

Long Acting Reversible Contraceptive Methods Switching and Associated Factors Among Women Attending Family Planning Clinic at Public Health Facilities of Dilla Town, Southern Ethiopia

Woiynshet Kelbore^a*, Nuria Yesuf^b, Genet Alto^c

^{a,c}Arbaminch University, College Of Medicine and Health Sciences, Department of Nursing Postal Adress: 21 Arba Minch Ethiopia

^bDilla University, College Of Medicine And Health Sciences, Department Of Midwifery

^aEmail: woiynshetg@gmail.com, ^bEmail: nuriadelil61@gmail.com, ^cEmail: genet.Shalom@gmail.com

Abstract

When a switch is made to another contraceptive method, there is often a period of time between the switch when a person is at risk for unprotected intercourse. Choice of a less effective method increases the risk of an unplanned pregnancy, as does using a method incorrectly or inconsistently. Hence, the purpose of this study was to determine the magnitude of long acting reversible contraceptive method switching and associated factors among reproductive age women attending family planning clinic at public health facilities of Dilla town Southern Ethiopia 2019. An institution-based cross-sectional study was conducted among 381 reproductive age women attending public health facilities of Dilla town from March 1-29, 2019. A structured intervieweradministered questionnaire was used. Bivariable and multivariable analyses were carried out using binary logistic regression to assess the association between explanatory variables and Switching from long acting reversible contraceptive methods to short acting contraceptive methods. Statistical significance was declared at p-value < 0.05. Overall, the magnitude of long acting reversible contraceptive method switching was 27.6% (CI): 0.253, 0.298). Having primary education [adjusted odds ratio (AOR): 3.652, 95% CI: 1.412, 9.443], being unmarried [AOR: 12.019; 95% CI; 4.250, 33.993], having plan to space birth [AOR: 0.197; 95% CI; 0.076, 0.511], partner opposition [AOR: 3.071, 95% CI: 1.297,7.268], having age 20 and above at first pregnancy [AOR: 0.401, 95% CI: 0.217,0.740], were significantly associated with long acting reversible contraceptive method switching.

^{*} Corresponding author.

Switching from long-acting reversible contraceptive methods to short acting methods was high in the study area. Thus, empowering women and involving partner in family planning service are invaluable to addressee the problem.

Key word: Contraceptive; Switching; Reproductive Age; Dilla town; public health facility.

1. Introduction

Contraceptive switching refers to the case where a person changes his or her major method of birth control [1].Contraceptive switching behavior is analyzed by examining the user's new contraceptive use status in the month following discontinuation in conjunction with information on the reason for discontinuation. Therefore, the new contraceptive status of a woman in the month following discontinuation is classified into one of four categories: no longer needs contraception, using another modern method of contraception (switching between modern methods), using another traditional method of contraception (switching to traditional method) and not using any contraception [2]. Long acting contraceptives which designed to use for 3-12 year are cost effective only when they serve for the intended period of time. Along with their health impact the economic impact of Early discontinuation of long acting contraceptives and switching to other contraceptive method are very high [8]. Switching between contraceptive methods will have an effect on the level of fertility depending on the timing of adopting the destination method and whether the switching was to a more effective or to a less effective method. Also, the risk of getting pregnant while using a contraceptive method is determined by the effectiveness of the method and is also due to incorrect use of the method [9]. Not all women who discontinue a contraceptive method become nonusers; some switch to another, more (or less) effective method (10). When people switch from long acting method of contraception to short acting, there is often a period of time during which they are at risk of an unplanned pregnancy, because they are still learning how to use the new method accurately and consistently [1]. Pregnancy and childbirth poses a risk to the life of the woman. Repeated pregnancies and child birth restrict women from education, employment and productivity resulting in poor status of women in the community with the resultant poor living standard. Increased family size leads to income and resource sharing. Repeated and too many pregnancies entail early weaning with the consequent high infant morbidity and mortality as well as the high cost of alternative infant feeding option[11]. High fertility and rapid population growth have an impact on the overall socio-economic development of the country in general and maternal and child health in particular. Maternal and child mortality are two of the major health problems challenging healthcare organizations, especially in developing countries. The majority of maternal deaths are the direct result of complications encountered during pregnancy and arising from unsafe terminations of pregnancies [12]. Demographic and Health Surveys (DHSs) conducted between 1990 and 2015 among contraceptive user women in East Africa: Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, and Uganda revealed that contraceptive switching is 6, 11,10,6 and 5% respectively [13]. Contraceptive method switching accounts more than 83% of all discontinuations over 12 month of use in Jimma town. Of all contraceptive use segments 9.6% of them switched to other method by the end of their first year of use. The highest 12 months switching rate was 3.3% and 5.1% for implant and IUDS respectively [14]. Level of switching from long-acting family planning methods to other methods was 40.4 % among revisit clients of public health facilities in Dire Dawa, Ethiopia [15]. The Ethiopian demographic health survey 2016, showed that only 10% FP clients utilized long acting methods (8% implants and 2% IUCD) and for all women age 15-49 who started an episode of contraceptive use in the 5 years preceding the survey; 6% of the episodes of the woman switched to another method [16]. Despite from its low utilization, switching is common with unknown reasons; long acting reversible contraceptive method switching are dynamic and differ across countries and over time in that case looking for reasons women give for long acting reversible contraceptive method switching while in need has paramount importance is mandatory. So, this study is useful to determine the magnitude and associated factors which are contributing to the switching while women want using long acting reversible contraceptive method.

2. Method and material

2.1. Study area, design and period

This study is conducted in Dilla town Gedio Zone, Southern Ethiopia. Dilla town is located 90 km away from Hawassa (i.e. the capital of the SNNPR) and 363 Km away from Addis Ababa, the capital city of Ethiopia. The population of the town is around 95398; of this, 24,204 were reproductive-age women. The town has 1 referral hospital and 2 health centers. A facility based descriptive cross-sectional study was conducted from March-April 2019 in Dilla town, Southern Ethiopia.

2.2. Population, Sampling Determination and Sampling Procedure

The source population was all reproductive age women who use contraceptive in public health facilities of Dilla town. Reproductive age women who used short acting contraceptive methods during the data collection period were considered as study population. The sample size was calculated by EpiInfo-7 StatCalc using a single population proportion formula using the following assumptions: 40.4% (prevalence of long acting family planning method switching from a study conducted in Dire Dawa, Ethiopia [15], 95% level of confidence, and 5% margin of error. By adding a none response rate of 5% the final sample size was 389. All public health facilities in Dilla town (one referral hospital and two health centers) were included in this study and the sample size was allocated proportionally to each health facility based on the number of family planning service user in the last quarter of 2018. Based on the review, the total number of reproductive age women who came for family planning service in the last quarter of 2018 was divided by the number of the required sample size, which is 665/389=1.71. Finally, the data were collected by using a systematic random sampling technique with an interval of three (k =2). However, new contraceptive users were excluded from the study.

2.3. Variables of the study and Operational definitions

Switching from long acting reversible contraceptive methods to short acting Contraceptive methods is an outcome, while age of the women, educational level, occupation, partner/ husband education, income, number of pregnancies, age at first pregnancy, history of abortions, number of living children, future plan of fertility, desired number of children and main decider on type of contraceptive choice, type of contraceptive currently using, history of long acting contraceptive method utilization, Source of information, counseling on possible side effects, myth and misconception are independent variables. Long acting contraceptive method switching;

women who are currently using one of the short acting contraceptive method(pills, injectable, condom..) and had ever used long acting contraceptive method and discontinued for any reason [4]. Short acting contraceptive method: Methods of contraception those are user-dependent and require frequent administration, pills, injections, condom, contraceptive patch [23]. Short acting contraceptive user: women who are using one of the short acting contraceptive like pills, injectable, condom during data collection period. Myths and misconceptions: are commonly held beliefs about family planning that have no basis in actual scientific fact, like exaggerated or erroneous reports about side effects, misconceptions about short or long term health problems[24]. Five questions will be asked concerning misconceptions associated with LARC – those who scored below the mean on misconception items will categorize as misconceived.

2.4. Data collection methods and tools

Structured questionnaires were designed in English version and translated to Amharic and local language. Pretest was carried out on the 5% of sample size at Chichu health center and necessary correction was made prior to the actual data collection. The data was collected by six diploma nurses and two bachelors of Science nurses were recruited as supervisors. A 2-days training about the purpose of the study and process of data collection was given to the data collection team. Data was collected by using face to face interviews. Supervisors checked data for completeness daily based after data collection and principal investigator also randomly cross-checked the data before entry.

2.5. Data Processing and Analysis

The data were visually checked by the investigators and entered to EpiData statistical software

Version 3.1. Then, the data were exported to SPSS version 25.0 for cleaning and analysis. Descriptive summary measures such as frequency, percentages, mean and standard deviation were used to describe characteristics of the participants. Binary logistic regression was carried out to identify the factors associated with long acting reversible contraceptive methods switching. To control possible confounding factors, variables with a p-value of ≤ 0.25 in the bivariate analysis were taken to the multivariable analysis. Multicollinearity and model fitness was checked using standard error and Hosmer-Lemeshow test respectively. The adjusted odds ratio (AOR), with 95% confidence intervals (CI), was used to identify the independent variables associated with long acting reversible contraceptive methods switching. All tests were two-sided and statistical significance was declared at P-value < 0.05.

3. Results

3.1. Socio-demographic characteristics

A total of 381 participants were involved, making a response rate of 97.9%. The mean (\pm standard deviation (SD)) age of the participants was 25.6 (\pm 4.48 SD) years. Of the participants, 129(44.9%) were within the age group of 25-29 years, and 62.1 % were protestant by religion. The majority of the participants, 342 (89.8%)

were married, 226 (59.3%) were housewives and 153(42.1%) attained secondary education (Table 1).

 Table 1: Socio demographic and economic characteristics of short acting contraceptive user attending family

 planning clinic at public health facility Dilla town, Ethiopia 2019

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
15-19	17	4.50
20-24	129	33.90
25-29	171	44.90
30-34	44	11.50
35 and above	20	5.20
Religion		
Orthodox	119	31.20
Protestant	233	61.20
Others**	29	7.60
Educational status		
No formal education	72	18.90
Read and write	19	4.99
Primary education	95	24.93
Secondary education	153	40.16
College and above	40	11.2
Marital status		
Married	342	89.80
Unmarried	39	10.20
Occupational status		
House wife	226	59.30
merchant	60	15.70
Governmental worker	24	6.30
Daily laborer	51	13.40
None governmental worker	20	5.24
Husband education		
No formal education	15	4.10
Read and write	37	10.10
Primary education	95	25.81
Secondary education	106	28.80
College and above	115	31.30
Husband occupation		
merchant	187	37.28
Governmental worker	83	22.55
Daily laborer	93	25.27
None governmental worker	47	12.77
Unemployed	8	2.1
Family income		
Lowest quintile	71	18.63
Lowest quintile388```	81	21.26
Lowest quintile	71	18.63

3.2. Reproductive health related characteristics

Table 2: Reproductive health characteristics of short acting contraceptive users attending family planning clin	ic
at public health facility of Dilla town, Ethiopia 2019	

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Previous history of pregnancy	¥¥	<u>U</u>
Yes	377	99.0
No	4	1.0
		_
Number of pregnancy		
0-3	316	83.80
3-6	57	15.10
7 and above	1	1.10
History of abortion		
History of abortion	69	10 /
Tes No	200	10.4
110	309	81.0
Type of abortion		
Induced	59	86.80
Spontaneous	9	13.20
Age at first pregnancy		
15-19	159	43.20
20 and above	209	56.80
Number of children alive		
1	86	23
2-4	270	72.2
>5	18	4.8
Future plan of fertility		
To limit	50	13.12
To space	331	86.88
Desired no of children		
1-2	6	1.8
3-4	145	43.8
>4	80	54.4
Husband desire to have child in the		
future		
Yes	299	75.8
No	26	6.8
l don't Know	56	14.7

Among the participants, 377 (99%) had previous history of pregnancy and of them 68(18.04%) had history of abortion. 331(86.9%) of the participant had future plan of fertility so that they were using contraceptive method to space birth; of whom, about 54% desire to have more than 4 children. Majority of the husbands 299(78.5%) want to have children in the future (**Table 2**).

3.3. Contraceptive use related factors

Among the participant, 294(77.2%) use injectable contraceptive, 332 (87.1%) heard information on LARC method; the main source of information was health professional and HEW.

 Table 3: Contraceptive related characteristics of short acting contraceptive method user of women attending family planning clinic at public health facility of Dilla town, Southern Ethiopia 2019.

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Type of contraceptive currently using		
pills	87	22.8
injectable	294	71.2
Ever heard about long acting contract	ceptive	
method	•	
Yes	332	87.1
No	49	12.9
Type of long acting contraceptive you	know	
Implant	328	98.8
IUCD	262	78.9
Female sterilization	157	.47.6
Vasectomy	107	32.2
v usoolomy	107	52.2
Source of information		
Radio		200
TV		211
Poster		43
Magazine		30
Friends /neighbors		251
HP/HEW		266
Discussion with husband		
Yes	151	39.6
No	230	60.4
Husband support towards LARC		
Yes	71	18.6
No	91	23.9
Neutral	257	57.5
Main dasidan		
	254	667
Jui Hushand	2.34 1.1	00.7 11 5
Ining	44 83	11.5 21.8
Jonny	0.3	21.0
Counseling on benefits of LARC		
Yes	281	98.3
No	5	1.7
Counseling on possible side effect		
Yes	203	71.0
No	83	29.0
Satisfaction on counseling		
Yes	213	74.5
No	73	25.5
Perceived myth on LARC		
Above mean (> 2.5)	364	95.5
Below mean (< 2.5)	17	45

More than half 53.0% of husbands/ partners does not support /disapprove LARC method and the majority 83(29.0%) participants, were not counseled about the possible side effect of LARC (Table 3).

3.4. Prevalence of switching from long acting reversible contraceptive method

Table 4: Prevalence of long acting reversible contraceptive method switching and associated factors among women attending family planning clinic at public health facility Dilla town, Southern Ethiopia 2019. N=105

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
LARC utilization history	Trequency	Tereentuge
Yes	105	27.6
No	176	72.4
Type of LARC		
Implant	92	87.6
IUCD	13	12.4
	10	12.1
Reason for choosing the method		
Safety	32	30.5
Effectiveness	13	12.4
Long protection	80	76.2
Reduced appointment	37	35.2
It can be removed any time	12	11.4
·		
Facility where service received		
Health center	83	79
Hospital	19	18.1
Private health facility	3	2.9
Who choose the LARC method		
The women herself	73	69.5
Husband	2	1.9
Health professional	24	22.8
Shared discussion	6	5.2
Side affect they experience		
Monstrual irregularity No	0	13.23
Weight loss	9	15.25
Weight loss	24	33.29
Difficult to work	17	39.70 25.0
Excessive blooding	17	23.0
Arm numbress	34 12	17 64
Arminumoness	12	17.04
Contraceptive method use before LARC		
utilization		
Yes	69	65.7
No	36	34.3
Duration of use before LARC		
0-2 years	60	57.1
More than 2 years	45	42.9

Overall, the prevalence of switching from long acting reversible contraceptive method was 27.6% (95%, CI:

25.3%, 29.8%). Majority 92(87.6%) switched from implant, 80(76.2%) of the women choose LARC by its long protection, 83(79%) women got the service from health center, 71(67.6%) of switchers were used short acting contraceptive method prior to LARC method and 43(42.2%) used the method for more than two years (Table 4).

3.5. Reason for switching from LARC methods to short acting contraceptive method

Majority 68(65%) switched because of Side effect of long acting contraception. The reset mentioned short acting method preference (14%), husband opposition (10%), failure of contraceptive method (5%), breast feeding (3) and fear of infertility as reason for switching from long acting contraception method to short acting methods (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Reason for switching from LARC methods to short acting contraceptive method among women attending family planning clinic in public health facility of Dilla town SNNPR. (n=105)

3.6. Factors associated with switching from long acting reversible contraceptive methods

Variable	Category	Switching status		COR 95%CI	AOR 95%
		Yes	No		
age	15-24 25-34 35&above	60(41.1% 86(59.9%) 40(18.6%) 175(81.4) 5(25.0%) 15(75.0%))	2.093(0.722,6.088) 0.686(0.235,1.997) 1	4.354(0.853,22.235) 2.503(0.530,11.813) 1
Marital status	Married Unmarried	77(22.5%) 265(77.5%) 28(71.8)		1 8.760(4.171,18.401)	1 12.019(4.250,33.993

Educational status No formal culcutation 14(19.4) 58(80.0) 1 1 1 status Read and write Primary culcutation 9(47.4) 3.283(1.614.6.680) 3.652(1.12),443)* 2.278(0.610.8.500) 3.652(1.12),443)* veducation 9(47.4) 0.928(0.455.1.893) 0.956(0.386.2.414) 2.268(0.42),443)* 0.956(0.386.2.414) 2.857(0.863.9.459) 2.857(0.863.9.459) 2.857(0.863.9.459) 2.857(0.863.9.459) 2.857(0.863.9.459) 2.857(0.863.9.459) 2.857(0.863.9.459) 2.857(0.863.9.459) 2.984(0.29),443)* 0.650(0.256,1.646) 0.650(0.256,1.646) 0.650(0.256,1.646) 0.650(0.256,1.646) 0.650(0.256,1.646) 0.650(0.256,1.646) 0.650(0.256,1.646) 0.853(0.256,1.846) 1.919(0.538,6.846) 1.919(0.538,6.846) 1.919(0.538,6.846) 1.919(0.538,6.846) 1.919(0.538,6.846) 1.919(0.538,6.846) 1.919(0.638,6.86) 1.919(0.638,6.86) 1.919(0.638,6.86) 2.084(0.630,6.892) 1.8170(0.450,3.856) 2.084(0.630,6.892) 1.8170(0.450,3.856) 2.084(0.630,6.892) 1.819(0.225,3.471) 2.248(0.291,1.7.39) 1.333(0.212,8.375) 1.4410(1.85,7.059) 2.044(0.630,6.892) 1.1410(0.185,7.059) 2.045(0.16,60,71,3.12,01)			11(28.2)		
status education 58(80.6) 4.603(1574,13.462) 2.278(0.610,8.500) status education 9(47,4) 0.928(0.455,1.893) 0.956(0.386,2.414) Secondary 42(42,2) education 3.652(1.412,9.443)* 0.956(0.386,2.414) Secondary 42(42,2) education 5.3(55,8) 1.470(0.596,3.673) 2.857(0.863,9.459) College above 125(81.7) 1.029(0.540,1.961) 0.550(0.256,1.646) status forchant 60/cc71 44(73,3) 1.415(0.576,3.478) 1.919(0.538,6.846) Woman's Governmental 60/cc71 44(73,3) 1.415(0.576,3.478) 1.919(0.538,6.846) Status worker 8(33,3) 16(66.7) 1.071(0.541,2.120) 1.317(0.450,3.856) July laborer Others* 14(27.5) 37(72,5) 1.88(0.225,3.474) 2.248(0.291,17.39) status Red and write 9(24,3) 28(71,6) 1.092(0.320,3.789) 1.333(0.212,8.375) education status status status 32(30,2) 74(69.8) 1.189(0.352,4.017)	Educational	No formal	14(19.4)	1	1
annus Read and write Primary 0.052.05 (052.6) 4.603(1.574,13.462) 2.278(0.610,8.500) Read and write Primary 0.052.6) 3.283(1.614,6.680) 3.652(1.412,443)* education 53(255,8) 1.470(0.596,3.673) 2.857(0.863,9.459) college and 28(18,3) above 125(81.7) Woman's coccupational 1029(0.540,1.961) 1 0.650(0.256,1.646) Governmental 167(73.9) 1.029(0.540,1.961) 0.650(0.256,1.646) 0.650(0.256,1.646) status Governmental 162(27,7) 44(73.3) 1.415(0.576,3.478) 1.919(0.538,6.846) worker Daily laborer 102(60.0) 1.029(0.540,1.961) 0.650(0.256,1.646) Husband No formal 4(26,7) 11(73.3) 1 1 education Scooldary education 33(28,7) 82(71,6) 1.092(0.320,3.789) 1.331(0.209,8.219) education 33(28,7) 82(71,6) 1.107(0.329,3.725) 1.311(0.209,8.219) education 33(28,7) 82(71,6) 1.107(0.329,3.725) <td>status</td> <td>education</td> <td>58(80.6)</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td>	status	education	58(80.6)	1	1
Instant write Primary 10(52.6) 3.283(161.6.680) 3.203(12.14.2.943) Velocation 9(47.4) 0.928(0.455,1.83) 0.956(0.386,2.414) Secondary 42(44.2) 0.928(0.455,1.83) 0.956(0.386,2.414) Secondary 42(44.2) 0.928(0.455,1.83) 0.956(0.386,2.414) Oulcase above 125(81.7) 1.470(0.596,3.673) 2.857(0.863,9.459) Woman's merchant 16(26.7) 4.4(73.3) 1.415(0.376,3.478) 1.99(0.538,6.846) Status Mover 8(33.3) 16(66.7) 1.071(0.541.2.120) 1.317(0.450,3.856) Status No formental 16(26.7) 1.173.3) 1 1 Husband No formal 4(26.7) 1.173.3) 1 1 education 32(30.2) 74(69.8) 1.189(0.352,4.017) 1.317(0.450,3.856) Secondary 22(70.2) 2.48(71.3) 1.07(0.329,3.789) 1.33(0.212,8.375) education 32(30.2) 74(69.8) 1.189(0.352,4.017) 1.311(0.209,8.219) College <td< td=""><td>status</td><td>Read and write</td><td>56(66.6)</td><td>4 603(1 574 13 462)</td><td>2 278(0 610 8 500)</td></td<>	status	Read and write	56(66.6)	4 603(1 574 13 462)	2 278(0 610 8 500)
Image and action 10(2.1) 2.33(1.014,0.080) 2.33(1.12,2.414) secondary 42(44.2) 0.926(0.455,1.893) 0.956(0.386,2.414) secondary 42(44.2) education 53(55.8) 1.470(0.596,3.673) 2.857(0.863,9.459) College adove 125(81.7) 1 1 0.650(0.256,1.646) workari 167(73,9) 1.029(0.540,1.961) 0.650(0.256,1.646) 0.650(0.256,1.646) occupational forvernmental 167(73,9) 1.029(0.540,1.961) 0.650(0.256,1.646) occupational forvernmental 16(26.7) 44(73.3) 1.415(0.576,3.478) 1.919(0.538,6.846) workcr 8(33.3) 16(66.7) 1.029(0.30,3.789) 1.33(0.212,8.375) ducation status Read and write 9(24.3) 28(75.7) 0.884(0.225,3.474) 2.248(0.291,17.39) status Read and write 9(24.3) 28(75.7) 0.884(0.225,3.474) 2.248(0.291,17.39) status Read and write 9(24.3) 28(75.7) 0.884(0.225,3.441) 1.414(0.185,7.059) scondard		Drimory	10(52.6)	3.283(1.574,15.402)	2.278(0.010, 0.500) 3.652(1.412.0.443)*
Concentry 42(44.2) education 0.528(0.4.5), 1.895) 0.530(0.306.2.414) 0.530(0.306.2.414) Secondary 42(44.2) education 1.470(0.596.3.673) 2.857(0.863.9.459) College adove 125(81.7) 1.470(0.596.3.673) 2.857(0.863.9.459) Woman's nerchant 167(73.9) 1.029(0.540,1.961) 0.650(0.256,1.646) Norker 8(33.3) 16(66.7) 1.071(0.541.2.120) 1.317(0.450.3.856) Vorker 8(33.3) 16(66.7) 1.071(0.541.2.120) 1.317(0.450.3.856) Husbund education education 2.084(0.630,6.892) 1.107(0.523.7379) 1.248(0.291,17.39) Husbund education 9(24.3) 28(75.7) 0.884(0.225,3.474) 2.248(0.291,17.39) Primary 27(24.4) 68(71,16) 1.092(0.320.3789) 1.333(0.212.8.375) education 32(30.2) 74(69.8) 1.189(0.352,4.017) 1.144(0.185,7.059) Secondary education 32(30.2) 74(423.9) 1 1 History of Yes 31(45.6) 37(54.4) 2.661(1.		r fillial y	0(47.4)	0.028(0.455.1.802)	0.056(0.286.2.414)
Secondary education above 42(44.2) 28(18.3) above 1.470(0.596,3.673) 2.857(0.863,9.459) Woman's occupational status House wife mcrchant for (73.9) 59(26.1) 1 1 Woman's occupational status House wife mcrchant for overnmental dovernmental education 59(26.1) 1 0.650(0.256,1.646) More vorker 8(33.3) 16(66.7) 1.029(0.540,1.961) 0.650(0.256,1.646) More vorker 8(33.3) 16(66.7) 1.071(0.541,2.120) 1.317(0.450,3.856) Musband education education Read and write status 9(24.3) 28(75.7) 0.884(0.225,3.474) 2.248(0.291,17.39) Primary education 32(30.2) 74(69.8) 1.189(0.352,4.017) 1.144(0.185,7.059) Scondary education 32(30.2) 74(59.8) 1.189(0.323,7.49) 1.331(0.209,8.219) College and above 31(45.6) 37(54.4) 2.661(1.544,4.584) 1.793(0.788,4.080) History aborin Of No 74(23.9) 1 1 1 History aborin Yes 235(76.1) 1 1 Fertillity plan To limit		Secondama	9(47.4)	0.928(0.433,1.893)	0.930(0.380,2.414)
colucation 5355.8) 1.470(0.596,3.673) 2.857(0.863,9.439) College and 28(18,3) 125(81.7) 1 1 increasing House wife 59(26.1) 1 1 0.050(0.256,1.646) occupational merchant 167(73.9) 1.029(0.540,1.961) 0.050(0.256,1.646) Governmental 16(26.7) 44(73.3) 1.415(0.576,3.478) 1.919(0.538,6.846) worker 8(33.3) 16(66.7) 1071(0.541,2.120) 2.084(0.630,6.892) Husband education 4(26.7) 11(73.3) 1 1 education get(27.5) 37(72.5) 1.887(0.735,4.843) 2.248(0.291,17.39) Primary 27(28.4) 68(71.6) 1.092(0.320,3.789) 1.33(0.212,8.37) status Read and write 9(24.3) 28(75.7) 0.884(0.225,3.474) 2.248(0.291,17.39) reducation 33(28.7) 82(71,3) 1.107(0.329,3.725) 1.311(0.209,8.219) college and 21(42.0) 29(58.0) 1 1 To space 84(25.		Secondary	42(44.2)	1 470(0 506 2 672)	2 957(0 962 0 450)
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		education	53(55.8) 29(19.2)	1.470(0.596,3.673)	2.857(0.863,9.459)
above 125(81.7) 11(26.2) 31(73.8) 11(26.2) 31(73.8) Woman's occupational status House wife merchant 59(26.1) 1 1 167(73.9) 1.029(0.540,1.961) 0.650(0.256,1.646) worker 8(33.3) 16(66.7) 1.017(0.541,2.120) 1.317(0.450,3.856) Daily laborer 00ters* 14(27.5) 37(72.5) 1.887(0.735,4.843) 2.084(0.630,6.892) Husband educationa No format 4(26.7) 11(73.3) 1 1 educationa sciencian 9(24.3) 2.8(75.7) 0.884(0.225,3.474) 2.2084(0.291,17.39 Primary 27(28.4) 68(71.6) 1.092(0.320,3789) 1.333(0.212.8.375) educationa 32(30.2) 74(9.8) 1.189(0.352,4.017) 1.144(0.185,7.059) Secondary education 33(28.7) 82(71,3) 1.107(0.329,3.725) 1.311(0.209,8.219) College and above 1 1 1 1 History of Yes 31(45.6) 37(54.4) 2.661(1.544,4.584) 1.793(0.788,4.080)		College and	28(18.3)		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		above	125(81.7)		
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			11(26.2)		
$ \begin{array}{l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l $			31(73.8)		
occupational status merchant Governmental worker 167(73.9) (S26,7) 1.029(0.540,1.961) (A(73.3) 0.650(0.256,1.646) 1.919(0.538,6.846) Musch Baily laborer Others* 14(27.5) 37(72.5) (8(40.0) 1.415(0.576,3.478) 1.919(0.538,6.846) Husband educational status No formal education 4(26.7) 11(73.3) 1 1 Husband education No formal education 9(24.3) 28(75.7) 0.884(0.225,3.474) 2.248(0.291,17.39) Primary 27(28.4) 68(71.6) 1.092(0.320,3.789) 1.333(0.212,8.375) education secondary education 32(30.2) 74(69.8) 1.189(0.352,4.017) 1.144(0.185,7.059) Sccondary education 33(28.7) 82(71,3) 1.107(0.329,3.725) 1.311(0.209,8.219) Mistory of Yes 31(45.6) 37(54.4) 2.661(1.544,4.584) 1.793(0.788,4.080) abortion No 74(23.9) 1 1 1 Fertility plan To limit 21(42.0) 29(58.0) 1 1 Husband/ Yes 23(32.1) <td< td=""><td>Woman's</td><td>House wife</td><td>59(26.1)</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></td<>	Woman's	House wife	59(26.1)	1	1
status Governmental worker 16(26.7) 8(3.3.) 1415(0.576,3.478) 1.919(0.538,6.846) Norker 8(3.3.) 16(66.7) 1.071(0.541,2.120) 1.317(0.450,3.856) Daily laborer Others* 14(27.5) 37(72.5) 1.887(0.735,4.843) 2.084(0.630,6.892) Husband educational status Read and write 9(24.3) 28(75.7) 0.884(0.225,3.474) 2.248(0.291,17.39) Primary 27(28.4) 68(71.6) 1.092(0.320,3.789) 1.331(0.212,8.375) education 32(30.2) 74(69.8) 1.092(0.320,3.789) 1.331(0.209,8.219) College and above 33(28.7) 82(71,3) 1.017(0.329,3.725) 1.311(0.209,8.219) History of Yes 31(45.6) 37(54.4) 2.661(1.544.4.584) 1.793(0.786,8.4080) abore	occupational	merchant	167(73.9)	1.029(0.540,1.961)	0.650(0.256,1.646)
	status	Governmental	16(26.7) 44(73.3)	1.415(0.576,3.478)	1.919(0.538,6.846)
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		worker	8(33.3) 16(66.7)		
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Daily laborer		1.071(0.541,2.120)	1.317(0.450,3.856)
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Others*	14(27.5) 37(72.5)	1.887(0.735,4.843)	2.084(0.630,6.892)
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			8(40.0) 12(60.0)		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Husband	No formal	4(26.7) 11(73.3)	1	1
Status Read and write primary 9(24.3) 28(75.7) 0.884(0.225,3.474) 2.248(0.291,17.39) Status Primary 27(28.4) 68(71.6) 1.092(0.320,3.789) 1.333(0.212,8.375) education 32(30.2) 74(69.8) 1.189(0.352,4.017) 1.144(0.185,7.059) Secondary education 33(28.7) 82(71,3) 1.107(0.329,3.725) 1.311(0.209,8.219) History of Yes 31(45.6) 37(54.4) 2.661(1.544,4.584) 1.793(0.788,4.080) above 1 1 1 1 1 1 Fertility plan To limit 21(42.0) 29(58.0) 1 1 1 Husband / Yes 23(32.4) 48(67.6) 1 1 1 Partner No 49(53.8) 42(46.2) 2.435(1.277,4.644) 3.071(1.297,7.268)* support for neutral 33(15.1) 186(84.9) 0.370(0.199,0.688) 0.645(0.293,1.418) LARC Self 57(22.4) 197(77.6) 1 1	educational	education			
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	status	Read and write	9(24.3) 28(75.7)	0.884(0.225.3.474)	2 248(0 291 17 39
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Status	Primary	27(28.4) $68(71.6)$	1 092(0 320 3 789)	1.333(0.212.8.375)
Secondary education Secondary of Ves No		education	32(30.2) $74(69.8)$	1.092(0.320, 3.709) 1.189(0.352.4.017)	1.333(0.212,0.373) 1 144(0 185 7 059)
education College and above 33(28.7) 82(71,3) 1.107(0.329,3.725) 1.311(0.209,8.219) History of abortion Yes 31(45.6) 37(54.4) 2.661(1.544,4.584) 1.793(0.788,4.080) History of abortion Yes 31(45.6) 37(54.4) 2.661(1.544,4.584) 1.793(0.788,4.080) Fertility plan To limit 21(42.0) 29(58.0) 1 1 Fertility plan To limit 21(42.0) 247(74.6) 0.470(0.254,0.868) 0.197(0.076,0.511)* Husband / partner Yes 233(24.1) 48(67.6) 1 1 partner No 49(53.8) 42(46.2) 2.435(1.277,4.644) 3.071(1.297,7.268)* support for neutral 33(15.1) 186(84.9) 0.370(0.199,0.688) 0.645(0.293,1.418) LARC Husband 21(47.7) 23(52.3) 3.156(1.629,6.111) 2.18(0.779,6.101) Counseling Yes 62(30.5) 141(69.5) 1 1 on possible No 43(51.8) 40(48.2) 2.445(1.448,4.129) 1.172(0.		Secondary	52(50.2) 74(69.6)	1.109(0.552,4.017)	1.144(0.105,7.057)
College and above and above Intro/(0.327,3.727) Intro/(0.327,3.727) Intro/(0.327,3.727) History of yes 31(45.6) 37(54.4) 2.661(1.544,4.584) 1.793(0.788,4.080) aborition No 74(23.9) 1 1 Errilly plan To limit 215(76.1) 1 1 Fertility plan To limit 21(42.0) 29(58.0) 1 1 Husband / Yes 233(76.4) 48(67.6) 1 1 Partner No 49(53.8) 42(46.2) 2.435(1.277,4.644) 3.071(1.297,7.268)* support for neutral 33(15.1) 186(84.9) 0.370(0.199,0.688) 0.645(0.293,1.418) LARC Husband 21(47.7) 23(52.3) 3.156(1.629,6.111) 2.18(0.779,6.101) Courseling Yes 62(30.5) 141(69.5) 1 1 On possible No 36(49.3) 37(50.7) 1 1 Service 141(67.6) 0.492(0.287,0.846) 0.816(0.274,2.430)		education	33(28.7) 82(71.3)	1 107(0 320 3 725)	1 311(0 200 8 210)
above History of above Yes 31(45.6) 37(54.4) 2.661(1.544,4.584) 1.793(0.788,4.080) abortion No 74(23.9) 1 1 Fertility plan To limit 21(42.0) 29(58.0) 1 1 Fertility plan To limit 21(42.0) 29(58.0) 1 1 Husband / Yes 23(32.4) 48(67.6) 1 ``1 partner No 49(53.8) 42(46.2) 2.435(1.277,4.644) 3.071(1.297,7.268)* support for neutral 33(15.1) 186(84.9) 0.370(0.199,0.688) 0.645(0.293,1.418) LARC 1 1 1 On contraceptive Husband 21(47.7) 23(52.3) 3.156(1.629,6.111) 2.18(0.779,6.101) Choice Both together 27(32.5) 56(67.5) 1.666(0.966,2.876) 1.516(0.670,3.428) Counseling Yes 69(32.4) 144(67.6) 0.492(0.287,0.846) 0.816(0.274,2.430) On counseling		Collago and	55(28.7) 62(71,5)	1.107(0.529,5.725)	1.511(0.209,0.219)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		conege and			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Histom	Vac	21(45.6) $27(54.4)$	2 (61(1 544 4 594))	1 702(0 799 4 090)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	History Of	i es	51(43.0) $57(34.4)$	2.001(1.344,4.384)	1.795(0.788,4.080)
Image: Second State Second	abortion	NO	74(23.9)	1	1
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		T 11 1	235(76.1)	1	1
To space $84(25.4)$ $24/(74.6)$ $0.470(0.254,0.868)$ $0.197(0.076,0.511)^*$ Husband /Yes $23(32.4)$ $48(67.6)$ 1`1partnerNo $49(53.8)$ $42(46.2)$ $2.435(1.277,4.644)$ $3.071(1.297,7.268)^*$ supportforneutral $33(15.1)$ $186(84.9)$ $0.370(0.199,0.688)$ $0.645(0.293,1.418)$ LARCMain deciderSelf $57(22.4)$ $197(77.6)$ 11On contraceptiveHusband $21(47.7)$ $23(52.3)$ $3.156(1.629,6.111)$ $2.18(0.779,6.101)$ ChoiceBoth together $27(32.5)$ $56(67.5)$ $1.666(0.966,2.876)$ $1.516(0.670,3.428)$ CounselingYes $62(30.5)$ $141(69.5)$ 11on possibleNo $43(51.8)$ $40(48.2)$ $2.445(1.448,4.129)$ $1.172(0.572,2.404)$ side effect $144(67.6)$ $0.492(0.287,0.846)$ $0.816(0.274,2.430)$ On counselingNo $36(49.3)$ $37(50.7)$ 11Age at first $15-19$ years old $62(39.0)$ $97(61.0)$ 11pregnancy20 and above $43(20.6)$ $166(79.4)$ $0.405(0.255,0.644)$ $0.401(0.217,0.740)$ Myth andMisconceived $10(58.8)$ $7(41.2)$ 11misconception (<2.5) Not $95(26.1)$ $269(73.9)$ $0.247(0.092,0.668)$ $1.084(0.218,5.399)$	Fertility plan	To limit	21(42.0) 29(58.0)		
Husband /Yes $23(32.4)$ $48(67.6)$ 11partnerNo $49(53.8)$ $42(46.2)$ $2.435(1.277,4.644)$ $3.071(1.297,7.268)^*$ supportforneutral $33(15.1)$ $186(84.9)$ $0.370(0.199,0.688)$ $0.645(0.293,1.418)$ LARCMain deciderSelf $57(22.4)$ $197(77.6)$ 11On contraceptiveHusband $21(47.7)$ $23(52.3)$ $3.156(1.629,6.111)$ $2.18(0.779,6.101)$ ChoiceBoth together $27(32.5)$ $56(67.5)$ $1.666(0.966,2.876)$ $1.516(0.670,3.428)$ CounselingYes $62(30.5)$ $141(69.5)$ 11on possibleNo $43(51.8)$ $40(48.2)$ $2.445(1.448,4.129)$ $1.172(0.572,2.404)$ side effect		To space	84(25.4) 247(74.6)	0.470(0.254,0.868)	0.197(0.076,0.511)*
$\begin{array}{c cccccc} \text{partner} & \text{No} & 49(53.8) & 42(46.2) & 2.435(1.277,4.644) & 3.071(1.297,7.268)* \\ \text{support} & \text{for} & \text{neutral} & 33(15.1) & 186(84.9) & 0.370(0.199,0.688) & 0.645(0.293,1.418) \\ \hline \text{Main decider} & \text{Self} & 57(22.4) & 197(77.6) & 1 & 1 \\ \text{On contraceptive} & \text{Husband} & 21(47.7) & 23(52.3) & 3.156(1.629,6.111) & 2.18(0.779,6.101) \\ \text{Choice} & \text{Both together} & 27(32.5) & 56(67.5) & 1.666(0.966,2.876) & 1.516(0.670,3.428) \\ \hline \text{Counseling} & \text{Yes} & 62(30.5) & 141(69.5) & 1 & 1 \\ \text{on possible} & \text{No} & 43(51.8) & 40(48.2) & 2.445(1.448,4.129) & 1.172(0.572,2.404) \\ \hline \text{side effect} & & & & & & & & \\ \hline \text{Satisfaction} & \text{Yes} & 69(32.4) & 144(67.6) & 0.492(0.287,0.846) & 0.816(0.274,2.430) \\ \text{On counseling} & \text{No} & 36(49.3) & 37(50.7) & 1 & 1 \\ \hline \text{service} & & & & & & & \\ \hline \text{Age at first} & 15-19 \text{ years old} & 62(39.0) & 97(61.0) & 1 & 1 \\ \hline \text{pregnancy} & 20 \text{ and above} & 43(20.6) & 166(79.4) & 0.405(0.255,0.644) & 0.401(0.217,0.740) \\ \hline \text{Myth and} & \text{Misconceived} & 10(58.8) & 7(41.2) & 1 & 1 \\ \hline \text{misconception} & (<2.5) & \text{Not} & 95(26.1) & 269(73.9) & 0.247(0.092,0.668) & 1.084(0.218,5.399) \\ \hline \text{misconceived} & \text{misconceived} & 10(58.8) & 7(41.2) & 1 \\ \hline \text{misconceived} & 10.0000 & 0.0000000000000000000000000$	Husband /	Yes	23(32.4) 48(67.6)	1	`1
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} support & for & neutral \\ LARC \\ \hline \\ Main decider \\ Main decider \\ On contraceptive \\ Husband \\ Choice \\ Both together \\ Yes \\ Self \\ Set is faction \\ On counseling \\ Set is fact \\ Set is fact is for the set is for $	partner	No	49(53.8) 42(46.2)	2.435(1.277,4.644)	3.071(1.297,7.268)*
LARCMain deciderSelf $57(22.4)$ $197(77.6)$ 11On contraceptiveHusband $21(47.7)$ $23(52.3)$ $3.156(1.629,6.111)$ $2.18(0.779,6.101)$ ChoiceBoth together $27(32.5)$ $56(67.5)$ $1.666(0.966,2.876)$ $1.516(0.670,3.428)$ CounselingYes $62(30.5)$ $141(69.5)$ 11on possibleNo $43(51.8)$ $40(48.2)$ $2.445(1.448,4.129)$ $1.172(0.572,2.404)$ side effect $36(49.3)$ $37(50.7)$ 11SatisfactionYes $69(32.4)$ $144(67.6)$ $0.492(0.287,0.846)$ $0.816(0.274,2.430)$ On counselingNo $36(49.3)$ $37(50.7)$ 11Service $15-19$ years old $62(39.0)$ $97(61.0)$ 11pregnancy20 and above $43(20.6)$ $166(79.4)$ $0.405(0.255,0.644)$ $0.401(0.217,0.740)$ Myth and misconceptionMisconceived $10(58.8)$ $7(41.2)$ 11Mot misconceived $95(26.1)$ $269(73.9)$ $0.247(0.092,0.668)$ $1.084(0.218,5.399)$	support for	neutral	33(15.1) 186(84.9)	0.370(0.199,0.688)	0.645(0.293,1.418)
Main decider On contraceptive ChoiceSelf $57(22.4)$ $197(77.6)$ 11On contraceptive ChoiceHusband $21(47.7)$ $23(52.3)$ $3.156(1.629,6.111)$ $2.18(0.779,6.101)$ ChoiceBoth together $27(32.5)$ $56(67.5)$ $1.666(0.966,2.876)$ $1.516(0.670,3.428)$ Counseling on possible side effectYes $62(30.5)$ $141(69.5)$ 11On counseling on counseling No43(51.8) $40(48.2)$ $2.445(1.448,4.129)$ $1.172(0.572,2.404)$ Satisfaction ServiceYes $69(32.4)$ $144(67.6)$ $0.492(0.287,0.846)$ $0.816(0.274,2.430)$ On counseling ServiceNo $36(49.3)$ $37(50.7)$ 11Age at first pregnancy $15-19$ years old 20 and above $62(39.0)$ $97(61.0)$ 11Myth and misconceptionMisconceived (<2.5) Not $10(58.8)$ $7(41.2)$ 11Myth and misconceived $0.5(26.1)$ $269(73.9)$ $0.247(0.092,0.668)$ $1.084(0.218,5.399)$	LARC				
Main decider On contraceptive ChoiceSelf $57(22.4)$ $197(77.6)$ 111On contraceptive ChoiceHusband $21(47.7)$ $23(52.3)$ $3.156(1.629, 6.111)$ $2.18(0.779, 6.101)$ ChoiceBoth together $27(32.5)$ $56(67.5)$ $1.666(0.966, 2.876)$ $1.516(0.670, 3.428)$ Counseling on possibleYes $62(30.5)$ $141(69.5)$ 11on possible side effectNo $43(51.8)$ $40(48.2)$ $2.445(1.448, 4.129)$ $1.172(0.572, 2.404)$ Satisfaction On counseling NoYes $69(32.4)$ $144(67.6)$ $0.492(0.287, 0.846)$ $0.816(0.274, 2.430)$ On counseling ServiceNo $36(49.3)$ $37(50.7)$ 11Age at first pregnancy $15-19$ years old 20 and above $62(39.0)$ $97(61.0)$ 11Myth and misconceptionMisconceived (<2.5) Not $10(58.8)$ $7(41.2)$ 11Myth and misconceived $10(58.8)$ $7(41.2)$ 11Mot misconceived $95(26.1)$ $269(73.9)$ $0.247(0.092, 0.668)$ $1.084(0.218, 5.399)$					
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} On \ contraceptive \\ Husband \\ Choice \\ Both \ together \\ 27(32.5) \\ 56(67.5) \\ Counseling \\ On \ contraceptive \\ Both \ together \\ 27(32.5) \\ 56(67.5) \\ 1.666(0.966,2.876) \\ 1.516(0.670,3.428) \\ 1.516(0.670,3.428) \\ 1.516(0.670,3.428) \\ 1.516(0.670,3.428) \\ 1.516(0.670,3.428) \\ 1.172(0.572,2.404) \\ 1.172(0.57$	Main decider	Self	57(22.4) 197(77.6)	1	1
$\begin{array}{c cccc} Choice & Both together & 27(32.5) & 56(67.5) & 1.666(0.966,2.876) & 1.516(0.670,3.428) \\ \hline Counseling & Yes & 62(30.5) & 141(69.5) & 1 & 1 \\ on possible & No & 43(51.8) & 40(48.2) & 2.445(1.448,4.129) & 1.172(0.572,2.404) \\ \hline side effect & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	On contraceptive	Husband	21(47.7) 23(52.3)	3.156(1.629,6.111)	2.18(0.779,6.101)
Counseling on possible side effectYes $62(30.5)$ $43(51.8)$ $41(69.5)$ $43(51.8)$ 11No $43(51.8)$ $40(48.2)$ $2.445(1.448,4.129)$ $1.172(0.572,2.404)$ Satisfaction On counseling ServiceYes $69(32.4)$ $144(67.6)$ $36(49.3)$ $0.492(0.287,0.846)$ $0.816(0.274,2.430)$ Age at first pregnancy15-19 years old $62(39.0)$ $97(61.0)$ $43(20.6)$ 1 1 Myth and misconceptionMisconceived $10(58.8)$ $7(41.2)$ 1 1 Myth and misconceptionMisconceived $10(58.8)$ $7(41.2)$ 1 1 Myth and misconceived $95(26.1)$ $269(73.9)$ $0.247(0.092,0.668)$ $1.084(0.218,5.399)$	Choice	Both together	27(32.5) 56(67.5)	1.666(0.966,2.876)	1.516(0.670,3.428)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Counseling	Yes	62(30.5) 141(69.5)	1	1
side effect Yes 69(32.4) 144(67.6) 0.492(0.287,0.846) 0.816(0.274,2.430) On counseling Service No 36(49.3) 37(50.7) 1 1 Age at first pregnancy 15-19 years old 20 and above 62(39.0) 97(61.0) 1 1 Myth and misconception Misconceived 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Not 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399)	on possible	No	43(51.8) 40(48.2)	2.445(1.448,4.129)	1.172(0.572,2.404)
Satisfaction On counseling Service Yes 69(32.4) 144(67.6) 0.492(0.287,0.846) 0.816(0.274,2.430) Mo 36(49.3) 37(50.7) 1 1 Age at first pregnancy 15-19 years old 62(39.0) 97(61.0) 1 1 Myth and misconception Misconceived 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Myth and misconception Misconceived 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Not 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399)	side effect				
Myth and misconception Misconceived (<2.5) 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Myth and misconception Misconceived (<2.5)	Satisfaction	Yes	69(32.4) 144(67.6)	0.492(0.287.0.846)	0.816(0.274.2.430)
Service 1 1 1 Age at first pregnancy 15-19 years old 20 and above 62(39.0) 97(61.0) 43(20.6) 166(79.4) 1 1 Myth and misconception Misconceived (<2.5)	On counseling	No	36(49.3) 37(50.7)	1	1
Age at first pregnancy 15-19 years old 20 and above 62(39.0) 43(20.6) 97(61.0) 166(79.4) 1 0.405(0.255,0.644) 1 0.401(0.217,0.740) Myth and misconception Misconceived (<2.5) Not 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Not 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399)	Service	110	56(1)(5) 57(56.7)	1	1
Age at first 13-19 years out 02(39.0) 97(01.0) 1 1 1 pregnancy 20 and above 43(20.6) 166(79.4) 0.405(0.255,0.644) 0.401(0.217,0.740) Myth and misconception Misconceived 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Not 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399)	Age at first	15-10 years old	62(39.0) 97(61.0)	1	1
Myth and misconception Misconceived (<2.5) Not 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Not 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399)	ngo at mot	20 and above	$43(20.6) \ 166(70.4)$	1 0 405(0 255 0 644)	1 0 401(0.217.0.740)
Myth and misconception Misconceived (<2.5) 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Not misconceived 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399)	pregnancy	20 and above	+3(20.0) 100(79.4)	0.405(0.255,0.044)	0.401(0.217,0.740)
Myth and misconception Misconceived (<2.5) 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Not misconceived 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399)					
Myth and misconception Misconceived (<2.5) 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Not misconceived 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399)					
Myth and misconception Misconceived (<2.5) 10(58.8) 7(41.2) 1 1 Not misconceived 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399)					
misconception (<2.5) Not 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399) misconceived	Myth and	Misconceived	10(58.8) 7(41.2)	1	1
Not 95(26.1) 269(73.9) 0.247(0.092,0.668) 1.084(0.218,5.399) misconceived	misconception	(<2.5)	10(000) /(11.2)	-	-
misconceived	moconception	Not	95(26.1) 269(73.9)	0 247(0 092 0 668)	1 084(0 218 5 399)
		misconceived	20(20:1) 207(13:2)	5.217 (5.672,0.000)	1.00 ((0.210,0.077)

The odds of switching from LARC was 12 times (AOR=12.019; 95% CI: 4.250, 33.993) higher among unmarried women as compared to those who are married. Switching to LARC was 3.652 times (AOR=3.652; 95% CI; 1.412, 9.443) higher among women who have attended primary education as compared to women who do not attain formal education. Likewise, as compared to women whose husband approves/support LARC method the odds of switching was 3 times (AOR=3.071; 95% CI: 1.297, 7.268) higher among women whose husband oppose LARC. Women who were using contraceptive method for spacing or who have future plan of fertility are 80% less likely to switch from long acting reversible contraceptive method as compared to women who want to limit birth (AOR= 0.197; 95% CI; 0.076, 0.511).Moreover, Women who were 20 years and above in their first pregnancy are 60% less likely to switch from LARC as compared to those who were pregnant in their 15- 19 years old (AOR= 0.401;95% CI; 0.217,0.740) (Table 5).

4. Discussion

This study revealed that 27.6% of reproductive age women's exhibit switching from LARC. Marital status, women's educational status, fertility plan and partners' attitude on LARCs, were significantly associated with switching from LARC to short acting contraception. The prevalence of switching from LARC in this study is higher than the studies conducted in Jigjiga, and Agarfa, Ethiopia (4.2%) [20]. On the contrary, it is lower than a study conducted in Dire Dawa, Ethiopia (40.4%) [15] other 14 developing countries which indicated the prevalence of switching varies from 37.8% to 70.5% [25]. This discrepancy might be due to the difference counseling about LARC, study settings, socio cultural difference and period variation. The odd of switching from LARC was twelve times higher among unmarried women as compared to women who are married. This finding is inconsistent with the study done in Dire Dawa and Jigjig town (15, 21). This may be due to women who are married were planned in their fertility since they are always sexually active and they are more likely careful about unwanted pregnancy so they want more effective methods of contraception in the study area. Women who attain primary education were almost four times more likely to switch from LARC method to short acting contraceptive method as compared to those women who do not attain formal education. This finding is similar with the studies conducted in Jijiga, Ethiopia (21) and Senegal (4) it is inconsistent with the study in Gonder, Ghana and Honduran [10, 18,26]. In this study, the likelihood of switching from LARC to short acting contraception was three times higher among women whose husband opposes LARC as compared to those whose husband approves/support LARC method. This finding is in line with studies conducted in Nigeria and Dire Dawa, Ethiopia [15, 27]. This might be due to poor communication between couples in the study area. Likewise, women whose contraceptive intent was to space their fertility experience for child spacing purposes were 80% less likely to switch from long acting reversible contraceptive method as compared to women who want to limit birth. This is in line with the study conducted in Dire Dawa, Ethiopia [15]. But different from studies conducted in Jijiga and Jimma, Ethiopia [14, 21]. This might be probably due to the fact that women who do not want more children were not use specific method for recommended time instead they want to shift another modern contraceptive method. Furthermore, Women who were 20 years and above in their first pregnancy are 60% less likely to switch from LARC methods as compared to those who were pregnant in their 15-19 years old. This might be probably due to the fact that women who had pregnancy at their 20 years and above are married and want to space birth so they want to continue effective and long protective method of contraception. Generally, this study reported the magnitude of switching using interviewer-administered questionnaires. Due to the crosssectional nature of the study, the design could not allow causality to be inferred. Since the study was restricted to public health facilities, it was difficult to generalize to all reproductive age women living in the town. Thus, to minimize the effect of the aforementioned limitations scholars with similar interest are recommended to conduct a community-based study. Overall, the findings from this study are fundamental for policymakers to design appropriate intervention strategies to minimize switching from LARC.

5. Conclusions

In the study area, the proportion of switching from LARC was high. Being unmarried, women's having primary educational level, having plan to space birth, husband/ partners opposition on LARC and having age 20 and above at first pregnancy were statistically significant with switching from long acting reversible contraceptive method. Hence, much work is needed to minimize switching. Empowering women, making service relevant for husbands/partners to participate and their involvement should be considered to enhance LARC utilization at each level.

Reference

- [1]. Jaccard J. "Reducing Unplanned Pregnancies in Emerging Adulthood.". 2009.
- [2]. Singh KK, Singh BP. (January 2010). "Contraceptive discontinuation and switching patterns in Bangladesh".

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272794645_Contraceptive_discontinuation_and_switching_

- [3]. World Health Organization. ((Y·YY.: "Contraception discontinuation and switching in developing countries." Research policy brief. World Health Organization. https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/70932
- [4]. Fallon JB, Speizer IS, Calhoun LM, Corroon M. (2018,February) . "Women' s contraceptive discontinuation and switching behavior in urban Senegal , 2010 – 2015." BMC Women health,18. https://bmcwomenshealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12905-018-0529-9
- [5]. Staveteig S, Maliick L, Winter R. (2015, September). "Uptake and discontinuation of long acting reversible contraceptives in low-income countries." DHS Anal Stud., (54):1–59. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292615403_Uptake_and_Discontinuation_of_Long-Acting_Reversible_Contraceptives_LARCs_in_Low-Income_Countries
- [6]. Garrett, C.C., Keogh, L.A., Kavanagh, A. et al. (2015, September). "Understanding the low uptake of long-acting reversible contraception by young women in Australia: a qualitative study". BMC Women's Health, 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-015-0227-9;
- [7]. Mota, K., Reddy, S. & Getachew, B. (2015, July). "Unmet need of long-acting and permanent family planning methods among women in the reproductive age group in shashemene town, Oromia region, Ethiopia: a cross sectional study". BMC Women's Health, 15. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-015-0209-y
- [8]. Tadele, GA. (2017). "Early Discontinuation of Long Acting Reversible Contraceptives among Married and in Union Women: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis." Ann Med Heal Sci Res., 7.
- [9]. Khalifa M, Abdelaziz W, Sakr E. (2017, July). "Changes in Contraceptive Use Dynamics in Egypt:

Analysis of the 2008 and 2014 Demographic and Health Surveys." USAID.

- [10]. Barden-O'Fallon J, Speizer I. (2011, Mar) "What differentiates method stoppers from switchers? Contraceptive discontinuation and switching among honduran women. "Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 37(1):16–23. https://dx.doi.org/10.1363%2F3701611.
- [11]. Ministry of Health. Ethiopia. (2011). "National Guideline for Family Planning Services in Ethiopia."
- [12]. Singh S, Fetters T, Abdella A, Kumbi S.(2010, Mar). "The Estimated Incidence of Induced Abortion In Ethiopia, 2008". "Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 36(1). https://www.guttmacher.org/journals/ipsrh/2010/03/estimated-incidence-induced-abortion-ethiopia-2008
- [13]. Sheet F. (2018, Oct). "Contraceptive use in East Africa: What do the numbers tell us?" https://www.google.com/url?q=https://aphrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/FP-in-East-Africa-Fact-Sheet_October-2018.pdf
- [14]. Shiferaw Z, Mekonen L, Seifu W, Shine S. (2017). "Contraceptive Discontinuation, Method Switching and Associated Factors among Reproductive Age Women in Jimma Town, Southwest Ethiopia,2013". Fam Med Med Sci Res , 06(01):6–11from: https://www.omicsgroup.org/journals/contraceptivediscontinuation-methodswitching- and-associated-factors-amongreproductive-age-women-in-jimmatownsouthwest- ethiopia-2327-4972-1000213.php?aid=85728
- [15]. Atnafe M, Assefa N, Alemayehu T. (2017). "Long-acting family planning method switching among revisit clients of public health facilities in Dire Dawa, Ethiopia." Contracept Reprod Med , 1(1):18. http://contraceptionmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40834-016-0028-z
- [16]. Federal democratic republic of Ethiopia. Ethiopia Demographic health survey. 2016.
- [17]. Eshete A. (2015). "Contraceptive Method Mix Utilization and its Associated Factors among Married Women in Gedeo Zone, Southern Nations, Nationality and People Region- Ethiopia: A Community based Cross Sectional Study." Epidemiol Open Access 05(04):11–5. Available from: https://www.omicsonline.org/openaccess/
- [18]. Modey EJ, Aryeetey R, Adanu R. (2014, March)."Contraceptive discontinuation and switching among Ghanaian women: evidence from the Ghana Demographic and Health Survey, 2008." African Journal of Reproductive Health., 18(1):84-92. https://europepmc.org/article/med/24796172
- [19]. John W. (2012). "Family Planning Programs for the 21st Century Family Planning Programs for The 21st Century." https://www.popcouncil.org/research/family-planning-programs-for-the-21st-centuryrationale-and-design
- [20]. Bekele T, Gebremariam A, Tura P. (2015, September). "Contraceptive Choice and Switching Pattern among Married Women in Rural Community of South East Ethiopia." Family Medicine & Medical Science Research. DOI: 10.4172/2327-4972.1000139
- [21]. Shiferaw Z, Liyew M. (2018, March). "Prevalence and Factors Affecting Modern Contraceptive Switching Among Women of Child Bearing Age in Jijiga Town, Somali Region, Eastern Ethiopia". Journal of Family Medicine & Community Health, 5:2–7. https://www.jscimedcentral.com/FamilyMedicine/familymedicine-5-1147.pdf
- [22]. Bradley SEK, Schwandt HM, Khan S. Levels, "Trends, and Reasons for Contraceptive Discontinuation" https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/AS20/AS20.pdf

- [23]. Corroon M, Gueye A, Okigbo C. (2015, December). "Belief in Family Planning Myths at the Individual And Community Levels and Modern Contraceptive Use in Urban Africa." Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health, 41(4):191–9. doi: 10.1363/4119115
- [24]. Ali MM, Park MH, Ngo TD. (2014). "Levels and determinants of switching following intrauterine Device discontinuation in 14 developing countries" Academic research paper on "Health science, 90(1):47–53. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.contraception.2014.03.008
- [25]. Aregay, W, Azale, T., Sisay, M. et al. (2018, December). "Utilization of long acting reversible contraceptive methods and associated factors among female college students in Gondar town, northwest Ethiopia, institutional based cross-sectional study". BMC Res Notes, 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-018-3971-8
- [26]. Babalola S, John N. (2012). "Factors Underlying the Use of Long-Acting and Permanent Family Planning Methods in Nigeria: A Qualitative Study." http://www.respondproject.org/archive/files/4/4.1/4.1.3/Study5-2012-Factors-Underlining.pdf

Acknowledgement

Firstly, I would like to thank almighty God for his blessing throughout this study. Secondly, and for most I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisors Woiynshet Kelbore (MSc, Ass. professor) and Genet Assefa (Msc.) for their unreserved, support and enriching comment throughout the journey of this research project. Also, I would like to extend my acknowledgment to Arbaminch University, college of health science, for financial funding. I am also very grateful to Dilla town health beauro for providing the important information. Lastly, I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to the study participants and others who directly or indirectly involved in the study.