medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

A new content-qualified antenatal care coverage indicator: development and validation of a score using national health surveys

Luisa Arroyave[1,2]; Ghada E Saad[3]; Cesar G Victora[1,2]; Aluisio J D Barros[1,2]

Affiliations

[1] International Center for Equity in Health, Federal University of Pelotas, Pelotas, RS, Brazil

[2] Postgraduate Program in Epidemiology, Federal University of Pelotas, Pelotas, RS, Brazil

[3] Faculty of Health Sciences, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon

Corresponding Author:

Professor Aluisio J D Barros, Ph.D.
abarros@equidade.org
Rua Marechal Deodoro, 1160, 3rd floor. Pelotas, RS, Brazil. 96020-220

Luisa Arroyave – ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0642-8986
Ghada E Saad – ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6163-4822
Cesar G Victora – ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2465-2180
Aluisio J D Barros – ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2022-8729

Word count

Text: 3489 words
Abstract: 263 words
References: 34

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Introduction: Good quality antenatal care (ANC) helps reduce maternal and newborn mortality and morbidity, especially in low and middle-income countries (LMICs). Most studies that attempted to measure ANC quality proposed categorical indicators considering either contact with services or based on content, sometimes both. We aimed to create and validate a new indicator measured as a score, considering both contact and content.

Methods: We used Demographic and Health Surveys and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys. Information on ANC contact and content was used to build an adequacy score that would be applicable to all women in need of ANC. Cronbach's alpha and factor analysis were used to assess the proposed indicator. We also used a convergent validation approach, exploring the association with neonatal mortality.

Results: The proposed indicator (ANCq) is derived from the number of visits, timing of the first visit, skill level of the attendant, blood pressure measurement, tetanus toxoid vaccination and collection of blood and urine samples. The validity assessment showed satisfactory results with Cronbach's alpha coefficient equal to 0.82. ANCq score ranges from 0 to 10. The overall mean of ANCq in 63 LMICs with data was 6.7, ranging from 3.5 in Afghanistan to 9.3 in Cuba and the Dominican Republic. In most countries, higher scores of ANCq were associated with lower neonatal mortality, with pooled odds ratio of 0.90 (95% CI: 0.88-0.92).

Conclusion: ANCq allows the assessment of ANC in LMICs considering contact with services and content of care. ANCq presented good validity properties, being a useful tool for assessing ANC coverage and adequacy of care in monitoring and accountability exercises.

Keywords: Antenatal Care, Neonatal Mortality, Indicator, Health Surveys.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Key questions

What is already known?

- Antenatal care (ANC) is an important part of primary healthcare, being associated with reductions in maternal and new-born morbidity and mortality, mainly in low and middle-income countries (LMICs).
- Several indicators have been proposed to measured ANC quality either through contacts with services or based on content of care, or sometimes both. Several of the proposed indicators are applicable only to women who had at least one ANC visit, and measured quality as a categorical indicator.
- Consensus on the need for a more comprehensive ANC indicator that is suitable for monitoring progress, including aspects of quality of care.

What are the new findings?

- We proposed a content-qualified ANC indicator in the form of a score, called ANCq. It includes seven different variables related to contact with services and content of care received during pregnancy. The indicator is applicable to all pregnant women.
- The indicator has good validity properties and was inversely associated with neonatal mortality.
- There is wide variation across countries regarding the average ANCq score, and large within-country variation at individual level. Latin America and the Caribbean and East Asia and the Pacific are the best performing regions.

What do the new findings imply?

- The proposed indicator provides a standardized and comparable measure of ANC adequacy, allowing for comparisons between and within countries.
- The indicator can help monitoring ANC progress to all women in need of ANC, with several advantages over currently existing indicators: it is applicable to all pregnant women independent of having accessed ANC services, it includes serval aspects of ANC content and, being a score, provides a gradation of how suitable ANC was.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Antenatal care (ANC) is considered an essential part of basic primary healthcare during pregnancy, offering services that can prevent, detect and treat pregnancy-related risk factors to achieve a reduction in maternal and newborn morbidity and mortality.[1–7]

Despite multiple efforts towards increasing coverage of ANC services and improve their quality, success has been limited in low and middle-income countries (LMICs),[8] where maternal and neonatal mortality remain high.[7,9] Further efforts are still required to achieve the 2030 agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), specifically target 3 that seeks to ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages.

In 2016, the World Health Organization (WHO) published a new series of recommendations to update existing guidelines. The recommended number of ANC contacts was increased from four to eight, based on recent evidence indicating that a "higher frequency of ANC contacts by women and adolescent girls with a health provider is associated with a reduced likelihood of stillbirths".[10] The recommended timing for the first ANC visit remained within the first trimester of pregnancy. [10,11] These recommendations were aimed at reducing the risk of stillbirths and pregnancy complications, providing women with a "positive pregnancy experience", and improving the quality of ANC.[11]

There is consensus in the literature that ANC quality should not be solely measured through the number of visits, and that monitoring indicators should also include information on content of the care received by the women,[11,12] particularly regarding an essential set of interventions and assessments that are required for every pregnancy. [13]

Several authors have proposed different types of quality indicators for ANC.[3,5–8,12,14–17] Some have proposed binary indicators (e.g. good vs. poor quality)[5–7] or categorical classifications (e.g. good, acceptable, poor),[3] taking into account the number of interventions received by pregnant women. In most studies, good quality in ANC was defined as having received all or most of the components considered.[5,6,15,16] Another strategy to create a "quality index" was proposed by Dettrick et al. using data from Indonesia,[17] by principal components analysis to derive weights and calculate a score.

Most available indicators of ANC quality are restricted to pregnant women who had at least one ANC visit, thus leaving out those who did not receive any care, yet have a need for ANC. Although there is consensus among researchers on the need for a comprehensive ANC quality indicator for monitoring progress, none of the proposed measures has been widely adopted.[18]

In this article we propose an indicator of ANC in the form of a score that includes both

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

contact with ANC services and the content of care received during pregnancy. The indicator is applicable to all women in need of ANC and may be assessed through national health surveys. In a convergent validation exercise, we explored how our indicator was associated with neonatal mortality.

Methods

We used data from Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) and Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS), which are nationally representative household surveys providing data on a wide range of health indicators with a focus in reproductive, maternal and child health. Several questions refer to ANC, with information on different recommended interventions.[19–21] DHS and MICS use standardized data collection procedures across countries, so that data are comparable across surveys and between the two families of surveys.[20]

We analyzed the most recent survey for each country with publicly available datasets, carried out since 2010. Data on ANC refers to the last child born to each woman aged 15-49 years. The recall period includes five years before the survey for DHS, and two years for MICS.

The rationale that guided us in building this new ANC indicator was:

1. To create a single indicator including information on contact with health services and content of care received;
2. To cover all women in need of ANC - as expected from the denominator of a coverage indicator – rather than restricting it to women with at least one ANC visit;
3. Instead of a categorical indicator (e.g. “adequate” or “inadequate”, to develop a numerical score providing a measure of adequacy. A score ranging from 0 to 10 seemed the most intuitive;
4. To group of the number of ANC visits into categories, based on current and previous WHO recommendations;
5. To assign equal weights to all interventions, given that their importance may vary depending on the context, and also from woman to woman;
6. To include component items that are deemed desirable in a good quality ANC, namely a first visit during the first trimester of gestation; at least one visit with a skilled provider and as many ANC-related interventions as possible in a way to maximize the number of surveys for which the indicator is applicable.

Our first step was to identify all questions related to ANC available in DHS and MICS,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

especially those about specific interventions, which are the most variable from one survey to another (Table S1). Next, we determined the number of countries with available information for each question in order to select those that could be used in the score (Table S2).

Using variables that are available in a large proportion of available surveys, we gave arbitrary values to each ANC component, as described in Table 1 in the results section.

To verify the internal consistency of our indicator, we calculated Cronbach's alpha. We also conducted confirmatory factor analysis [22] to assessed whether the indicator was compatible with a one factor solution and its goodness of fit. Given the non-normal nature of the variables, factor analysis was adjusted using robust maximum likelihood estimation. The standardized root mean squared residual and the coefficient of determination were evaluated. Standardized root mean squared residual measures the difference between the residuals of the sample covariance matrix and the hypothesized model while the coefficient of determination indicates how well the model fits.

In the absence of a gold standard to which our indicator could be compared, we carried out convergent validation exercises for external validity. It is widely accepted that a good quality ANC will reduce the risk of neonatal mortality.[23,24] Therefore, we used data on this outcome to assess associations with our proposed score.

Using the birth history recorded in the surveys, we defined as a neonatal death those occurring during the first 30 days of life (the usual definition used in surveys given deaths occurring around the end of the first month being reported as happening at one month of age). For neonatal mortality analysis, we only used DHS because we can directly link the relevant datasets needed. Also, we included those DHS surveys with more than 10 neonatal deaths. The last child born alive for the women in the previous five years were included in the analyses.

We used logistic regression to analyze the relationship of our proposed score with neonatal mortality, estimating an odds ratio for each country. This allowed us to assess the direction of association in each country, and its significance. We then pooled all surveys and obtained an overall estimate using a meta-analytic approach, based on random effects pooling of the odds ratios. The results are presented as pooled odds ratios and forest plots.

We also adjusted the effect of ANCq in the logistic regression models by wealth, women's age and education in order to examine whether its effect was independent of these sociodemographic variables. Finally, to allow for non-linearity in the association, we used a fractional polynomial approach to find the best fitting model for the pooled data.

Finally, we compared the performance of our indicator in predicting neonatal mortality with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

other existing indicators in the literature that were applied for a set of surveys and not just for a specific country (Table S4). For that, we calculated the area under the ROC curve (AUC) for each indicator along with its confidence interval, as a measure of how well the indicators can predict the outcome.

The analyses were performed using Stata (StataCorp. 2017. Stata Statistical Software: Release 16. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC), always taking into account the survey design (clustering and sampling weights).

The study was based on an anonymized publicly available data, so that the analyses did not require ethical clearance. This was done by each of the institutions responsible for carrying out the original surveys.

Results

We identified and examined 99 surveys with national samples carried out since 2010, either DHS or MICS. Seven variables related to ANC coverage and quality were present in 63 surveys, of which three were related to contact with services: timing of the first visit, at least one visit with a skilled provider and the total number of visits. The remaining four variables were related to interventions: blood pressure measurement, blood and urine samples collection, and administration of at least two shots of tetanus toxoid.

The 63 surveys (42 DHS and 21 MICS) were conducted from 2010 to 2017 in LMICs from six UNICEF world regions. In total, we studied 583,602 women with a live birth in the 5 (DHS) or 2 (MICS) years before the survey.

The proposed score, which we refer to as ANCq, ranges from 0 to 10 points. Table 1 shows that each variable was coded as zero or one, except for number of visits (range from zero to three) and being seen by a skilled provider (zero for “no” and two for “yes”), given the relevance of the number of visits and type of provider for ANC quality. Providers considered as skilled included doctors, midwives, nurses and other attendants considered as skilled by each country, such as auxiliary midwives. The total score ranges from zero for women with no ANC to 10, for women who received full points for all items.

The validity assessment of the indicator showed satisfactory results, with Cronbach's alpha coefficient equal to 0.82. The confirmatory factor analysis indicated that a single factor solution was adequate, with the first factor presenting an eigenvalue of 3.68 and explaining 52.5% of the total variance in the set of 7 variables included. All other factors had eigenvalues below 1, which is the usual cut off value for selecting relevant factors. The

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

loadings of the variables ranged from 0.31 for tetanus injection to 0.84 for blood pressure measure, all above the recommended cut off of 0.30 for loadings). The confirmatory analysis indicated the model fits the data reasonably well with a standardized root mean squared residual = 0.05 (values less than 0.08 are recommended) and a coefficient of determination = 0.886 (of a maximum value of 1).

The median for the country estimates showed that, 49.8% of woman reported having attended between 4 and 7 visits. Most women reported receiving care from a skilled provider (95.8%) and 54.9% having started in the first trimester. Of the four content interventions, the most often reported was blood pressure measurement (92.5%) (Table 2).

The distribution of the ANCq scores for all countries pooled together is presented in Figure 1. The overall mean score was 6.7. For 54.9% of the women, the score ranged from 7 to 9 points, with 8 and 9 being the most frequent values (approximately 20% each). The overall proportion of women with no ANC was 6.9%. Figure 1 also shows the distribution of each intervention, according to the ANCq score in points. Women with one point received mainly tetanus toxoid and nothing else (97%), even though they did not attend ANC.

The country specific means of ANCq ranged between 3.5 for Afghanistan to 9.3 in Cuba and the Dominican Republic. Figure 2 presents box and whisker plots for ANCq by country, grouped by UNICEF world region. There is wide variation in ANCq within countries, between countries and between regions. Table S3 in the supplementary material presents the means and quartile cut-off points for each country.

To explore how our ANCq score relates with neonatal mortality, we used 42 DHS with more than 10 neonatal deaths reported in the 5 years before the survey. In 27 countries the odds ratios were consistent with protection, given that their confidence intervals did not include the unity (results summarized as a forest plot, Figure S1). In 11 countries, the odds ratios were below one, and in four countries above one, but in all these cases the confidence intervals included the unity. The pooled odds ratio estimate was 0.90 (95% CI: 0.88-0.92) - each additional point in the score reduces the odds of neonatal mortality by 10%. There was moderate heterogeneity between countries (I^2:60.2%).

Adjusting the model for wealth, women's age and education had a very small impact on the estimated odds ratio, and it remained significantly indicative of protection for neonatal mortality (adjusted OR: 0.92; 95% CI: 0.91-0.93).

Finally, we used the pooled dataset to explore in more detail the shape of the association between ANCq and the outcome. A fractional polynomial approach within logistic regression was used to allow for non-linearity in the association. This approach slightly improved the fit compared to the logit linear model ($p<0.001$). The graph of the resulting model is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

presented in Figure 3. We observed that the drop in mortality rate from score zero to one was the largest, followed by progressive declines following closely a straight line. On average, the neonatal mortality rate predicted for women with no ANC (zero score) was 33 deaths per thousand live births, whereas a rate of 10 per thousand was predicted for those with the maximum score of 10.

The estimation of AUCs for the four available indicators showed that ANCq presented the highest AUC (0.58; 95% CI: 0.57-0.59), followed by the indicators by Amouzou et al. [24] (0.57; 95% CI: 0.56-0.57), Arsenault et al. [8] (ROC: 0.52; 95% CI: 0.51-0.53) and Carvajal [15] (ROC: 0.50; 95% CI: 0.50-0.50).

Discussion

We proposed an ANC score indicator that comprises both contact with health services and content of care that was estimated for 63 countries, using DHS and MICS surveys. Higher scores were associated with lower neonatal mortality, suggesting that the indicator is capturing relevant aspects of ANC. The indicator presented wide variation between and within countries, may be estimated from health surveys, and is a useful tool for monitoring progress in ANC, including aspects related to adequacy of care.

Average national scores ranged from 3.5, in Afghanistan, to 9.3 in Cuba and the Dominican Republic. Latin America and the Caribbean was the region with higher average scores and less variability between countries. Although our results show that globally more than half of women scored between 7 and 9 points (55%), 7% received no care during pregnancy, which may be explained by contextual and individual factors [25,26]. A systematic review of factors affecting the utilization of ANC in LMICs showed that maternal education, household income, cultural belief and place of residence have an important influence on ANC coverage.[27]

Our study has some limitations that should be noted. Whereas the surveys are nationally representative and comparable in terms of sampling strategy and data collection methods,[21] there is ample variability in the information collected on ANC, and in most cases, the information on content is limited to a few variables. Specifically, many MICS lacked information on iron supplementation, one of the key ANC interventions. In order to estimate ANCq for a larger set of countries, it was only possible to include four interventions, and iron supplementation was excluded. Likewise, several other evidence-based ANC interventions were left out.[28] As a result, the score may overestimate ANC adequacy. However, it is likely that interventions are highly correlated and, in this case, a subset of these may provide reasonable estimates of overall quality. Another limitation is that the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

information is based on self-report, and for DHS this may refer to care received during a pregnancy that took place up to five years before the survey.

The decision to attribute points to each item arbitrarily is debatable. Our starting point was to give equal weights to all available evidence-based interventions - since it is difficult to assess their relative importance – and to give higher weight to the number of visits and the type of provider. Most other studies measuring the quality of ANC through scores also gave arbitrary weights for each item, and most often the same weight for each intervention included.[29–32] Others relied upon data driven approaches such as principal components analyses,[17,33] but this ignores any theory in terms of the weights assigned. We started with a theoretical construct, and then showed that it was consistent with principal components results. The validity assessment of our proposed indicator through Cronbach's alpha and confirmatory factor analysis also presented satisfactory results.

The loading for tetanus injection before birth was considerably lower compared to the other variables. One possible reason is that it is possible to receive tetanus immunization outside the context of ANC visits, and also that its indication during pregnancy is also determined by past history of immunization. Unfortunately, this cannot be ascertained with the information available in the surveys. Despite the weaker loading for this variable, we decided to keep it in our indicator given its importance in preventing neonatal tetanus.

Our proposed indicator, the ANCq, was estimated in a large number of surveys, including both DHS and MICS. Most published studies on the quality of ANC were conducted using a single survey, which has the advantage of including a larger number of quality indicators according to national recommendations. [5,7,30,34] However, this approach does not lend itself for a global monitoring indicator. The study by Arsenault et al. analysed 91 DHS and MIC,[8] but to do so the authors only took into account three ANC interventions – having blood pressure checked and urine and blood sample collected, thus rendering the indicator less representative of what is perceived as adequate care. Other studies have also analysed ANC quality - either as an outcome or exposure variable – using selected surveys. However, only a few DHS and MICS have information for all variables included in those proposed indicators (Table S4). Lastly, most quality indicators have completely left out pregnancy women who did not have any ANC visits, and therefore did not measure population coverage.

Given the lack of a gold standard indicator for ANC quality in surveys, we resorted to a convergent validation strategy. An outcome presumed to be related to ANC was chosen – neonatal mortality - and we showed that ANCq is monotonically and inversely associated it - the higher the score, the lower the associated risk. Similar associations have been reported in previous studies.[23,24] One study from Zimbabwe reported reduction of 42.3%,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

30.9% and 28.7% in neonatal, infant and under-five mortality, respectively, for children whose mothers received good quality ANC.[23] It should be noted that we explored the association between ANCq and neonatal mortality in order to conduct a convergent validation strategy. We did not want to create a predictor of mortality with the ANCq.

Studies of quality of ANC among attenders [8,15] are well suited to answer the question of quality of services and have a place in the quality literature. We explicitly chose to propose a coverage indicator with all women in need of ANC in the denominator, that would also include aspects of ANC content, and thus head in the direction of measuring effective coverage. We also favored a more nuanced, numerical score rather than a yes or no indicator. We believe that the development of a graded indicator of effective coverage – in spite of the limitations inherent to survey data - offers us a powerful tool for ANC monitoring in the context of the SDGs.

Acknowledgements: We thank the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the Wellcome Trust, Associação Brasileira de Saúde Coletiva and Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES) for funding this study. We are thankful to Cintia Borges and Thiago Melo for your help in the graphic design.

Contributors: LA and AJDB conceptualized the paper and conducted the analyses, with support from CVG and GEH. LA interpreted the results and wrote the manuscript with technical support from AJDB. AJDB, GEH and CGV contributed to critically review the analysis and writing. AJDB originally proposed the idea of the indicator and advised on the analysis. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding: This study was supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, through Countdown to 2030 (OPP1148933), the Wellcome Trust (grant 101815/Z/13/Z), Associação Brasileira de Saúde Coletiva and Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES).

Competing interests: We have no competing interest to declare.

Patient consent for publication: Not required.

Data availability statement: The original datasets from DHS (http://dhsprogram.com/) and MICS (http://mics.unicef.org/) are freely available.

Open access: This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

References

1. World Health Organization. WHO | Essential interventions, commodities and guidelines for reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health [Internet]. WHO. [cited 2019 May 29]. Available from: https://www.who.int/pmnch/media/press/2011/20111215_essential_interventions_pr/en/

2. Uneke CJ, Uro-Chukwu HC. Improving quality of antenatal care through provision of medical supply kits. Lancet Glob Health. 2018 Jan 1;6(1):e4–5.

3. Tetui M, Ekirapa EK, Bua J, Mutebi A, Tweheyo R, Waiswa P. Quality of Antenatal care services in eastern Uganda: implications for interventions. Pan Afr Med J [Internet]. 2012 09 [cited 2019 Jan 14];13. Available from: http://www.panafrican-med-journal.com/content/article/13/27/full/

4. Rani M, Bonu S, Harvey S. Differentials in the quality of antenatal care in India. Int J Qual Health Care. 2008 Feb 1;20(1):62–71.

5. Fagbamigbe AF, Idemudia ES. Assessment of quality of antenatal care services in Nigeria: evidence from a population-based survey. Reprod Health [Internet]. 2015 Sep 18 [cited 2017 Aug 28];12. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4574449/

6. Joshi C, Torvaldsen S, Hodgson R, Hayen A. Factors associated with the use and quality of antenatal care in Nepal: a population-based study using the demographic and health survey data. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2014 Mar 3;14:94.

7. Kyei NNA, Chansa C, Gabrysch S. Quality of antenatal care in Zambia: a national assessment. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2012 Dec 13;12:151.

8. Arsenault C, Jordan K, Lee D, Dinsa G, Manzi F, Marchant T, et al. Equity in antenatal care quality: an analysis of 91 national household surveys. Lancet Glob Health. 2018 Nov 1;6(11):e1186–95.

9. Betrán AP, Bergel E, Griffin S, Melo A, Nguyen MH, Carbonell A, et al. Provision of medical supply kits to improve quality of antenatal care in Mozambique: a stepped-wedge cluster randomised trial. Lancet Glob Health. 2018 Jan 1;6(1):e57–65.

10. World Health Organization. WHO | WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience [Internet]. WHO. [cited 2019 May 29]. Available from: http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/maternal_perinatal_health/anc-positive-pregnancy-experience/en/

11. World Health Organization WHO. New guidelines on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience [Internet]. WHO. 2016 [cited 2019 May 27]. Available from: http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/news/antenatal-care/en/

12. Ataguba JE-O. A reassessment of global antenatal care coverage for improving maternal health using sub-Saharan Africa as a case study. PLOS ONE. 2018 Oct 5;13(10):e0204822.

13. Owili PO, Muga MA, Mendez BR, Chen B. Quality of care in six sub-Saharan Africa countries: a provider-based study on adherence to WHO's antenatal care guideline. Int J Qual Health Care. 2019 Feb 1;31(1):43–8.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

14. Hodgins S, D'Agostino A. The quality–coverage gap in antenatal care: toward better measurement of effective coverage. Glob Health Sci Pract. 2014 Apr 8;2(2):173–81.

15. Carvajal-Aguirre L, Amouzou A, Mehra V, Ziqi M, Zaka N, Newby H. Gap between contact and content in maternal and newborn care: An analysis of data from 20 countries in sub-Saharan Africa. J Glob Health. 2017 Dec;7(2):020501.

16. Muchie KF. Quality of antenatal care services and completion of four or more antenatal care visits in Ethiopia: a finding based on a demographic and health survey. BMC PREGNANCY CHILDBIRTH. 2017 Sep 11;17.

17. Dettrick Z, Gouda HN, Hodge A, Jimenez-Soto E. Measuring Quality of Maternal and Newborn Care in Developing Countries Using Demographic and Health Surveys. PLOS ONE. 2016 Jun 30;11(6):e0157110.

18. Duysburgh E, Williams A, Williams J, Loukanova S, Temmerman M. Quality of antenatal and childbirth care in northern Ghana. BJOG Int J Obstet Gynaecol. 2014;121(s4):117–26.

19. Boerma JT, Sommerfelt AE. Demographic and health surveys (DHS): contributions and limitations. World Health Stat Q Rapp Trimest Stat Sanit Mond. 1993;46(4):222–6.

20. DHS. The DHS Program - Quality information to plan, monitor and improve population, health, and nutrition programs [Internet]. [cited 2019 Apr 8]. Available from: https://dhsprogram.com/

21. Corsi DJ, Neuman M, Finlay JE, Subramanian SV. Demographic and health surveys: a profile. Int J Epidemiol. 2012 Dec;41(6):1602–13.

22. Acock AC. Discovering Structural Equation Modeling Using Stata: Revised Edition. 1 edition. College Station, Tex: Stata Press; 2013. 306 p.

23. Makate M, Makate C. The impact of prenatal care quality on neonatal, infant and child mortality in Zimbabwe: evidence from the demographic and health surveys. Health Policy Plan. 2017 Apr 1;32(3):395–404.

24. Amouzou A, Ziqi M, Carvajal-Aguirre L, Quinley J. Skilled attendant at birth and newborn survival in Sub-Saharan Africa. J Glob Health. 2017 Dec;7(2):020504.

25. Mourtada R, Bottomley C, Houben F, Bashour H, Campbell OMR. A mixed methods analysis of factors affecting antenatal care content: A Syrian case study. PloS One. 2019;14(3):e0214375.

26. Amo-Adjei J, Aduo-Adjei K, Opoku-Nyamah C, Izugbara C. Analysis of socioeconomic differences in the quality of antenatal services in low and middle-income countries (LMICs). PLOS ONE. 2018 Feb 23;13(2).

27. Simkhada B, Teijlingen ER van, Porter M, Simkhada P. Factors affecting the utilization of antenatal care in developing countries: systematic review of the literature. J Adv Nurs. 2008 Feb;61(3):244–60.

28. World Health Organization. WHO | The new Lancet Series: Maternal health 2016 [Internet]. WHO. [cited 2020 Feb 26]. Available from: http://www.who.int/life-course/news/events/lancet-series-maternal-health-2016/en/

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

29. Agha S, Williams E. Quality of antenatal care and household wealth as determinants of institutional delivery in Pakistan: Results of a cross-sectional household survey. Reprod Health. 2016 Jul 19;13.

30. Islam MM, Masud MS. Determinants of frequency and contents of antenatal care visits in Bangladesh: Assessing the extent of compliance with the WHO recommendations. PLOS ONE. 2018 Sep 27;13(9).

31. Habibov NN, Fan L. Does prenatal healthcare improve child birthweight outcomes in Azerbaijan? Results of the national Demographic and Health Survey. Econ Hum Biol. 2011 Jan;9(1):56–65.

32. Habibov NN. On the socio-economic determinants of antenatal care utilization in Azerbaijan: evidence and policy implications for reforms. Health Econ POLICY LAW. 2011 Apr;6(2):175–203.

33. Dixit P, Khan J, Dwivedi LK, Gupta A. Dimensions of antenatal care service and the alacrity of mothers towards institutional delivery in South and South East Asia. PloS One. 2017;12(7):e0181793.

34. Dettrick Z, Gouda HN, Hodge A, Jimenez-Soto E. Measuring Quality of Maternal and Newborn Care in Developing Countries Using Demographic and Health Surveys. PLOS ONE. 2016 Jun 30;11(6):e0157110.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Figures and tables



Figure 1. ANCq score distribution using DHS and MICS surveys from 63 low- and middle-income countries. Source: DHS and MICS, 2010-2017.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. ANCq score distribution for each country grouped by UNICEF regions of the world. Source: DHS and MICS, 2010-2017

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Predicted probabilities of dying in the first 30 days of life (neonatal mortality) according to the ANCq score. Source: DHS and MICS, 2010-2017

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Scoring of the variables that compose the content-qualified ANC indicator, ANCq

Contact with ANC services		**Points**
Number of ANC visits	0 visits	0
	1-3 visits	1
	4-7 visits	2
	8 or more visits	3
ANC started in the first trimester	No	0
	Yes	1
Skilled provider in at least one visit	No	0
	Yes	2
ANC content		**Points**
Blood pressure measured	No	0
	Yes	1
Blood sample collected	No	0
	Yes	1
Urine sample collected	No	0
	Yes	1
Received tetanus toxoid (at least one shot)	No	0
	Yes	1

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.02.28.20028720; this version posted February 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Median and interquartile range for the country estimates using DHS and MICS surveys from 63 low- and middle-income countries**.** Source: DHS and MICS, 2010-2017.

Variable	Median	IQR
Number of ANC visits		
Zero visits	2.5	0.1 - 6.5
1-3 visits	22.9	9.2 - 36.3
4-7 visits	49.8	32.8 - 57.7
8 or more visits	13.7	3.9 - 35.2
ANC with skilled attendant		
Yes	95.8	89.4 - 98.9
ANC started in first trimester of pregnancy		
Yes	54.9	37.6 - 70.6
Blood pressure measured in ANC visit		
Yes	92.5	79.3 - 96.8
Blood sample taken in ANC visit		
Yes	85.9	67.0 - 94.5
Urine sample taken in ANC visit		
Yes	82.5	53.7 - 93.4
2+ tetanus injections before birth		
Yes	55.56	40.1 - 62.8