34 (7.5)
	>5,000 birr	22 (4.8)

Others = *divorced, widowed, **catholic, pagans, etc., ***Amhara, Oromo, Tigre etc., ****daily laborer, housemaid etc.

Assessment of respectful maternity care during facility-based childbirth is necessary for the design, monitoring, and evaluation of interventions to promote respectful care during childbirth, especially in low-resource settings. In Ethiopia, few studies were conducted and evidences on the status of respectful maternity care and associated factors is limited. Therefore, this study assessed the status of respectful maternity care and associated factors in public Hospitals, in Hadiya Zone, Southern Ethiopia.

TABLE 2 Provider related and obstetric characteristics of the respondents among mothers who gave birth at Hadiya Zone public hospitals Southern Ethiopia, 2020 (n = 451).

Variables	Category	Frequency (%)	
ANC follow up	Yes	439 (97.3%	
	No	12 (2.7)	
ANC visits	<2 times	144 (32.1%)	
	2-4 time	253 (56.1%)	
	>4 times	54 (11.9%	
Parity	Only one	216 (47.8%)	
	Two	153 (33.9%)	
	Three	51 (11.3%)	
	Four and above	31 (6.8%)	
The profession of HCP	Midwife	347 (76.9%)	
	Doctor	80 (17.7%)	
	Others	24 (5.3%)	
Sex of health care provider	Female	108 (23.9%)	
	Male	343 (76.1%)	

ANC, Antenatal care; HCP, Health care provider.

Methods and materials

Study area and period

The study was conducted at public hospitals in the Hadiya Zone, Southern Ethiopia. The zone has one teaching and referral hospital, two primary hospitals, 72 public health centers, 311 health posts, and 142 private clinics (16). The study was conducted from March 01 to 30/2020.

Study design and population

A hospital based cross-sectional study was conducted among all mothers who gave birth in Hadiya Zone Public Hospitals during the study period. Seriously ill women who were unable to respond and who were referred from other health facilities after the second stage of labor were excluded from the study.

Sample size and sampling procedure

The sample size was determined by using the double population proportion formula considering factors that are significantly associated with the outcome variable at (p < 0.05), a two-sided confidence level of 95%, a margin of error of 5%, power of 80%, and the ratio of exposed to unexposed 1:1 using Epi-calc statistical software. Taking the average monthly income as an exposure variable: outcome among exposed (79.6%) and among unexposed (67%) (17), and adding a 10% non-response rate the final sample size was 460.

All public hospitals were included in the study. Sample size was allocated to each hospital proportionally by considering the average number of attendants. A systematic random sampling was applied to select study participants using delivery registration logbook as a sampling frame.

Data collection tool and procedure

A pre tested and structured questionnaires were prepared by reviewing literatures pertinent to the topic (7, 18-20). The tool contains socio demographic characteristics, obstetric characteristics of the participants and categories of RMC that women will get during facility based child birth. The status of RMC was measured using a validated tool for assessing RMC which was adapted from the Maternal and Child Health Integrated Program (18). Data were collected through an exit interview during discharge. Each eligible woman was approached privately in a separate room within the hospital environment. The data were collected by eight health professionals working outside the study Hospitals. A 2-day training was given to both the data collectors and the supervisors regarding the objective of the study, data collection tools, and ways of data collection. The collected data was checked by supervisors for its completeness and consistency daily.

Data processing and analysis

Data were entered into the computer using Epi-data version 4.2 and exported to SPSS version 23 for analysis. Bi-variable analysis was carried out to see the association of each of the independent variables with the outcome variable (Respectful maternity care). Hosmer and Lemeshow's goodness-of-fit test was used to assess whether the necessary assumptions were fulfilled. All variables with a p-value ≤ 0.2 were taken into the multivariable model to control for all possible confounders. Finally, the results of multivariable logistic regression analysis were presented in the adjusted odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals. The level of statistical significance was declared at p-value < 0.05.

Measurements

In this study, women were considered to have respectful maternity care during labor and childbirth if they answered yes to all of those questions assessing RMC or verification criteria used for assessing the seven categories (performance standards) of RMC during labor and childbirth (19–22).

Women were considered as experienced disrespect and abuse if they answered no to one or more of those questions

TABLE 3 Respectful maternity care categories among mothers who gave birth at Hadiya Zone public hospitals, Southern Ethiopia, 2020 (n = 451).

	RMC		
Categories	Yes (%)	No (%)	
Abuse free care			
Never used physical force/abrasive behavior with the woman	409 (80.6%)	42 (19.4%)	
Never physically restrains woman	424 (82.1%)	27 (17.9%)	
Never separates woman from her baby unless	430 (85.3%)	21 (14.7%)	
Provides comfort/pain-relief as necessary	397 (88.3%)	54 (11.7%)	
Does not deny food or fluid to women in labor	430 (85.3%)	21 (14.7%)	
Total	82.6%	17.4%	
Confidential care			
Never discussed private information in a way that others could hear	364 (70.7%)	87 (29.3%)	
Used drapes/covering/screen appropriately to protect woman's privacy	341 (65.6%)	110 (34.4%)	
not to be seen by other people (apart from health providers) during			
delivery			
Total	58.1%	41.9%	
Informed consent			
Great and introduces self to woman and companion	327 (62.5%)	124 (37.5%)	
Encourage the women and companion to ask questions	329 (62.9%)	122 (37.1%)	
Respond the women's question with politeness and truthfulness	366 (71.2%)	85 (28.8%)	
The provider explains what was being done and what to expect	340 (55.4%)	111 (44.6%)	
throughout labor and delivery			
the provider gives periodic updates on status and progress of labor	351 (67.8%)	100 (32.2%)	
The provider allows the women to choose birth position as she wants	347 (66.9%)	104 (33.1%)	
The provider obtains permission/consent prior to any procedure	349 (67.4%)	102 (32.6%)	
Total	56.3%	43.7%	
Dignified care			
The health care provider speaks politely to woman and her companion	401 (68.9%)	50 (31.1%)	
Allows woman and her companion to observe cultural practices as	417 (72.5%)	34 (27.5%)	
much as possible			
Never makes insults, intimidation, threats, shouted at, scolded,	425 (84.2%)	26 (15.8%)	
laughed, scorned or coerces woman or her companion			
Total	75.2%	24.8%	
Abandonment-free care			
The health care provider never ignored or abandoned the woman	416 (72.2%)	35 (27.8%)	
when she called for help			
The provider never leaves woman alone or unattended during on the	434 (76.2%)	17 (23.8%)	
delivery couch			
Total	74.2%	25.8%	
Free of discrimination			
Speaks to the woman in a language and at a language-level that she	432 (78%)	19 (22%)	
understands			
The health care provider didn't discriminate the women based on any	414 (74%)	27 (26%)	
specific attribute			
Total	76%	24%	
Never detained or confined against her will			
Facility doesn't have a policy to detain women who don't pay.	434 (86.2%)	17 (13.8%)	
The women don't been forced to stay against their will	420 (75.3%)	31 (24.7%)	
Total	80.7%	19.3%	
Overall self-reported respectful maternity care	Yes (67.8%)	No (32.2%)	

assessing RMC or verification criteria used for assessing the seven categories of RMC (18, 23, 24).

Results

Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents

A total of 451 mothers participated in the study; which yields a response rate of 98.04%. Among mothers, 178 (39.1%) of the study participants were within the age group of 25–29 years. The mean age of the mothers was 28.6 (SD \pm 4.04) years.

Concerning their marital status and residency, 398 (88.2) of them were married and 237 (52.1%) of the respondents were from urban. Of the total 159 (35.3%) of them attended primary education and 203 (45%) are housewives (Table 1).

Obstetric characteristics of respondents

Of the total respondents, 439 (97.3.0%) had antenatal care follow up and 234 (51.4%) had two or more ANC visits. Regarding the gravidity of participants, 216 (47.5%) were multigravida. More than half 240 (53.2%) gave birth vaginally while 41 (14.4%) gave birth by caesarian section (Table 2).

Status of respectful maternity care

Overall, 67.8% (95%; CI: 62.4, 70.8%) of the women received respectful maternity care. Out of all participants, 41.9% didn't receive confidential care and 43.7% complained that HCPs (health care providers) did not take informed consent before any procedure (Table 3).

Factors associated with respectful maternity care

The bivariable analysis result showed that marital status, educational status, parity, the profession of health care provider, sex of health care provider, mode of delivery, birth outcome, length of hospital stay, complications during labor, and delivery were significantly associated with respectful maternity care. After adjusting for other variables; marital status, mode of delivery, and complications during labor and delivery remained significantly associated with respectful maternity care in multivariable logistic regression.

Married women were two times more likely to obtain respectful maternity care than single women [AOR: 2.17 (1.03–6.93)]. The odds of respectful maternity care were 2.48 times higher among mothers who delivered by cesarean section

compared to those who gave birth by spontaneous vaginal delivery [AOR: 2.485, 95%CI (1.03, 5.97)]. The odds of respectful maternity care were four times higher among those women who did not face complications during childbirth as compared to their counterparts [AOR: 4.37, 95% CI (1.41–13.56)] (Table 4).

Discussion

A compassionate and respectful care during pregnancy and childbirth is one of the essential components of safe motherhood. In this study, the overall magnitude of respectful maternity care during labor and childbirth was 67.8 % (95% CI: 62.4–70.8%). On the other hand, about one-third of women (32.2%) reported disrespect and abusive (D&A) care during labor and childbirth which was unacceptably high.

The magnitude of RMC in this study is by far higher than the study conducted in Addis Ababa (21%) (20), Harar (38.4%) (21), West Shewa, Oromia region (35.8%) (22), and the study conducted in public Hospitals of Benishangul Gumuz Region, Ethiopia (12.6%) (23). However, this study finding is lower than the study finding from Tanzania (85%) (24) and Kenya (80%) (25). The difference could be due to study setting differences, methodological variation, participants' educational and socio-economic status, service quality, and the ability of participants to report disrespect and abusive care.

This study revealed that married women were two times more likely to receive respectful maternity care compared to those who are not in a marital union. This finding may be a result of companion, which indicates that providers are more likely to be cautious about how they act and speak to a client when a companion of the client is present. This finding is also supported by many other studies (17, 23, 25–27).

Furthermore, participants who gave birth by cesarean section were 2.48 times more likely to receive respectful maternity care compared to participants who gave birth by spontaneous vaginal delivery. The result is in contrast with the study done in Bahirdar, Northwest Ethiopia, and Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (17, 28). This could be justified by study setting differences, case flows, staff workload, and attitude of health care providers.

Unexpectedly, women who didn't face complications during childbirth were about four times to receive RMC as compared to those who faced complications during birth. This is aligned with other studies conducted in Ethiopia (17, 21, 28). This might be because those mothers who develop complications are admitted and stayed for an extended time and they might perceive poor quality of care provided by health professionals during their stay.

TABLE 4 Factors associated with respectful maternity care among mothers who gave birth at public hospitals of Hadiya Zone, southern, Ethiopia 2020 (n = 451).

Monthly income	Variable	Category	Respectful maternity care		COR (95% CI)	AOR (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -value
2,001-3,000			No	Yes			
	Monthly income	<2,000	44 (28.8%)	109 (71.2%)	1	1	1
A 001 - 5.000		2,001-3,000	48 (36.4%)	84 (63.6%)	0.706 (0.43-1.16)	0.560 (0.265-1.181)	0.914
Marital status		3,001-4,000	41 (36.3%)	72 (63.7%)	0.709 (0.422-1.191)	0.553 (0.241-1.271)	0.128
Marital status Single Married 9 (32.1%) 19 (67.9%) 1 1 1 Married Orbers 124 (31.3%) 272 (68.7%) 1.526 (1.164, 2.577) 2.17 (1.031-6.933)* Colhers 15 (60%) 10 (40%) 0.351 (0.116-1.052) 0.580 (0.154-2.180) Residence Burlan 68 (37.4%) 147 (62.6%) 1.361 (0.92-2.03) 2.23 (0.96-4.32) Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 43 (71.7%) 1.763 (1.02-3.04) 0.98 (0.39-2.465) Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 43 (71.7%) 1.763 (1.02-3.04) 0.98 (0.39-2.465) Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 43 (71.7%) 1.763 (1.02-3.04) 0.98 (0.39-2.455) Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 43 (71.7%) 1.763 (1.02-3.04) 0.98 (0.39-2.455) Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 43 (51.4%) 1.427 (0.73-279) 1.25 (0.55-4.35) Amount of College 32 (24.2%) 10 (75.9%) 1.427 (0.73-279) 0.615 (0.07-5.39) Amount of College 12 (1.23.3%) 12 (3		4,001-5,000	8 (24.2%)	25 (75.8%)	1.261 (0.529-3.01)	0.553 (0.241-1.271)	0.463
Married 124 (31.3%) 272 (68.7%) 1.526 (1.164, 2.577) 2.17 (1.031-6.933)*		>5,000	7 (38.9%)	11 (61.1%)	0.634 (0.23-1.74)	0.691 (0.161-2.964)	0.235
Residence Rural 60 (28%) 10 (40%) 0.351 (0.116-1.062) 0.580 (0.154-2.180) Residence Rural 60 (28%) 154 (72%) 1 1 Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 147 (62.6%) 1.361 (0.92-2.03) 2.23 (0.96-4.32) Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 43 (71.7%) 1.763 (1.02-3.04) 0.98 (0.39-2.465) Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 43 (71.7%) 0.821 (0.461-1.461) 0.53 (0.28-1.357) Educational status Primary 17 (8.3%) 100 (75.8%) 0.821 (0.461-1.461) 0.53 (0.28-1.357) Educational status Primary 17 (8.3%) 5 (41.7%) 1.427 (0.73-2.795) 1.52 (0.53-4.35) ANC visit No 7 (58.3%) 5 (41.7%) 1 1 1 Primary 60 19 (1) 63 (41.7%) 88 (58.3%) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Marital status	Single	9 (32.1%)	19 (67.9%)	1	1	
Residence Rural 60 (28%) 154 (72%) 1 1 Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 43 (71.7%) 1.763 (1.02-3.04) 0.98 (0.39-2.465) Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 43 (71.7%) 1.763 (1.02-3.04) 0.98 (0.39-2.465) Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 43 (71.7%) 1.763 (1.02-3.04) 0.98 (0.39-2.465) Educational status Primary 17 (28.3%) 48 (59.3%) 0.821 (0.461-1.461) 0.53 (0.208-1.357) Educational status No 7 (58.3%) 100 (75.8%) 1.427 (0.73-2.795) 1.20 (5.54-4.35) ANC visit No 7 (58.3%) 5 (41.7%) 1 1 1 ANC visit No 7 (53.3%) 5 (41.7%) 2.939 (0.917-9.423) 0.615 (0.07-5.39) Parity Only 1 63 (41.7%) 88 (58.3%) 1 1 1 2 51 (23.6%) 165 (76.4%) 2.316 (1.47-3.63) 1.005 (0.459-2.203) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <td></td> <td>Married</td> <td>124 (31.3%)</td> <td>272 (68.7%)</td> <td>1.526 (1.164, 2.577)</td> <td>2.17 (1.031-6.933)*</td> <td>0.001</td>		Married	124 (31.3%)	272 (68.7%)	1.526 (1.164, 2.577)	2.17 (1.031-6.933)*	0.001
Educational status		*Others	15 (60%)	10 (40%)	0.351 (0.116-1.062)	0.580 (0.154-2.180)	0.081
Educational status Primary Secondary (33 (40.7%)) 43 (71.7%) 1.763 (1.02-3.04) 0.98 (0.39-2.465) Ecollege Secondary (20.1%) 33 (40.7%) 48 (59.3%) 0.821 (0.461-1.461) 0.53 (0.208-1.357) ANC visit No (768.3%) 5 (41.7%) 1.427 (0.73-2.795) 1.52 (0.53-4.35) ANC visit No (768.3%) 5 (41.7%) 1 1 Parity Only 1 63 (41.7%) 88 (58.3%) 1 1 1 Parity Only 1 63 (41.7%) 88 (58.3%) 1.206 (0.63-2.317) 0.61 (0.22-1.69) Parity Only 1 63 (41.7%) 32 (62.7%) 1.206 (0.63-2.317) 0.61 (0.22-1.69) 4 11 (50%) 11 (50%) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.1	Residence	Rural	60 (28%)	154 (72%)	1	1	1
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Urban	88 (37.4%)	147 (62.6%	1.361 (0.92-2.03)	2.23 (0.96-4.32)	0.136
Secollege 32 (24.2%) 100 (75.8%) 1.427 (0.73-2.795) 1.52 (0.53-4.35) ANC visit No 7 (58.3%) 5 (41.7%) 1 1 Yes 141 (32.3%) 296 (67.7%) 2.939 (0.917-9.423) 0.615 (0.07-5.39) Parity Only 1 63 (41.7%) 88 (58.3%) 1 1 2 51 (23.6%) 165 (76.4%) 2.316 (1.47-3.63) 1.005 (0.459-2.203) 3 19 (37.3%) 32 (62.7%) 1.206 (0.63-2.317) 0.61 (0.22-1.69) 4 11 (50%) 11 (50%) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) 2 5 4 (44.4%) 5 (55.6%) 0.895 (0.23-3.466) 0.86 (0.09-8.137) Profession of provider Doctors 35 (43.8%) 45 (56.2%) 1 1 1 Midwives 102 (29.5%) 245 (70.6%) 1.861 (1.13-3.06) 0.576 (0.22-1.48) **Others 11 (64.7%) 13 (67.3%) 0.848 (0.335-2.15) 0.31 (0.069-1.411) Sex of HCP Female 48 (44.4%) 60 (55.6%) 1 1 1 Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 1 Cesarean 51 (59.3%) 35 (40.7%) 4.59 (2.80-7.54) 2.48 (1.03-5.97)* Instrumental 13 (43.3%) 17 (56.7%) 1.98 (0.856-4.58) 2.262 (0.24-21.33) Birth outcome Alive 120 (29.5%) 242 (73.3%) 1 1 1 Dead 28 (66.7%) 14 (33.3%) 4.783 (2.43-9.40) 2.472 (0.757-8.067) Stay at HF -12	Educational status	Primary	17 (28.3%)	43 (71.7%)	1.763 (1.02-3.04)	0.98 (0.39-2.465)	0.079
ANC visit		Secondary	33 (40.7%)	48 (59.3%)	0.821 (0.461-1.461)	0.53 (0.208-1.357)	0.551
Parity Yes 141 (32.3%) 296 (67.7%) 2.939 (0.917-9.423) 0.615 (0.07-5.39) Parity Only 1 63 (41.7%) 88 (58.3%) 1 1 2 51 (23.6%) 165 (76.4%) 2.316 (1.47-3.63) 1.005 (0.459-2.203) 3 19 (37.3%) 32 (62.7%) 1.206 (0.63-2.317) 0.61 (0.22-1.69) 4 11 (50%) 11 (50%) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) ≥5 4 (44.4%) 5 (55.6%) 0.895 (0.23-3.466) 0.86 (0.09-8.137) Profession of provider Doctors 35 (43.8%) 45 (56.2%) 1 1 1 Midwives 102 (29.5%) 245 (70.6%) 1.861 (1.13-3.06) 0.576 (0.22-1.48) 1 1 1 Sex of HCP Female 48 (44.4%) 60 (55.6%) 1<		≥College	32 (24.2%)	100 (75.8%)	1.427 (0.73-2.795)	1.52 (0.53-4.35)	0.283
Parity Only 1 63 (41.7%) 88 (58.3%) 1 1 2 51 (23.6%) 165 (76.4%) 2.316 (1.47-3.63) 1.005 (0.459-2.203) 3 19 (37.3%) 32 (62.7%) 1.206 (0.63-2.317) 0.61 (0.22-1.69) 4 11 (50%) 11 (50%) 0.716 (0.29-1.75) 0.79 (0.199-3.14) ≥5 4 (44.4%) 5 (55.6%) 0.895 (0.23-3.466) 0.86 (0.09-8.137) Profession of provider Doctors 35 (43.8%) 45 (56.2%) 1 1 Midwives 102 (29.5%) 245 (70.6%) 1.861 (1.13-3.06) 0.576 (0.22-1.48) **Others 11 (64.7%) 13 (67.3%) 0.848 (0.335-2.15) 0.31 (0.069-1.411) Sex of HCP Female 48 (44.4%) 60 (55.6%) 1 1 1 Male 100 (29.5%) 241 (70.7%) 1.93 (1.235-3.01) 0.768 (0.328-1.802) 1 1 1 Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ANC visit	No	7 (58.3%)	5 (41.7%)	1	1	1
Profession of provider		Yes	141 (32.3%)	296 (67.7%)	2.939 (0.917-9.423)	0.615 (0.07-5.39)	0.792
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Parity	Only 1	63 (41.7%)	88 (58.3%)	1	1	1
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		2	51 (23.6%)	165 (76.4%)	2.316 (1.47-3.63)	1.005 (0.459-2.203)	0.059
		3	19 (37.3%)	32 (62.7%)	1.206 (0.63-2.317)	0.61 (0.22-1.69)	0.642
Profession of provider Doctors 35 (43.8%) 45 (56.2%) 1 1 Midwives 102 (29.5%) 245 (70.6%) 1.861 (1.13-3.06) 0.576 (0.22-1.48) **Others 11 (64.7%) 13 (67.3%) 0.848 (0.335-2.15) 0.31 (0.069-1.411) Sex of HCP Female 48 (44.4%) 60 (55.6%) 1 1 1 Male 100 (29.5%) 241 (70.7%) 1.93 (1.235-3.01) 0.768 (0.328-1.802) Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 1 Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 1 Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 1 Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 1 Type delivery Instrumental 13 (43.3%) 17 (56.7%) 1.98 (0.856-4.58) 2.262 (0.24-21.33) Birth outcome Alive 120 (29.5%) 287 (70.5%) 1 1 1 <t< td=""><td></td><td>4</td><td>11 (50%)</td><td>11 (50%)</td><td>0.716 (0.29-1.75)</td><td>0.79 (0.199-3.14)</td><td>0.188</td></t<>		4	11 (50%)	11 (50%)	0.716 (0.29-1.75)	0.79 (0.199-3.14)	0.188
Midwives 102 (29.5%) 245 (70.6%) 1.861 (1.13-3.06) 0.576 (0.22-1.48) **Others 11 (64.7%) 13 (67.3%) 0.848 (0.335-2.15) 0.31 (0.069-1.411) Sex of HCP Female 48 (44.4%) 60 (55.6%) 1 1 Male 100 (29.5%) 241 (70.7%) 1.93 (1.235-3.01) 0.768 (0.328-1.802) Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 Cesarean 51 (59.3%) 35 (40.7%) 4.59 (2.80-7.54) 2.48 (1.03-5.97)* Instrumental 13 (43.3%) 17 (56.7%) 1.98 (0.856-4.58) 2.262 (0.24-21.33) Birth outcome Alive 120 (29.5%) 287 (70.5%) 1 1 1 Dead 28 (66.7%) 14 (33.3%) 4.783 (2.43-9.40) 2.472 (0.757-8.067) 242 (73.3%) 1 1 1 Stay at HF <12 h		≥5	4 (44.4%)	5 (55.6%)	0.895 (0.23-3.466)	0.86 (0.09-8.137)	0.974
Sex of HCP **Others 11 (64.7%) 13 (67.3%) 0.848 (0.335-2.15) 0.31 (0.069-1.411) Sex of HCP Female 48 (44.4%) 60 (55.6%) 1 1 1 Male 100 (29.5%) 241 (70.7%) 1.93 (1.235-3.01) 0.768 (0.328-1.802) 0.768 (0.328-1.802) Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 1 Cesarean 51 (59.3%) 35 (40.7%) 4.59 (2.80-7.54) 2.48 (1.03-5.97)* 1	Profession of provider	Doctors	35 (43.8%)	45 (56.2%)	1	1	1
Sex of HCP Female 48 (44.4%) 60 (55.6%) 1 1 Male 100 (29.5%) 241 (70.7%) 1.93 (1.235-3.01) 0.768 (0.328-1.802) Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 Cesarean 51 (59.3%) 35 (40.7%) 4.59 (2.80-7.54) 2.48 (1.03-5.97)* Instrumental 13 (43.3%) 17 (56.7%) 1.98 (0.856-4.58) 2.262 (0.24-21.33) Birth outcome Alive 120 (29.5%) 287 (70.5%) 1 1 1 Dead 28 (66.7%) 14 (33.3%) 4.783 (2.43-9.40) 2.472 (0.757-8.067) Stay at HF <12 h 88 (26.7%) 242 (73.3%) 1 1 1 12-24 h 7 (38.9%) 11 (61.1%) 3.018 (1.85-4.92) 1.23 (0.494-3.076) 24 (2.27) 2.24 (2.27) 2.24 (2.27) 2.24 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27) 2.25 (2.27)		Midwives	102 (29.5%)	245 (70.6%)	1.861 (1.13-3.06)	0.576 (0.22-1.48)	0.153
Male 100 (29.5%) 241 (70.7%) 1.93 (1.235-3.01) 0.768 (0.328-1.802) Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 Cesarean 51 (59.3%) 35 (40.7%) 4.59 (2.80-7.54) 2.48 (1.03-5.97)* Instrumental 13 (43.3%) 17 (56.7%) 1.98 (0.856-4.58) 2.262 (0.24-21.33) Birth outcome Alive 120 (29.5%) 287 (70.5%) 1 1 Dead 28 (66.7%) 14 (33.3%) 4.783 (2.43-9.40) 2.472 (0.757-8.067) Stay at HF <12 h		**Others	11 (64.7%)	13 (67.3%)	0.848 (0.335-2.15)	0.31 (0.069-1.411)	0.861
Type delivery SVD 84 (25.2%) 249 (74.8%) 1 1 Cesarean 51 (59.3%) 35 (40.7%) 4.59 (2.80-7.54) 2.48 (1.03-5.97)* Instrumental 13 (43.3%) 17 (56.7%) 1.98 (0.856-4.58) 2.262 (0.24-21.33) Birth outcome Alive 120 (29.5%) 287 (70.5%) 1 1 Dead 28 (66.7%) 14 (33.3%) 4.783 (2.43-9.40) 2.472 (0.757-8.067) Stay at HF <12 h 88 (26.7%) 242 (73.3%) 1 1 1 12-24 h 7 (38.9%) 11 (61.1%) 3.018 (1.85-4.92) 1.23 (0.494-3.076) 24 h 8 (53.3%) 7 (46.7%) 1.725 (0.61-4.86) 2.005 (0.25-16.007) >2 days 45 (52.3%) 41 (47.7%) 0.960 (0.32-2.88) 0.60 (0.048-7.63) Delivery complication Yes 53 (43.4%) 69 (56.6%) 1	Sex of HCP	Female	48 (44.4%)	60 (55.6%)	1	1	1
Cesarean 51 (59.3%) 35 (40.7%) 4.59 (2.80-7.54) 2.48 (1.03-5.97)* Instrumental 13 (43.3%) 17 (56.7%) 1.98 (0.856-4.58) 2.262 (0.24-21.33) Birth outcome Alive 120 (29.5%) 287 (70.5%) 1 1 Dead 28 (66.7%) 14 (33.3%) 4.783 (2.43-9.40) 2.472 (0.757-8.067) Stay at HF <12 h		Male	100 (29.5%)	241 (70.7%)	1.93 (1.235-3.01)	0.768 (0.328-1.802)	0.439
Instrumental 13 (43.3%) 17 (56.7%) 1.98 (0.856-4.58) 2.262 (0.24-21.33)	Type delivery	SVD	84 (25.2%)	249 (74.8%)	1	1	1
Birth outcome Alive 120 (29.5%) 287 (70.5%) 1 1 1 Dead 28 (66.7%) 14 (33.3%) 4.783 (2.43-9.40) 2.472 (0.757-8.067) Stay at HF <12 h 88 (26.7%) 242 (73.3%) 1 1 12-24 h 7 (38.9%) 11 (61.1%) 3.018 (1.85-4.92) 1.23 (0.494-3.076) >24 h 8 (53.3%) 7 (46.7%) 1.725 (0.61-4.86) 2.005 (0.25-16.007) >2 days 45 (52.3%) 41 (47.7%) 0.960 (0.32-2.88) 0.60 (0.048-7.63) Delivery complication Yes 53 (43.4%) 69 (56.6%) 1		Cesarean	51 (59.3%)	35 (40.7%)	4.59 (2.80-7.54)	2.48 (1.03-5.97)*	0.004*
Dead 28 (66.7%) 14 (33.3%) 4.783 (2.43-9.40) 2.472 (0.757-8.067) Stay at HF <12 h		Instrumental	13 (43.3%)	17 (56.7%)	1.98 (0.856-4.58)	2.262 (0.24-21.33)	0.216
Stay at HF <12 h 88 (26.7%) 242 (73.3%) 1 1 1 12-24 h 7 (38.9%) 11 (61.1%) 3.018 (1.85-4.92) 1.23 (0.494-3.076) >24 h 8 (53.3%) 7 (46.7%) 1.725 (0.61-4.86) 2.005 (0.25-16.007) >2 days 45 (52.3%) 41 (47.7%) 0.960 (0.32-2.88) 0.60 (0.048-7.63) Delivery complication Yes 53 (43.4%) 69 (56.6%) 1	Birth outcome	Alive	120 (29.5%)	287 (70.5%)	1	1	1
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Dead	28 (66.7%)	14 (33.3%)	4.783 (2.43-9.40)	2.472 (0.757-8.067)	0.062
>24 h 8 (53.3%) 7 (46.7%) 1.725 (0.61-4.86) 2.005 (0.25-16.007) >2 days 45 (52.3%) 41 (47.7%) 0.960 (0.32-2.88) 0.60 (0.048-7.63) Delivery complication Yes 53 (43.4%) 69 (56.6%) 1	Stay at HF	<12 h	88 (26.7%)	242 (73.3%)	1	1	1
>2 days 45 (52.3%) 41 (47.7%) 0.960 (0.32-2.88) 0.60 (0.048-7.63) Delivery complication Yes 53 (43.4%) 69 (56.6%) 1		12-24 h	7 (38.9%)	11 (61.1%)	3.018 (1.85-4.92)	1.23 (0.494-3.076)	0.065
>2 days 45 (52.3%) 41 (47.7%) 0.960 (0.32-2.88) 0.60 (0.048-7.63) Delivery complication Yes 53 (43.4%) 69 (56.6%) 1		>24 h	8 (53.3%)	7 (46.7%)	1.725 (0.61-4.86)	2.005 (0.25-16.007)	0.403
Delivery complication Yes 53 (43.4%) 69 (56.6%) 1		>2 days	45 (52.3%)		0.960 (0.32-2.88)	0.60 (0.048-7.63)	0.891
No 95 (29 1%) 232 (70 0%) 1.876 (1.22-2.88) 4.27 (1.41.12.56)*	Delivery complication	Yes	53 (43.4%)	69 (56.6%)	1		1
110		No	95 (29.1%)	232 (70.9%)	1.876 (1.22-2.88)	4.37 (1.41-13.56)*	0.000*

Significant at $^*P < 0.05$, 1 = constant, CI, Confidence Interval; COR, Crude odds Ratio; AOR, Adjusted Odds Ratio; HCP, Health care provider; HF, Health facility; Others = * divorced, widowed, ** professionals like Nurses, Health officers.

Finally, as a limitation this study was based on self-report, hence it was not possible to validate claims made by respondents in the course of questionnaire administration. There might be the possibility of underestimating disrespect and abusive care within short duration of data collection period due to its sensitive nature. To minimize this bias, the data were collected in a private room within the hospital setup.

Conclusion

The level of respectful maternity care in this study was moderate in comparison with other studies in the country. But still, about one-third of women experienced disrespect and abusive care while they gave birth at a health facility. Therefore, concerned body and stakeholders should

devise strategies to avoid disrespect and abusive care during labor and childbirth. Furthermore, due emphasis should be given for improving RMC among unmarried women, and women with complications of labor regardless of mode of delivery.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Ethics statement

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by Institutional Health Research Ethics Review Committee (IHRERC) of the College of Health and Medical Sciences, Haramaya University. The patients/participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

Author contributions

TMe drafted the study. TY and MD monitored the study process. TMu and AA was involved in report writing and drafted the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

References

- 1. World Health Organization. The Prevention and Elimination of Disrespect and Abuse During Childbirth. (2014). Available online at: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/134588/1/WHO_RHR_14.23_eng.pdf (accessed January 3, 2015).
- 2. WHO. World Health Organization Recommendations: Intrapartum Care for a Positive Childbirth Experience. Geneva: World Health Organization (2018). Available online at: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/260178/9789241550215-eng.pdf (accessed June 25, 2018).
- 3. World Health Organization. Health in 2015: from MDGs, Millennium Development Goals to SDGs, Sustainable Development Goals. World Health Organization (2015). Available online at: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/200009
- 4. Magar V. Gender, health and the sustainable development goals. Bull World Health Organ. (2015) 93:743. doi: 10.2471/BLT.15.16 5027
- 5. Lee BX, Kjaerulf F, Turner S, Cohen L, Donnelly PD, Muggah R, et al. Transforming our world: implementing the 2030 agenda through sustainable development goal indicators. *J Public Health Policy*. (2016) 37:13–31. doi: 10.1057/s41271-016-0002-7
- 6. Central Statistical Agency (CSA), ICF. Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey 2016: Key Indicators Report. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; Rockville, MD: CSA and ICF (2016).
- 7. Miller S, Lalonde A. The global epidemic of abuse and disrespect during childbirth: history, evidence, interventions, and FIGOs mother- baby

Funding

This study was funded by Haramaya University. The funding organization has no role in designing the study, data collection, analysis, interpretation, protocol writing, and submission.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge the study participants, data collectors, supervisors, hospital administrators, and staff for their willingness, to give their time and information for this study.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

friendly birthing facilities initiative. Int J Gynecol Obstetr. (2015) 131:S49–52. doi: 10.1016/j.ijgo.2015.02.005

- 8. Kruk ME, Gage AD, Arsenault C, Jordan K, Leslie HH, Roder-DeWan S, et al. High-quality health systems in the Sustainable Development Goals era: time for a revolution. *Lancet Global Health*. (2018) 6:e1196–e252. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30386-3
- Warren C, Njuki R, Abuya T, Ndwiga C, Maingi G, Serwanga J, et al. Study protocol for promoting respectful maternity care initiative to assess, measure and design interventions to reduce disrespect and abuse during childbirth in Kenya. BMC Preg Childbirth. (2013) 13:1–9. doi: 10.1186/1471-2393-13-21
- 10. Silal SP, Penn-Kekana L, Harris B, Birch S, McIntyre D. Exploring inequalities in access to and use of maternal health services in South Africa. *BMC Health Serv Res.* (2011) 120:12. doi: 10.1186/1472-696-12-120
- 11. Bowser D, Hill K. Exploring Evidence for Disrespect and Abuse in Facility-Based Childbirth: Report of a Landscape Analysis. (2010). Available online at: http://www.mhtf.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/17/2013/02/Respectful_Care_at_Birth_9-20-101_Final.pdf (accessed March 10, 2014).
- 12. Banks AMK, Ratcliffe HL, Betemariam W. A Langer Jeopardizing quality at the frontline of healthcare: prevalence and risk factors for disrespect and abuse during facility-based childbirth in Ethiopia. *Health Policy Plan.* (2018) 33:317–27. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czx180
- 13. Ukke GG, Gurara MK, Boynito WG. Disrespect and abuse of women during childbirth in public health facilities in Arba Minch town, south Ethiopia–a cross-sectional study. *PLoS ONE*. (2019) 14:e0205545. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0205545

14. Kassa ZY, Husen S. Disrespectful and abusive behavior during childbirth and maternity care in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Res Notes.* (2019) 12:83. doi: 10.1186/s13104-019-4118-2

- 15. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Ministry of Health. *Ethiopian National Health Quality Strategy: Transforming Quality of Health Care in Ethiopia*, 2016–2020. Addis Ababa: Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Ministry of Health (2016).
- 16. Hadiya Zone Demographic and Health Division Annual Report, Hadiya Zone, Southern Ethiopia. GA UN, Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable (2018).
- 17. Kitaw M, Tessema M. Respectful maternity care and associated factors among mothers in the immediate post partum period, in public health facilities of Addis Ababa. *Int J Pregnancy Child Birth.* (2019) 5:10–7. doi: 10.15406/ipcb.2019.05.00140
- 18. Reis V, Deller B, Carr C, Smith J. Respectful Maternity Care: Country Experiences: Survey Report. Washington, DC: United States Agency for International Development (2012).
- 19. Warren CAT, Obare F, Sunday J, Njue R, Askew I, Bellows B. Evaluation of the impact of the voucher and accreditation approach on improving reproductive health behaviors and status in Kenya. *BMC Public Health.* (2011) 11:177. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-11-177
- 20. Asefa A, Bekele D. Morgan Aea. Service providers' experiences of disrespectful and abusive behavior towards women during facility based childbirth in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Reprod Health*. (2018) 15:4. doi: 10.1186/s12978-017-0449-4
- 21. Bante A, Teji K, Seyoum B, Mersha A. Respectful maternity care and associated factors among women who delivered at Harar hospitals, eastern Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Preg Childbirth*. (2020) 20:1–9. doi: 10.2147/IMDH.5286458

- 22. Bulto GA, Demissie DB, Tulu AS. Respectful maternity care during labor and childbirth and associated factors among women who gave birth at health institutions in the West Shewa zone, Oromia region, Central Ethiopia. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* (2020) 20:443. doi: 10.1186/s12884-020-03135-z
- 23. Amsalu B, Aragaw A, Sintayehu Y, Sema A, Belay Y, Tadese G, et al. Respectful maternity care among laboring women in public hospitals of Benishangul Gumuz Region, Ethiopia: a mixed cross-sectional study with direct observations. SAGE Open Med. (2022) 10:20503121221076995. doi: 10.1177/20503121221076995
- 24. Sando D, Ratcliffe H, McDonald K, Spiegelman D, Lyatuu G, Mwanyika-Sando M, et al. The prevalence of disrespect and abuse during facility-based childbirth in urban Tanzania. *BMC Preg Childbirth*. (2016) 16:236. doi: 10.1186/s12884-016-1019-4
- 25. Abuya T, Warren CE, Miller N, Njuki R, Ndwiga C, Maranga A, et al. Exploring the prevalence of disrespect and abuse during childbirth in Kenya. *PLoS ONE*. 10:e0123606. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.01 23606
- 26. Tekle Bobo F, Kebebe Kasaye H, Etana B, Woldie M, Feyissa TR. Disrespect and abuse during childbirth in Western Ethiopia: should women continue to tolerate? *PLoS ONE*. 14:e0217126. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.02
- 27. Gebremichael MW, Worku A, Medhanyie AA, Berhane Y. Mothers' experience of disrespect and abuse during maternity care in northern Ethiopia. *Glob Health Action*. (2018) 11:1465215. doi: 10.1080/16549716.2018.14 65215
- 28. Wassihun B, Zeleke S. Compassionate and respectful maternity care during facility based child birth and women's intent to use maternity service in Bahir Dar, Ethiopia. *BMC Preg Childbirth*. (2018) 18:294. doi: 10.1186/s12884-018-1909-8