

1 **Ignoring the elephant in the room: factors contributing to inadequate access**
2 **to condoms and sources of condoms during novel coronavirus diseases 2019 in**
3 **South Africa.**

4 Obasanjo Afolabi Bolarinwa ^{1,2*}

5 *¹Discipline of Public Health Medicine, School of Nursing and Public Health, University of*
6 *KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa; ²Department of Demography and Social Statistics,*
7 *Faculty of Social Sciences, Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria.*

8
9 *Corresponding Author: Obasanjo Afolabi Bolarinwa, Email: bolarinwaobasanjo@gmail.com,
10 +27838467184.

11

12 **Author contributions**

13 OAB conceptualized the study, wrote the first draft, analyzed & interpreted the results, and
14 overall edited the manuscript.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 **Abstract**

24 Evidence has shown that the prescribed lockdown and physical distancing due to the novel
25 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) have made accessing essential health care services much
26 difficult in low-and middle-income countries (LMICs). Access to contraception is essential and
27 should not be denied, even in a global crisis, because it is associated with several health benefits.
28 It is paramount to maintain timely access to contraception without unnecessary barriers. Hence,
29 this study examines the factors contributing to limited access to condoms and sources of
30 condoms during the COVID-19 pandemic in South Africa (SA).The first secondary dataset on
31 coronavirus from the National Income Dynamic Study (NIDS) conducted in SA during the
32 coronavirus pandemic was employed in this study. This study involved 4,517 respondents. Data
33 were analysed using frequency analysis, chi-square test and binary logistic regression analysis.
34 Almost one-quarter of South Africans could not access condoms, and every 7 in 10 South
35 Africans preferred public or government hospitals as a source of condoms. Female South
36 Africans (aOR=0.86; 95% CI=0.69-1.08), those aged 35-45 (aOR=0.96; 95% CI=0.73-1.28) and
37 those residing in KwaZulu-Natal province (aOR=0.30; 95% CI=0.17-0.52) were 14%, 4% and
38 70% respectively less likely to have access to condoms during the COVID-19 lockdown.
39 Findings from the study suggest strategies and interventions that will be tailored towards non-
40 obstruction of contraception access during the on-going COVID-19 or any future pandemic.
41 Moreover, special consideration should be given to certain provinces, the uneducated and those
42 in the 4th quintile of wealth-income in South Africa.

43 **Keywords:** Access, Sources, Condoms, sexual and reproductive health, COVID-19, South
44 Africa.

45

46 **Introduction**

47 The coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak has revealed how strikingly unprepared the
48 world is for a pandemic and how easily viruses spread in our interconnected world (1). It has also
49 been shown to be highly contagious (2), and this has radically changed social relations in the
50 world (3).

51 The strain that the outbreak imposes on health systems will undoubtedly impact the sexual and
52 reproductive health of individuals living in low-and middle-income countries (LMICs) (4, 5)
53 with such consequences as halt the supply of contraceptive products, including condoms, due to
54 restriction imposed as a result of lockdown and physical distancing (6, 7).

55 Developing countries within Sub-Saharan Africa and Southern Asia bears the maximum burden
56 of unmet need for modern contraceptives, accounting for 57% of total global unmet needs, of
57 which 39% of these women reside in developing countries (8). Despite the doubling in the
58 number of women consuming modern contraceptive methods from 470 million in 1990 to around
59 840 million in 2019, an estimated 214 million women in developing countries still had unmet
60 needs for contraceptives (8).

61 This is equally apparent as Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) region continues to have the lowest
62 contraceptive prevalence at 24% and the highest level of unmet need at 25% (9). There are
63 numerous barriers to receiving high-quality healthcare in SSA (10). However, multiple factors
64 such as poverty, illiteracy, lack of knowledge and awareness about contraceptives, non-
65 availability of contraceptives and other factors have been linked to low use of contraceptive in
66 this region (8), but the most recent is the limited access to sexual and reproductive healthcare
67 (SRH) services which makes accessibility of contraception limited (11).

68 Healthcare access is defined as the opportunity to identify healthcare needs, seek healthcare
69 services, reach, obtain or use healthcare services, and require services fulfilled (12). It's pertinent
70 to know that access to required medications or services is central to achieving universal health
71 coverage (13). For instance, a recent study in Italy concluded that nine out of every fifteen adults
72 indulged in risky sexual behaviour due to lack of access to condoms due to coronavirus outbreak
73 in the country (14).

74 Evidence has also shown that the prescribed lockdown and physical distancing due to COVID-19
75 have made accessing essential health care much more difficult in LMICs (15). Access to
76 contraception is essential and should not be denied, even in the time of a global crisis (16).
77 Effective contraception significantly reduces maternal mortality by preventing unintended
78 pregnancy and the inherent risks associated with pregnancy; for these reasons and more, it is
79 paramount to maintain timely access to contraception without unnecessary barriers (16).

80 Guttmacher Institute Authors and other studies estimated that if there were a 10% decline over a
81 year in the use of contraception as a result of inadequate access because of the ongoing
82 pandemic, an additional of over 48 million women would have an unmet need for contraception
83 worldwide, resulting in more than 15 million additional unintended pregnancies (17-19), which
84 may lead to unsafe abortions and higher extra spending in the future on sexual and reproductive
85 health outcomes as a result of coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic (20-22).

86 The first cases of SARS-CoV-2 were declared in Africa in late February and early March 2020
87 (23). South Africa (SA) had its first case reported on March 06, 2020 (24); since then, cases have
88 increased to over 638,000 and more than 15,000 deaths have been recorded as of 8th of
89 September, 2020 (25).

90 President Cyril Ramaphosa declared a nationwide lockdown on 23 March 2020 to help curb the
91 spread of the 2019 Coronavirus Disease outbreak (COVID-19) in SA and to encourage health
92 systems to plan for the may influx of moderate to severe cases of COVID-19 (26, 27). In
93 addition to the national lockdown, other physical distancing steps such as isolation of persons
94 infected with the COVID-19 and quarantining of anyone who might have been exposed or in
95 contact with an infected individual were also encouraged and implemented (28).

96 Despite World Health Organization (WHO) advises to Federal and state governments that
97 preparedness efforts should focus on access to “essential medicines” and healthcare services to
98 satisfy the priority health needs of the population (29). However, certain individuals within
99 households and communities in South Africa were deprived of access to essential medicine or
100 health care services, including sexual and reproductive health services and contraception,
101 because they feel obligated to uphold the lockdown and prevent transmission of COVID-19, as
102 such these individuals choice of contraception are being influenced by location or source of
103 contraception (30).

104 South Africa's overall unmet need for contraception of 18%, while the contraceptive prevalence
105 rate (CPR) for married women is 54% and 64% for unmarried women (31). Although the effects
106 of contraceptive obstruction during pandemics are often not the direct result of the pandemic,
107 instead they are indirect consequences of strained health care systems, disruptions in care and
108 redirected resources to pandemic needs (32, 33)

109 It’s imperative to note that before the COVID-19 outbreak, access to optimal healthcare has also
110 been facing major socio-demographic inequalities (34) and these Socio-demographic
111 inequalities contribute to unequal access to quality health care (35). However, with the current
112 evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic, there is a need for concerted actions towards ensuring

113 individuals who need essential access to sexual and reproductive health, including the provision
114 of contraception services, are not obstructed (4, 36). Thus, there is a need to examine South
115 Africans' demographic and economic characteristics' access to condoms and sources of condoms
116 during the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

117

118

119

120

121

122 **Methods and Materials**

123 **Study design and settings**

124 This study used data from the National Income Dynamics Study-Coronavirus Rapid Mobile
125 Survey (NIDS-CRAM) (37). NIDS-CRAM is a nationally-representative survey of the NIDS,
126 which involves a sample of South African adults from 2017 NIDS wave 5 (38). This survey's
127 primary investigator is the Southern Africa Labour and Development Research Unit (SALDRU),
128 which is affiliated with the University of Cape Town (UCT). SALDRU is aided by the South
129 Africa Department of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (39). The NIDS wave 5 survey
130 employed a stratified, two-stage cluster sample design to interview respondents in all nine South
131 African provinces. Hence this study maintained the NIDS wave 5 study design and settings for
132 NIDS-CRAM (40).

133

134 **Data collection**

135 NIDS-CRAM is a computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI) survey, with the first wave
136 conducted during the coronavirus pandemic in South Africa between May and June 2020.
137 Respondents were mainly asked retrospective questions about their circumstances in February
138 and April 2020. The NIDS-CRAM constitutes a sample of 7,074 individuals drawn from the
139 adult sub-sample of the fifth wave of NIDS conducted in 2017. Information such as demographic
140 characteristics, economic characteristics, access to contraception and sources of contraception
141 during the coronavirus pandemic in South Africa were the variables extracted from the NIDS-
142 CRAM wave 1 dataset. The de-identified dataset can be accessed upon request at
143 <http://www.nids.uct.ac.za> while the redefined dataset used for this study has been deposited to
144 open science framework (OSF) and can be accessed here <https://doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/J4XQR>.

145

146 **Sampling**

147 All the age groups interviewed in the survey were included. After eliminating respondents who
148 failed to answer questions related to access to condoms or source of condoms during the
149 coronavirus pandemic in South Africa, a total of 4,517 respondents were eligible for the study
150 out of 7,074 individuals. The eligible respondents were those within the reproductive age group
151 between the ages of 17 to 45 years.

152

153 **Statistical Analysis**

154 NIDS_CRAM wave 1 dataset was recoded and analyzed using STATA version 16. Descriptive
155 statistics were used to summarize data on demographic characteristics, economic characteristics,
156 access to condoms and preferred sources during the 2019 novel coronavirus pandemic in South
157 Africa. Outcome variables were access to condoms and sources of condoms. Access to condoms
158 was measured by asking the respondents if they have access to condoms during COVID-19
159 lockdown or not, followed by the source they preferred, while the explanatory variables were
160 demographic and economic characteristics of the respondents. Selected demographic
161 characteristics include; age, population group, gender and province of the respondents while
162 Economic characteristics was measure by employment status, educational level and income of
163 the respondents. Income of the respondents were measured using the nation’s wealth quintile
164 categorization (Upper quintile: R52 078 and above, 4th quintile: R23 156 – R52 077, 3rd
165 quintile: R12 781 – R23 155, 2nd quintile: R7 030 – R12 780, and Lower quintile: R7 029 and
166 below) (41).

167 Source of condoms has three variable which includes; private sources (respondent getting
168 condoms from the private source like private clinic or hospital), public (respondent getting
169 condoms from the public source like public/government clinic or hospital) and other sources
170 which includes pharmacy shops, road sellers etc.). Dataset was weighted by applying the
171 recommended weight command of “svyset cluster [pw=w1_nc_wgt], strata(stratum)”and
172 summarized as percentages (%) for both explanatory and outcome variables (37). Chi-square was
173 done to check the significant association of the selected demographic and economic variables on
174 access to condoms and sources of condoms. Binary logistic regression tests were performed to
175 determine adjusted likelihood of the explanatory variables on only access to condoms in the
176 outcome variables due to its dichotomy nature; those who had access were coded “1” as “yes”

177 and those who did not have access were coded “0” as “No”. P-value < 0.05 was considered
178 statistically significant at 95% confidence interval (CI), and explanatory variables with an
179 adjusted odds ratio (aOR) greater than 1 were considered to have a higher likelihood on the
180 outcome variables.

181

182 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

183 This study is a secondary analysis of the NIDS-CRAM wave 1 dataset. Ethical approval for
184 NIDS-CRAM was granted by the University of Cape Town (UCT) Commerce Faculty Ethics
185 Committee. In 2017, the NIDS data collectors (Wave 5) conducted a written informed consent
186 process for all participants and only resumed interviews until this procedure had been completed.
187 NIDS-CRAM 2020 was drawn from the same population sample of wave 5; hence, the
188 participants' consent was re-validated via telephone interview before proceeding with relevant
189 questions.

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198 **Results**

199 **Percentage distribution of the explanatory and outcome variables.**

200 Table 1 below showed the percentage distribution of the explanatory variables, which are the
201 respondents' demographic and economic characteristics during the survey.

202 **Demographic Characteristics**

203 The majority of the respondents were between the age group 25-34 years (39.55). Almost 8 in 10
204 (84.07%) of the respondents were Africans or Black, while the lowest population group was
205 among Asians/Indians with 1.85%.

206 A little above half of the respondents were female (51.67%), while males involved in the survey
207 were below average (48.33%). Gauteng had the highest respondents, with 27.64%, followed by
208 KwaZulu-Natal 18.08%, while the lowest was among Northern-Cape (2.75%). Almost 8 in 10 of
209 the respondents dwells in a House or flat residence, while 1.07% of the respondents dwell in
210 other forms of dwelling types other than those listed above (Table 1).

211 **Economic Characteristics**

212 More than two-fifths of the respondents interviewed were employed (47.79%), while 13.12%
213 were not economically active at the time of data collection. More than three-fifths of the
214 respondents were in the lower quintile (60.18%), while those in the third quintile were the least
215 with 4.05% of the respondents' wealth-income category. The majority of the respondents had
216 secondary school education (94.16%), while 1.36% had tertiary education.

217

218 **Table 1. Percentage distribution of demographic & economic characteristics of the**
 219 **respondents**

Variable	<i>n=4,517</i>	Variable	<i>n=4,517</i>
Age	Percentage (%)	Employment	Percentage (%)
17-24	25.88	Not Economically Active	13.12
25-34	39.55	Unemployed	39.09
35-45	34.57	Employed	47.79
Mean Age= 30.73	SD Age =7.41	Income	
Population group		Lower quintile	60.18
African/Black	84.07	2nd quintile	8.43
Coloured	8.78	3rd quintile	4.05
Asian/Indian	1.85	4th quintile	8.10
White	5.30	Upper quintile	19.24
Sex		Education	
Male	48.33	No schooling	0.25
Female	51.67	Primary	4.28
Province		Secondary	94.16
Western Cape	10.60	Tertiary	1.36


Eastern Cape	11.33	220
Northern Cape	2.75	221
Free State	6.10	222
KwaZulu-Natal	18.63	223
North West	4.47	224
Gauteng	27.64	225
Mpumalanga	8.59	226
Limpopo	9.88	227
Dwelling Type		228
A Flat House	78.18	229
Traditional House	7.64	230
Informal House	13.12	231
Other	1.07	232
		233
		234

NIDS-CRAM, 2020 (Weighted)

Percentage distribution of the outcome variables

Percentage distribution of the outcome variables presented in figure1 below indicated that more than two-fifths (22.83%) of the respondents were unable to access condoms during the coronavirus pandemic in South Africa while 7 in every 10 respondents preferred public sources; which include public hospital and clinic to get condoms.

Figure 1: Access and source of condoms



235

236 **NIDS-CRAM, 2020 (Weighted)**

237

238

239 **Bivariate Analysis**

240

241 Table 2 showed the chi-square test of association between demographic & economic factors and
242 access to condoms & source of condoms during the coronavirus pandemic in South Africa.

243 The results showed that respondents between 17-24 years (23.59%) had no access to condoms,
244 while the age group 35-45 years (67.17%) preferred public source of condoms to other sources.
245 Test of association showed no significant association between the age of respondents and access
246 to condoms as $P > 0.05$ while there was a significant association between the age of respondents
247 and sources of condoms as $P < 0.05$.

248 Among the respondents' population group, the African or Black population group had no access
249 to condoms as every 2 in 10 African or Black population were unable to access condoms. Also,
250 more than 7 in 10 African or Black population preferred public sources of condoms. Both access

251 to condoms and sources of condoms is significantly associated with the population group as
252 $P < 0.05$.

253 Gender of respondents showed that females had no access to contraception as a little more than
254 two-fifths (23.85%) were unable to access condoms while more than three-quarters of the female
255 respondents preferred public source of condoms. The association test was not significant
256 between gender and access to condoms as $P > 0.05$, while there is a significant association
257 between gender and source of condoms as $P < 0.05$.

258 Every 3 in 10 respondents from the KwaZulu-Natal province (30.07%) had no access to
259 condoms, while approximately 81% of respondents from the same province preferred public
260 sources of condoms. Both access to condoms and sources of condoms were the significantly
261 associated province of respondents as both P -value were less than 0.05.

262 28.38% of respondents who dwelled in the traditional house were unable to access condoms. In
263 the same vein, 86.35% of those same respondents category preferred public source of condoms.
264 Test of association showed no significant association between dwelling type and access to
265 condoms as $P > 0.05$ while there is a significant relationship between dwelling type and sources
266 of condoms as $P < 0.05$.

267 Among the employment category, a little below a quarter (23.39%) of respondents who were not
268 unemployed had no access to condoms; also, 8 in ten of the same group preferred public sources
269 of condoms. Test of association between employment and access to condoms showed no
270 significant association as $P > 0.05$ while there is an association between employment and sources
271 of condoms as $P < 0.05$.

272 Almost every 3 in 10 respondents with primary education had no access to condoms, while 9 in
 273 10 respondents of the same group preferred public sources of condoms. Both access to condoms
 274 and sources of condoms was significantly associated education of respondents as both *P-values*
 275 were less than 0.05.

276 **Table 2:** Test of association using chi-square between independent variables and dependent variables

Variable	Access to Condoms		Sources of Condoms		
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Private (%)	Public (%)	Other (%)
Age					
17-24	76.41	23.59	3.89	80.56	15.54
25-34	77.57	22.43	3.18	68.9	27.91
35-45	77.27	22.73	9.44	67.17	23.39
Total	77.17	22.83	5.53	71.43	23.05
$\chi^2=6.76$	<i>P-value = 0.73</i>		$\chi^2=47.90$	<i>P-value=0.03*</i>	
Population group					
African	75.69	24.31	4.07	74.46	21.47
Coloured	82.5	17.52	7.53	66.81	25.66
Asian/Indian	96.2	3.79	2.39	0.00	97.61
White	85.08	14.92	39.5	8.46	52.05
Total	77.17	22.83	5.53	71.43	23.05

	$\chi^2=84.02$		$P\text{-Value}=0.00^*$		$\chi^2=221.33$		$P\text{-value}=0.00^*$	
Gender								
Male	78.23	21.77	5.23	67.03	27.74			
Female	76.15	23.85	5.78	75.14	19.07			
Total	77.15	22.85	5.53	71.41	23.06			
	$\chi^2=3.61$		$P\text{-value}=0.21$		$\chi^2=20.75$		$P\text{-value}=0.02^*$	
Province								
Western Cape	83.65	16.35	12.82	70.22	16.97			
Eastern Cape	83.75	16.25	5.39	72.05	22.55			
Northern Cape	75.07	24.93	6.47	50.66	42.87			
Free State	74.45	25.55	6.32	76.62	17.06			
KwaZulu- Natal	61.49	38.51	3.46	81.26	15.28			
North-West	81.84	18.16	8.49	69.39	22.12			
Gauteng	81.91	18.09	5.23	57.55	37.22			
Mpumalanga	71.53	28.47	5.81	70.46	23.73			

Limpopo	84	16	4.83	77.67	17.49
Total	77.17	22.83	5.52	71.43	23.05
<i>$\chi^2=237.04$</i>		<i>P-value=0.00*</i>		<i>$\chi^2= 102.69$</i>	
<i>P-value=0.00*</i>					
Dwelling Type					
A Flat House	77.4	22.6	6.56	69.01	24.43
Traditional House	71.62	28.38	1.17	86.35	12.47
Informal House	79.38	20.68	2.88	77.08	20.04
Others	72.48	27.52	0	54.25	45.75
Total	77.17	22.88	5.26	71.43	23.05
<i>$\chi^2=11.04$</i>		<i>P-value=0.23</i>		<i>$\chi^2=40.42$</i>	
<i>P-value=0.00*</i>					
Employment					
Not Active	77.38	22.62	2.33	83.25	13.8
Unemployed	76.61	23.39	2.11	80.6	18.21
Employed	77.57	22.43	9.32	60.95	29.74
Total	77.17	22.83	5.52	71.43	23.05
<i>$\chi^2=4.83$</i>		<i>P-value=0.36</i>		<i>$\chi^2=103.15$</i>	
<i>P-value=0.00*</i>					

Wealth					
Income					
Lower quintile	76.54	23.46	3.22	75.31	22.32
2nd quintile	75.84	24.16	0.48	89.32	10.7
3rd quintile	86.07	13.93	3.55	83.44	18.17
4th quintile	71.55	28.45	2.57	77.66	17.06
Upper quintile	80.19	19.81	18.83	49.78	36.7
Total	77.16	22.84	5.53	71.43	23.05
<i>$\chi^2=31.04$</i>			<i>$P\text{-value}=0.00^*$</i>		
<i>$\chi^2=137.65$</i>			<i>$P\text{-value}=0.00^*$</i>		
Education					
No Education	75.14	24.86	0	100.00	0
Primary	73.81	26.19	1.05	91.98	6.97
Secondary	77.29	22.71	5.80	69.96	24.24
Tertiary	79.76	20.24	3.47	96.53	0
Total	77.17	22.83	5.53	71.43	23.05
<i>$\chi^2=53.17$</i>			<i>$P\text{-value}=0.00^*$</i>		
<i>$\chi^2=58.46$</i>			<i>$P\text{-value}=0.00^*$</i>		

277 **NIDS-CRAM, 2020 (Weighted)**

*** Significant at 0.05**

278

279 **Multivariable Analysis**

280

281 Table 3 showed the binary logistic regression results between independent variables and access
282 to condoms during the coronavirus pandemic in South Africa.

283 Respondents between the age group, 25-34 years, were 6% more likely to have access to
284 condoms with a 95% confidence interval (0.81-1.38). Population group respondents who were
285 Coloured and White were 15% and 46%, respectively, more likely to have access to condoms
286 than the Black or African population.

287 Female respondents were 14% less likely to have access to condoms with a confidence interval
288 of (0.69-1.08) compared to the male respondents. Both respondents who reside in KwaZulu-
289 Natal and Mpumalanga were 70% and 45% likely to have access to condoms, respectively,
290 compared to Western-Cape respondents.

291 The respondents' employment status showed that unemployed respondents were 3% less likely to
292 have access to condoms compared to the reference category (RC), who were not economically
293 active. Those who were within the 4th quintile of wealth-income were 24% less likely to have
294 access to condoms compared to those in the upper quintile who were 14% more likely to have
295 access to condoms.

296 Respondents who had no education were 14% less likely to have access to condoms with a
297 confidence interval of (0.25-3.21) compared to the reference category (RC). Test of relationship

298 showed no significant relationship between all categories of respondents educational level and
 299 access to condoms as $P>0.05$.

300

301 **Table 3:** Test of the relationship between independent variables & access to condoms using
 302 Binary Logistic Regression

Variables	Access to Condoms		
	aOR	P> t	95% CI
17-24	RC		
25-34	1.06	0.70	(0.81-1.38)
35-45	0.96	0.79	(0.73-1.28)
Population group			
African	RC		
Coloured	1.15	0.62	(0.66-2.02)
Asian/Indian	15.93	0.00*	(2.85-88.92)
White	1.46	0.32	(0.69-3.12)
Gender			
Male	RC		
Female	0.86	0.20	(0.69-1.08)

Province			
Western Cape	RC		
Eastern Cape	1.10	0.76	(0.58-2.09)
Northern Cape	0.63	0.21	(0.31-1.30)
Free State	0.64	0.17*	(0.33-1.22)
KwaZulu-Natal	0.30	0.00*	(0.17-0.52)
North-West	0.98	0.96	(0.54-1.65)
Gauteng	0.95	0.85	(0.30-0.98)
Mpumalanga	0.55	0.04	(0.60-2.23)
Limpopo	1.16	0.65	(0.85-1.71)
Dwelling Type			
A Flat House	RC		
Traditional House	1.21	0.29	(0.85-1.71)
Informal House	1.13	0.46	(0.81-1.58)
Others	0.71	0.56	(0.22-2.28)
Employment			
Not Active	RC		

Unemployed	0.97	0.85	(0.71-1.33)	303
Employed	0.98	0.93	(0.68-1.42)	
Wealth Income				
Lower quintile	RC			
2nd quintile	0.97	0.84	(0.69-1.35)	
3rd quintile	1.90	0.01*	(1.15-3.12)	
4th quintile	0.76	0.10	(0.56-1.05)	
Upper quintile	1.23	0.19	(0.90-1.68)	
Education				
No Education	0.89	0.86	(0.25-3.21)	
Primary	1.05	0.93	(0.33-3.37)	
Secondary	1.29	0.74	(0.29-5.71)	
Tertiary	RC			

304 **NIDS-CRAM, 2020 (Weighted)** * Significant at 0.05

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314

315

316

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324

325

326

327

328 **Discussion**

329 This study examined the factors contributing to inadequate access to condoms and sources of
330 condoms during the 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) in South Africa (SA) using the first
331 national income dynamic study-coronavirus rapid mobile survey (NIDS-CRAM) dataset
332 conducted during 2019-nCoV. I described national-level variation in accessing condoms and
333 sources of condoms during the 2019-nCoV lockdown in the year 2020, and the role which
334 selected demographic and economic characteristics played. This study acquired and contributed
335 to the existing literature on how limited access to condoms can increase the unmet need for
336 contraception, which may lead to poor sexual and reproductive health outcomes. The study
337 further expands the scope of the unmet need for contraception by including limited access to
338 condoms during the 2019-nCoV lockdown and physical distancing in SA.

339 The study is in concordance with the study that concluded that inadequate or limited access to
340 condoms is part of the contributing factors to the unmet need for contraception (9). The result
341 showed that more than two in every ten South Africans experienced limited access to condoms
342 during the pandemic. A study conducted in Indonesia and Kenya on preferred contraception
343 sources showed that most of the population preferred public/government hospitals to obtain their
344 contraception prescriptions (42, 43). This is in line with the study result in that more than two-
345 thirds of South Africans preferred public/government hospitals to get condoms. This could be
346 one of the reasons why the respondents were unable to access condoms as most public or
347 government hospitals were occupied or overwhelmed due to the influx of 2019-nCoV patients
348 (32, 33) and also limited transportation as a result of lockdown/ physical distancing (12, 44).

349 The study further showed evidence that there is variation in respondents' adopted sources of
350 condoms as all selected demographic and economic variables were significantly associated with
351 the source of condoms. This means that South Africans demographic or economic characteristics
352 determine their sources of condoms. This is also in line with a study conducted in Kenya that
353 showed a large variation in respondents' socio-demographic characteristics and contraception
354 sources (43).

355 As the access to contraception continues to be a major contributor to high unmet needs in
356 developing countries (8), this study results showed that South Africans who were between 35-45
357 years, the female respondents, those who reside in KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga provinces
358 and finally, those who were unemployed, not educated and those in the 4th quintile of wealth-
359 income experienced were less likely to have access to condoms during the 2020 lockdown/
360 physical distancing due to 2019-nCoV pandemic. This is contrary to the studies conducted in
361 South Africa and Ghana prior to the 2019-nCoV pandemic in terms of socio-demographic
362 characteristics of respondents affected (45, 46).

363 However, this study results showed similarity in most studies, commentaries and editorial
364 opinions that obstruction in sexual and reproductive services in the ongoing 2019-nCoV
365 pandemic could lead to a high unmet need for contraception (15, 17, 32) and to the best of my
366 knowledge this is the first paper that holistically employed NIDS-CRAM dataset to examine how
367 2019-nCoV influence limited access to condoms, preferred sources of condoms and demographic
368 & economic characteristics of South Africans affected.

369

370 **Strengths and Limitations**

371 The use of secondary datasets has its limitations as some questions of interest to further probe the
372 respondents in terms of retrospective questions were not asked during data collection, and this
373 limited the scope of the study. The strength of this study is the use of aboriginal staff during the
374 telephone interview. The use of computer-assisted telephone interviewing during 2019-nCoV is
375 another important strength of the study.

376

377 **Conclusion and Recommendations**

378 Limited access to condoms is the ignored elephant in the room. This study added to the body of
379 literature that there was limited access to condoms during 2019-nCoV and that the preferred
380 source of condoms was very skewed in South Africa.

381 The study concluded that demographic and economic characteristics of South Africans
382 influenced their adopted sources of condoms and that limited access to condoms was more
383 experienced among the aged population, Black South African population groups, those who
384 reside in Free state, Mpumalanga and KwaZulu-Natal provinces and those who were either poor
385 nor rich, i.e., those in the 4th quintile of wealth income and those uneducated. Policies,
386 strategies, and interventions that will consider the contraception demands of South Africans
387 during the ongoing or future pandemic should be targeted at similar demographic and economic
388 characteristics. This will reduce the unmet need for contraception in South Africa and tackle the
389 unequal family planning use coverage.

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400 **References**

401

- 402 1. Kavanagh MM, Erondou NA, Tomori O, Dzau VJ, Okiro EA, Maleche A, et al. Access to
403 lifesaving medical resources for African countries: COVID-19 testing and response, ethics, and
404 politics. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10238):1735-8.
- 405 2. Faden YA, Alghilan NA, Alawami SH, Alsulmi ES, Alsum HA, Katib YA, et al. Saudi
406 Society of Maternal-Fetal Medicine guidance on pregnancy and coronavirus disease 2019. *Saudi*
407 *medical journal*. 2020;41(8):779-90.
- 408 3. Ibarra FP, Mehrad M, Mauro MD, Godoy MFP, Cruz EG, Nilforoushzadeh MA, et al.
409 Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the sexual behavior of the population. The vision of the
410 east and the west. *International braz j urol*. 2020;46:104-12.
- 411 4. Riley T, Sully E, Ahmed Z, Biddlecom A. Estimates of the potential impact of the
412 COVID-19 pandemic on sexual and reproductive health in low-and middle-income countries. *Int*
413 *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2020;46:46.
- 414 5. Hussein J. *COVID-19: What implications for sexual and reproductive health and rights*
415 *globally?* : Taylor & Francis; 2020.
- 416 6. Makins A, Arulkumaran S, Contraception F, Committee FP, Sheffield J, Townsend J, et
417 al. The negative impact of COVID-19 on contraception and sexual and reproductive health:
418 Could immediate postpartum LARCs be the solution? *International Journal of Gynecology &*
419 *Obstetrics*. 2020.
- 420 7. Oyediran KA, Makinde OA, Adelakin O. The Role of Telemedicine in Addressing
421 Access to Sexual and Reproductive Health Services in sub-Saharan Africa during the COVID-19
422 Pandemic. *African Journal of Reproductive Health*. 2020;24(2):49-55.
- 423 8. (UNFPA) UNPF. Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Family Planning and Ending
424 Gender-based Violence, Female Genital Mutilation and Child Marriage. 2020 [Available from:

- 425 [https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/COVID-](https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/COVID-19_impact_brief_for_UNFPA_24_April_2020_1.pdf)
426 [19 impact brief for UNFPA 24 April 2020 1.pdf.](https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/COVID-19_impact_brief_for_UNFPA_24_April_2020_1.pdf)
- 427 9. Cleland J, Harbison S, Shah IH. Unmet need for contraception: issues and challenges.
428 *Studies in family planning*. 2014;45(2):105-22.
- 429 10. Geldsetzer P, Reinmuth M, Ouma PO, Lautenbach S, Okiro EA, Bärnighausen T, et al.
430 Mapping physical access to healthcare for older adults in sub-Saharan Africa: A cross-sectional
431 analysis with implications for the COVID-19 response. *medRxiv*. 2020.
- 432 11. Mmeje OO, Coleman JS, Chang T. Unintended Consequences of the COVID-19
433 Pandemic on the Sexual and Reproductive Health of Youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2020.
- 434 12. Ahmed S, Ajisola M, Azeem K, Bakibinga P, Chen YF, Choudhury NN, et al. Impact of
435 the societal response to COVID-19 on access to healthcare for non-COVID-19 health issues in
436 slum communities of Bangladesh, Kenya, Nigeria and Pakistan: results of pre-COVID and
437 COVID-19 lockdown stakeholder engagements. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2020;5(8).
- 438 13. Adebisi YA, Jumoke AA, Carolyn OO. Coronavirus disease-19 and access to medicines
439 in Africa. *International Journal of Health & Allied Sciences*. 2020;9(5):120.
- 440 14. Balestri R, Magnano M, Rizzoli L, Infusino SD, Urbani F, Rech G. STIs and the COVID-
441 19 pandemic: the lockdown does not stop sexual infections. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*.
442 2020.
- 443 15. Cash R, Patel V. Has COVID-19 subverted global health? *The Lancet*.
444 2020;395(10238):1687-8.
- 445 16. Benson LS, Madden T, Tarleton J, Micks E. Society of Family Planning interim clinical
446 recommendations: Contraceptive provision when healthcare access is restricted due to pandemic
447 response. 2020.
- 448 17. Kumar M, Daly M, De Plecker E, Jamet C, McRae M, Markham A, et al. Now is the
449 time: a call for increased access to contraception and safe abortion care during the COVID-19
450 pandemic. *BMJ Global Health*. 2020;5(7):e003175.
- 451 18. Ahmed Z, Cross L. Crisis on the horizon: Devastating losses for global reproductive
452 health are possible due to COVID-19, Guttmacher Institute. 2020.
- 453 19. Kumar N. COVID 19 era: a beginning of upsurge in unwanted pregnancies, unmet need
454 for contraception and other women related issues. *The European Journal of Contraception &*
455 *Reproductive Health Care*. 2020;25(4):323-5.
- 456 20. Yazdkhasti M. The novel coronavirus (COVID-19) and unintended pregnancy during the
457 quarantine period. 2020.
- 458 21. Hall KS, Samari G, Garbers S, Casey SE, Diallo DD, Orcutt M, et al. Centring sexual and
459 reproductive health and justice in the global COVID-19 response. *The Lancet*.
460 2020;395(10231):1175-7.
- 461 22. Purdy C. Opinion: how will COVID-19 affect global access to contraceptives—and what
462 can we do about it? *Devex*. 2020.
- 463 23. Caballero AE, Ceriello A, Misra A, Aschner P, McDonnell ME, Hassanein M, et al.
464 COVID-19 in people living with diabetes: An international consensus. *Journal of Diabetes and*
465 *its Complications*. 2020;34(9):107671.
- 466 24. Nyasulu J, Pandya H. The effects of coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic on the South
467 African health system: A call to maintain essential health services. *African Journal of Primary*
468 *Health Care & Family Medicine*. 2020;12(1).
- 469 25. (NICD) NIoCD. COVID-19 Surveillance Dashboard 2020 [Available from:
470 <https://www.nicd.ac.za>.

- 471 26. 2020 SAn. Covid-19 News updae 2020 [Available from:
472 <https://www.sanews.gov.za/southafrica/president-ramaphosa-announces-nationwide-lockdown>.
473 27. Blumberg L, Jassat W, Mendelson M, Cohen C. The COVID-19 crisis in South Africa:
474 Protecting the vulnerable. *South African Medical Journal*. 2020.
475 28. Mukumbang FC, Ambe AN, Adebisi BO. Unspoken inequality: how COVID-19 has
476 exacerbated existing vulnerabilities of asylum-seekers, refugees, and undocumented migrants in
477 South Africa. *International journal for equity in health*. 2020;19(1):1-7.
478 29. Alexander GC, Qato DM. Ensuring access to medications in the US during the COVID-
479 19 pandemic. *JAMA*. 2020.
480 30. Joska JA, Andersen L, Rabie S, Marais A, Ndwandwa E-S, Wilson P, et al. COVID-19:
481 Increased Risk to the Mental Health and Safety of Women Living with HIV in South Africa.
482 *AIDS and Behavior*. 2020:1.
483 31. Health SAdo. South Africa Demographic and Health Survey 2016: Key Indicators
484 Report: Statistics South Africa; 2017.
485 32. Ferreira-Filho ES, de Melo NR, Sorpreso ICE, Bahamondes L, Simões RDS, Soares-
486 Júnior JM, et al. Contraception and reproductive planning during the COVID-19 pandemic.
487 *Expert Review of Clinical Pharmacology*. 2020;13(6):615-22.
488 33. Hamzehgardeshi Z, Yazdani F, Rezaei M, Kiani Z. COVID-19 as a Threat to Sexual and
489 Reproductive Health. *Iranian Journal of Public Health*. 2020;49:136-7.
490 34. Okereke M, Ukor NA, Adebisi YA, Ogunkola IO, Favour Iyagbaye E, Adiola Owor G,
491 et al. Impact of COVID-19 on access to healthcare in low- and middle-income countries:
492 Current evidence and future recommendations. *The International Journal of Health Planning and*
493 *Management*. 2020.
494 35. Desai S, Samari G. COVID-19 and Immigrants' Access to Sexual and Reproductive
495 Health Services in the United States. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*. 2020.
496 36. Tang K, Gaoshan J, Ahonsi B. Sexual and reproductive health (SRH): a key issue in the
497 emergency response to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) outbreak. *Reproductive Health*.
498 2020;17:1-3.
499 37. Kerr A, Ardington C, Burger R. Sample design and weighting in the NIDS-CRAM
500 survey. 2020.
501 38. Ingle K, Brophy T. Panel User Manual. 2020.
502 39. SALDRU. Development Research Unit. National income dynamics study (NIDS).
503 2012;2012.
504 40. Leibbrandt M, Woolard I, de Villiers L. Methodology: Report on NIDS wave 1.
505 Technical paper. 2009;1.
506 41. Stats S. Living conditions of households in South Africa. Avail-18. 2015.
507 42. Radhakrishnan U. A dynamic structural model of contraceptive use and employment
508 sector choice for women in Indonesia. US Census Bureau Center for Economic Studies Paper No
509 CES-WP-10-28. 2010:10-01.
510 43. Jalang'o R, Thuita F, Barasa SO, Njoroge P. Determinants of contraceptive use among
511 postpartum women in a county hospital in rural KENYA. *BMC public health*. 2017;17(1):604.
512 44. Brey Z, Mash R, Goliath C, Roman D. Home delivery of medication during Coronavirus
513 disease 2019, Cape Town, South Africa. *African Journal of Primary Health Care & Family*
514 *Medicine*. 2020;12(1):4.

515 45. Marrone G, Abdul-Rahman L, De Coninck Z, Johansson A. Predictors of contraceptive
516 use among female adolescents in Ghana. African journal of reproductive health. 2014;18(1):102-
517 9.
518 46. Chimbindi NZ, McGrath N, Herbst K, San Tint K, Newell M-L. Socio-demographic
519 determinants of condom use among sexually active young adults in rural KwaZulu-Natal, South
520 Africa. The open AIDS journal. 2010;4:88.

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532