

Predictors of voluntary uptake of modern contraceptive methods in rural Sindh, Pakistan

MEMON, Zahid, MIAN, Abeer, AHMED, Wardah, JAWWAD, Muhammad, MUHAMMAD, Shah, NOORANI, Abdul Qayyum, BHUTTA, Zulfiqar and SOLTANI, Hora http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9611-6777

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

http://shura.shu.ac.uk/33527/

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

MEMON, Zahid, MIAN, Abeer, AHMED, Wardah, JAWWAD, Muhammad, MUHAMMAD, Shah, NOORANI, Abdul Qayyum, BHUTTA, Zulfiqar and SOLTANI, Hora (2024). Predictors of voluntary uptake of modern contraceptive methods in rural Sindh, Pakistan. PLOS Global Public Health, 4 (4): e0002419.

Copyright and re-use policy

See http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html

	Female Sterilization	Male Sterilization	IUD (Intrauterine Device)	Injection	Implants	Pills	Condom	SDM (Standard Days Method)	Lactation amen method (LAM)	Rhythm method	Withdrawal
No of children						-					
1	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.6%)	16 (6.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)
2	4 (1.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	21 (8.3%)	3 (0.9%)	16 (6.1%)	15 (5.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.7%)
3	6 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.4%)	20 (7.6%)	4 (1.5%)	12 (4.2%)	12 (4.1%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)
4 or more children	99 (11.5%)	1 (0.1%)	10 (1.1%)	65 (7.5%)	29 (3.3%)	29 (3.3%)	44 (4.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.3%)	13 (0.9%)
Respondent's age						-					
15-19	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (6.9%)	1 (1.5%)	2 (6.7%)	1 (1.6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
20-24	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (7.5%)	1 (0.6%)	5 (2.2%)	15 (8.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
25-29	7 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	14 (4.5%)	1 (0.4%)	15 (4.8%)	13 (4.8%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (1.2%)
30-34	20 (5%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.4%)	37 (8.7%)	11 (2.3%)	16 (3.2%)	25 (5.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.7%)	7 (1.6%)
35-39	48 (13.8%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (1.2%)	22 (6%)	7 (2.1%)	13 (4.4%)	22 (5.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.3 %)
40 or above	34 (9.8%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.1%)	24 (7.4%)	15 (4.3%)	11 (2.5%)	11 (2.6%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	4 (1.1%)
Respondent'sEducation	l					-					
No education	70 (6.3%)	0 (0%)	10 (0.8%)	84 (7%)	30 (2.5%)	40 (3.2%)	38 (2.8%)	1 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)	3 (0.2%)	10(0.8%)
Primary	26 (10.1%)	1 (0.5%)	2 (0.8%)	18 (7.9%)	3 (1.3%)	12 (5.4%)	16 (6.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (2.6%)
Middle	6 (9.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7 (13.1%)	0 (0%)	2 (2.8%)	4 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Secondary	3 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (1.2%)	2 (2.7%)	12 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3(4.4%)
Intermediate or above	4 (3.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	2 (1.9%)	6 (5.4%)	17 (18.2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Huband's Education											
No education	34 (6.1%)	1 (0.2%)	7 (0.9%)	54 (8.8%)	19 (2.8%)	25 (3.9%)	14 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.3%)
Primary	16 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	21 (5.9%)	6 (1.7%)	7 (2%)	16 (4.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.5%)
Middle	9 (8.8%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	10 (9%)	3 (3.8%)	6 (5.2%)	10 (8.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.8%)
Secondary	17 (7.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.7%)	11 (5%)	7 (3.3%)	7 (3.3%)	13 (5.6%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0%)	4 (1.8%)
Intermediate or above	33 (8.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.8%)	17 (5.2%)	1 (0.3%)	17 (4.3%)	34 (9.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.8%)
Wealth Index											

S2_Table. Distribution of MCM among sociodemographic characteristics

Poorest	15 (4.3%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.5%)	28 (8.4%)	6 (2%)	11 (3.7%)	5 (1.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.7%)
Poor	15 (4.5%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.7%)	22 (7.9%)	9 (2.7%)	8 (2.6%)	6 (1.5%)	1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.7%)
Middle	22 (7.3%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.8%)	30 (8.5%)	10 (2.7%)	14 (3.7%)	9 (2.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	5 (1.4%)
Rich	30 (9.6%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	21 (5.7%)	7 (2.2%)	15 (4.1%)	25 (7.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.9%)
Richest	27 (7.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	12 (4%)	4 (1.1%)	14 (3.8%)	42 (11.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.6%)	7 (2.0%)