Title:

Knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of long-acting reversible contraceptive (LARC) methods among healthcare workers in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Authors:

Laura Rouncivell[1*], Simbarashe Takuva[1, 2], Neo Ledibane[1], Alfred Musekiwa[1], Trudy D Leong[3]

[1] School of Health Systems and Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa.

[2] Perinatal HIV Research Unit, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

[3]National Department of Health, Affordable Medicines Directorate, Essential Drugs Programme, South Africa.

*Corresponding Author: Laura Rouncivell. School of Health Systems and Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa. Email: Laura.rouncivell@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Objective: To assess the knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions (KAP) of long-acting reversible contraceptive (LARC) methods among healthcare workers (HCW's) in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA).

Methods: A systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted following the PRISMA methodology. Two authors independently searched three electronic databases for studies published between 2000 and January 2020 reporting on the KAP of LARC methods among HCW's in SSA. Titles and abstracts were screened against eligibility criteria, data were extracted and the included studies were assessed for risk of bias. A meta-analysis of proportions for 11 pre-determined questions relating to LARC KAP was performed. Heterogeneity was explored using the I^2-statistic and publication bias investigated using funnel plots and Egger's tests.

Results: Twenty-two studies comprising of 11 272 HCW's from 11 SSA countries were included. Forty-one percent (95% CI: 20%, 61%) of HCW's had received intrauterine contraceptive device (IUCD) insertion training while 63% (95% CI: 44%, 81%) expressed a desire for training. Only 27% (95% CI: 18%, 36%) deemed IUCD appropriate for HIV-infected women. Restrictions for IUCD and injectables based on a minimum age were imposed by 56% (95% CI: 33%, 78%) and 60% (95% CI: 36%, 84%), respectively. Minimum parity restrictions were observed among 29% (95% CI: 9%, 50%) of HCW's for IUCDs and 36% (95% CI: 16%, 56%) for injectable contraceptives. Heterogeneity was high and publication bias was present in two of the 11 questions.

Conclusion: The systematic review and meta-analysis indicate that unnecessary provider-imposed restrictions may hinder the uptake of LARC methods by women in SSA.

Key Words: Contraception, long-acting reversible contraception, meta-analysis, knowledge, attitude, perceptions, sub-Saharan Africa, healthcare workers

Conflicts of Interest: None.

Ethics approval: Ethical approval was received from the Faculty of Health Sciences Research Ethics Committee (REC) at the University of Pretoria, School of Health Systems and Public Health. Reference Number: 640/2019

Authors Contributions: All authors contributed to the design of the study and the preparation of the manuscript. LR, ST and AM contributed toward the statistical analysis. All authors read and approved the content of the manuscript.

BACKGROUND

The use of and access to family planning and contraception play a critical role in reducing maternal and infant mortality, improving sexual and reproductive health (SRH) outcomes and fulfilling women's human rights across the globe (1). In 2017, an estimated 810 women died daily due to preventable pregnancy and childbirth-related complications (2). This issue is exacerbated by high rates of unintended pregnancies. In low-middle income countries (LMICs), unintended pregnancies reduce the likelihood of women attending the optimal number of antenatal care visits (3) while also predisposing them to unsafe abortions, particularly where access to abortion services are limited (4). Unintended pregnancies pose a threat to global health due to their resulting adverse maternal and foetal health, social and economic consequences (5). Recent modelling suggests that the global unintended pregnancy rate for women aged 15-49 years between 2015 and 2019 was 64 per 100 000 with sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) experiencing a rate of 91 per 100 000 (4). Of the unintended pregnancies occurring in SSA, 37% were estimated to have ended in abortion (4). Even in countries where abortion is completely restricted, 50% of unintended pregnancies still resulted in abortion (4). Despite SRH policies across SSA gaining notable attention to provide universal access to reproductive health (6), in 2015 only 25% of married women throughout SSA were using a form of modern contraception in comparison to 58% globally (7). The United Nations estimates that in 2019 the global unmet need for family planning among 15-49-year-old women was 10%, increasing to an average of 17.1% in SSA with 15 countries having an unmet need greater than 20% (8). The resulting effect of a high unmet need for family planning propels the rate of unintended pregnancies.

Women requiring contraception should be provided sufficient information about all methods to make an informed choice. Long-acting reversible contraceptives (LARC's) are the preferred intervention, as they are user-independent and last for 3-5 years (progestin injectables are also considered to be long-acting, though they last for 2-3 months)(9). Advantages of LARC's over short-acting reversible contraceptives (SARCs) include increased effectiveness (>99%) as seen by their low failure rates (10). Evidence suggests that a high number of unintended pregnancies also occur in the postpartum and post-abortion period (11). LARC's have shown to be highly effective and safe in the prevention of rapid repeat pregnancies (RRP) while also indicated as a method of emergency contraceptive (particularly the Copper intrauterine

device [Cu-IUD]). Therefore, these methods play a critical role in the prevention of unsafe abortions and their associated risks (12,13). Despite the pronounced benefits of LARC's, the trend in uptake in SSA is significantly lower in comparison to other regions of the world (6). Data suggests that only 25.1% of women in SSA were using a LARC method between 2005 and 2015 (6). While injectable progestin contraceptives (IPC) account for 45% of modern methods utilised, the uptake of intrauterine contraceptive devices (IUCD) and sub-dermal implants which yield higher adherence and lower discontinuation rates remain low (7,14). The low uptake of effective modern contraception is further highlighted by the total fertility rates (TFR) observed in the region; Kenya, Nigeria and the Republic of Niger observe TFR's of 4.8, 5.2 and 7.6 children per woman, respectively (15). In South Africa, the TFR according to mid-year population estimates is much lower at 2.33 children per woman (16).

Effective contraceptive use is further critical in the SSA population due to the high HIV burden the region faces. Unintended pregnancies and RRP among women living with HIV (WLWHIV) or using antiretroviral therapy (ART) for pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) can result in adverse maternal and infant health consequences or an increase in vertical HIV transmission (17). However, as ART use has increased, so has concern over the drug interactions with hormonal contraceptives (18). According to an updated systematic review, there is evidence indicating reduced efficacy of progestin-based contraceptive implants in conjunction with efavirenz-based regimens. Among these women, pregnancy rates were higher in comparison to those not using efavirenz-based regimens (18). For this reason, the low utilisation of the non-hormonal Cu-IUD's in regions with a double burden of HIV and unintended pregnancies is concerning.

With evidencing predicting a population surge in SSA by 2050 (19) and with low LARC method uptake, there is a need for SSA to renew its strategy to provide access to contraceptives, in particular, LARC's which can prevent avoidable adverse health outcomes arising from unintended pregnancies. Previous research suggests that healthcare workers (HCW's) throughout the world hold certain misconceptions regarding the suitability of LARC's for adolescents, unmarried and HIV-infected women (20–23). This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to determine the current state of knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions among HCW's in SSA regarding LARC methods.

METHODS

A systematic review and proportion meta-analysis (24) were conducted to explore the KAP of LARC methods among HCW's across SSA. The study followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (25). The protocol for this systematic review is registered on PROSPERO database (ID: CRD42020148302).

Eligibility criteria

All cross-sectional, longitudinal, population-based and mixed-method studies that investigated all or a combination of the constructs of knowledge, attitudes, and/or perceptions of HCW's towards LARC methods were eligible for inclusion. All studies published in English between January 2000 and January 2020 were considered. Studies were included if they focussed on IUCD contraception, hormonal sub-dermal implants and hormonal injectable contraceptives. Additionally, studies which addressed the KAP using structured questionnaires were eligible. HCW's were defined as medical practitioners, nurses, pharmacists, community health (extension) workers (CHEWs), clinical associates, and family planning providers, who were practising in SSA at the time of the study. Knowledge of LARC methods referred to HCW's understanding of how the methods worked, their training experience, their capacity to counsel clients and their ability to provide the contraceptives. Attitude was defined as the impact of the HCW's own religious, moral and ethical beliefs on their willingness to provide LARC methods and perceptions were considered as the restrictions imposed on the provision of LARC's (e.g. restricting access based on a client's age or parity, HIV-status or marital status).

Information sources and search strategy

Two researchers (LR and ST) independently searched three major online databases (PubMed, Ovid (Medline), and Scopus) for studies that met the inclusion criteria. A final search strategy was developed and applied to the databases in October 2019 and again in January 2020. The search strategy (attached in supplementary file 1) utilised Boolean operators ("AND" or "OR") to ensure the detection of relevant studies. Grey literature was also searched to identify any relevant organisational or governmental reports. No language restrictions were applied.

143 ***Study selection***

144 After applying the search strategy, two researchers (LR and ST) independently screened all
145 titles and abstracts that were produced. Of the records that were deemed preliminarily
146 relevant, the full-text articles were obtained and further screening was conducted. The
147 screening of studies was done using the systematic review reference manager app, Rayyan
148 QCRI (26). The relevance of the studies was assessed based on the initial inclusion criteria that
149 were developed. All studies not meeting the criteria were subsequently excluded, with
150 reasons therefore documented. Any discrepancies were discussed and resolved through
151 consensus.

152 ***Data collection and data extraction***

153 A data extraction tool was developed for this study. The tool was piloted on three studies and
154 adjusted where necessary. The tool documented data on study title, year and author, study
155 design, study population, outcome measured, contraceptive focus, method of recruitment,
156 data collection period, sampling technique, response rate, results, and study strengths and
157 limitations. For each study included in the review, a data collection form was filled out.

158 To conduct the meta-analysis,

159 information that was common across studies was collected. A total of 11 statements were
160 considered as outcomes, outlined in the table below:

161 Table 1: Questions used to conduct the proportion meta-analysis

Construct	Question Number	Question
Knowledge	1	Have you received training in family planning counselling?
	2	Do you provide family planning counselling to your clients?
	3	Have you ever heard of emergency contraception (EC)?
	4	The proportion of providers who correctly identify the Copper-intrauterine device as a form of EC.
	5	Are you trained to insert intrauterine contraceptive devices (IUCD)?
	6	Do you desire more training on IUCD?
Attitude and Perceptions	7	Do you perceive IUCD to be suitable/safe for HIV-infected women?
	8	Do you impose minimum age restrictions for the provision of IUCD?
	9	Do you impose minimum parity restrictions for the provision of IUCD?
	10	Do you impose minimum age restrictions for the provision of injectable contraceptives?
	11	Do you impose minimum parity restrictions for the provision on injectable contraceptives?

162 All data were extracted on the proportion answering “yes” to the questions.

Quality assessment

The risk of bias for each of the included studies was assessed. Cross-sectional studies were assessed using the 'instrument for risk of bias in cross-sectional studies of attitudes and practices'(27). The tool allowed for various areas of the study to be assessed such as: how representative the sample was to the general population of interest; the response rate; the impact of missing data; and the reliability of the data instrument used for collection. As one observational study was included, the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) was used to assess quality and bias within the study (28). With this tool, the study was assessed based on the selection of study groups and the comparability of the selected groups. Two studies utilising a mixed-method design were also included in the review. These studies were subsequently assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 18 (29).

Data synthesis

It was deemed appropriate to combine numerical results from the studies; therefore, a meta-analysis was performed using Stata version 15 (STATA Corp., College Station, TX, USA). Several proportion meta-analyses were conducted based on the questions presented using studies that yielded comparable outcomes. A Stata dataset was created to record the numerators and denominators required to run the 'metaprop' command. Where these were not readily available, they were calculated. Heterogeneity was explored using the I^2-statistic and Chi-squared statistic with results greater than 75% considered to have high heterogeneity (30). For this reason, a random-effects model was used to compensate for the heterogeneity that was seen among the studies (31). For each question, an effect size with 95% CIs was calculated. To further explore the heterogeneity, a sub-group analysis was conducted based on the region in which the study was conducted (East Africa, West Africa, Southern Africa). Publication bias was also explored visually through funnel plots and statistically using Egger's tests.

RESULTS

The electronic databases and hand searches yielded a total of 4 448 citations. After removing 832 studies (252 duplicates and 580 published before 2000), 3 616 titles and abstracts were screened. Of these, 3 533 were irrelevant and the remaining 83 full-text articles were assessed for inclusion. Sixty-one were excluded for various reasons (32 reported a wrong outcome, one

193 was a background article, 11 were outside of SSA, one was published before 2000 and 16 did
194 not address LARC methods) and the remaining 22 studies were included in the review. The
195 process is summarised in Figure 1.



196 Figure 1. PRISMA flow chart for a systematic review of studies on knowledge, attitudes, and
197 perceptions on long-acting reversible contraceptives in sub-Saharan Africa, 2000-2020.

198 ***Study characteristics***

199 From the 22 studies published between 2000 and 2019, a total of 11 272 participants were
200 included in this review with the sample size ranging from 31 to 2 377. The studies were
201 conducted across 11 countries including Botswana (32), Ethiopia (33), Ghana (34,35), Kenya
202 (36–38), Malawi (39,40), Nigeria (41–45), Senegal (46), South Africa (47–50), Tanzania (51),
203 Uganda (52,53), and Zimbabwe (47,49). Eleven studies provided information on injectable
204 contraceptives (34,37–40,45–47,51,53,54), 21 on IUCD (33–45,47,48,50–55), and nine on the
205 contraceptive implant (34,38–40,46,47,51,53,55). Additionally, knowledge was reported by
206 15 studies (33,35,36,38,39,41–44,48–50,52–54), attitudes by 14 (35,36,38–44,48–50,53,54)
207 and perceptions of HCW's by ten studies (34,37–40,46,51,53,54,56,57). A detailed summary
208 of the study characteristics is outlined in Table 2 and Table 3 presents the characteristics of
209 the HCWs included in each study.

210 Table 2: The characteristics of the studies included in the systematic review and meta-analysis of studies assessing the knowledge, attitudes
211 and perceptions of long-acting reversible contraceptives among healthcare workers in sub-Saharan Africa, 2000-2020.

Author [Reference]	Title	Country, City	Study Design (Period)	Sample size	HCW Type	Study Outcome	LARC Type
Abebaw et al. 2019 (33)	Providers' knowledge on postpartum intrauterine contraceptive device (PPIUCD) service provision in Amhara region public health facility, Ethiopia.	Ethiopia, Amhara region	Cross-sectional	864	Gynaecologists, OB/GYN residents, GPs emergency surgeons health officers, midwives, nurses	Knowledge	IUCD (postpartum)
Adekunle et al. 2000 (41)	Emergency contraception: survey of knowledge, attitudes and practice of health care professionals in Ibadan, Nigeria.	Nigeria, Ibadan	Cross-sectional survey	735	Physicians, nurses, social workers, pharmacists, hospital administrators, medical officers	Knowledge and attitudes	Emergency contraception (Cu-IUD and Levonorgestrel included)
Atuahene et al. 2016 (34)	Health knowledge, attitudes and practices of family planning service providers and clients in Akwapim North District of Ghana	Ghana, Akwapim North District	Cross-sectional survey.	70	Midwives SRNs CHNs enrolled nurses, HCAs	Perceptions	IUCD, implants, injectables
Blanchard et al. 2015 (47)	Clinicians' perceptions and provision of hormonal contraceptives for HIV-positive and at-risk women in Southern Africa: original research article.	South Africa and Zimbabwe	Nationally representative survey	1444	Nurses Physicians	Perceptions	Hormonal Contraception (LNG-IUD, Cu-IUD, Implant, Injectables)

Byamugisha et al. 2007 (52)	Knowledge, attitudes and prescribing pattern of emergency contraceptives by health care workers in Kampala, Uganda.	Uganda, Kampala District	Cross-sectional	247	Midwives Nurses Clinical officers doctors gynaecologists other	Knowledge	Emergency contraception (Cu-IUD and LNG-IUD included)
Caplan et al. 2018 (40)	Provider perspectives on barriers to reproductive health services for HIV-infected clients in Central Malawi	Malawi	Mixed-Methods	31	Physicians, Clinical officers, Medical assistants, Nurses	Attitude, perceptions	IUCD Injectables Implants
Ebuehi et al. 2006 (42)	Health Care Providers' Knowledge of, Attitudes Toward and Provision of Emergency Contraceptives in Lagos, Nigeria	Nigeria, Lagos	Cross-sectional survey	256	Health care providers	Knowledge, attitudes	Emergency contraceptives (Cu-IUD and LNG-IUD included)
Gutin et al. 2011 (48)	Survey of knowledge, attitudes and practices surrounding the intrauterine device in South Africa	South Africa, Cape Town and Umtata	Cross-sectional survey	32	Nurses	Knowledge, attitude	Cu-IUD
Judge et al. 2011 (36)	Provider determinants of emergency contraceptive counselling and provision in Kenya and Ethiopia	Kenya Ethiopia	Cross-sectional	644 Kenya (523) Ethiopia (121)	Doctors Nurses Midwives	Knowledge, attitude	Emergency contraception (IUCD)

Morhason-Bello et al. 2014 (43)	Knowledge and use of emergency contraception by medical doctors on internship in a tertiary healthcare facility in Nigeria	Nigeria, Ibadan	Cross-sectional	205	Doctors	Knowledge, attitudes	Emergency contraception (Cu-IUD and LNG-IUD included)
Morse et al. 2013 (49)	Provision of long-acting reversible contraception in HIV- prevalent countries: results from nationally representative surveys in southern Africa	South Africa Zimbabwe	Nationally representative cross-sectional survey	1444	Physicians Nurses	Knowledge, attitudes	Cu-IUD LNG-IUS Implants
Mwafulirwa et al. 2016 (39)	Family Planning Providers' Experiences and Perceptions of Long- Acting Reversible Contraception in Lilongwe, Malawi	Malawi, Lilongwe	Mixed-method Cross-sectional & FGDs	62: 37 (Cross-sectional) 25 (FGDs)	Clinical officer Medical assistant Registered nurses Nurse midwives Counsellors	Knowledge, attitude, perceptions	IUCD Implants Injectables
Nalwadda et al. 2011 (53)	Constraints and prospects for contraceptive service provision to young people in Uganda: providers' perspectives	Uganda, Mityana, Mubende	Cross-sectional study	102	Medical officers Clinical officers Midwives/nurses Nursing assistants	Knowledge (skill), attitude, perceptions	Cu-IUD, injectables, Implants
Newmann et al. 2013 (38)	Providers' Perspectives on Provision of Family Planning to HIV-Positive Individuals in HIV Care in Nyanza Province, Kenya	Kenya, Nyanza province	Mixed-method	31	Clinicians CHWs	Knowledge, attitude, perceptions	IUCD Injectables Implants
Oriji et al. 2011 (44)	Knowledge, attitude, and practice of emergency contraception among medical doctors in Port Harcourt	Nigeria, Port Harcourt	Cross-sectional survey	100	GPs Surgeons OB/GYN Physicians	Knowledge, attitude	Emergency contraception (Cu-IUD and Levonorgestrel included)

Rupley et al. 2015 (35)	Maternity care provider knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding provision of postpartum intrauterine contraceptive devices at a tertiary centre in Ghana	Ghana, Ashanti region	Cross-sectional survey	91	Physicians Midwives	Knowledge, attitude	IUCD (postpartum)
Schwandt et al. 2017 (45)	Contraceptive service provider-imposed restrictions to contraceptive access in urban Nigeria	Nigeria	Cross-sectional survey	2377	Doctors CHEWs Midwives/Nurses Pharmacists	Perceptions	IUCD Injectables
Sibanda et al. 2017 (50)	Knowledge, attitudes and practices of health professionals in public health institutions on emergency contraception in Pietermaritzburg, KwaZulu-Natal Province, South Africa	South Africa, Pietermaritzburg	Cross-sectional survey	268	Enrolled nurse Professional nurse Medical intern Medical officer (OB/GYN) Registrar (OB/GYN) Specialist (OB/GYN)	Knowledge, attitude	Emergency contraception (Cu-IUD included)
Sidze et al. 2014 (46)	Young women access and use of contraception: the role of providers' restrictions in urban Senegal	Senegal	Cross-sectional	637	Doctors Nurses Midwives Maternal and child aids Medical assistants' Auxiliary staff	Perceptions	Injectables Implants
Speizer et al. 2000 (51)	Do service providers in Tanzania unnecessarily restrict clients' access to contraceptive methods?	Tanzania	Cross-sectional	901	Doctors Nurses Midwives Child & Maternal Health workers Auxiliary workers	Perceptions	Implants IUCD Injectables

Tshitenge et al. 2018 (32)	Knowledge, attitudes and practice of healthcare providers regarding contraceptive use in adolescence in Mahalapye, Botswana	Botswana, Mahalapye	Cross-sectional	80	Nurses Doctors	Knowledge, attitude	IUCD Injectables
Tumlinson et al. 2015 (37)	Provider barriers to family planning access in urban Kenya	Kenya	Cross-sectional	676	Doctors Medical/Clinical officers RN CN VCT provider	Perceptions	IUCD Injectables

212 GP, general practitioner; CHN, community health nurse; CN, community nurse; RN, registered nurse; SRN, senior registered nurse; HCA, healthcare administrator; OB/GYN,
213 obstetrics and gynaecology; CHEW, community health extension worker; VCT, voluntary counselling and testing; IUCD, intrauterine contraceptive device; Cu-IUD, copper
214 intrauterine device; LNG-IUD, levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine device; DMPA, depot-medroxyprogesterone acetate (Depo Provera).

215 Table 3: The characteristics of the healthcare workers included in the studies assessing the knowledge, attitudes, and perception of long-acting
216 reversible contraceptives in sub-Saharan Africa, 2000-2020.

Author [reference]	**Age in years Distribution (n)**	**Sex**	**HCW Type Distribution**	**Religion Distribution**	**Marital Status Distribution**	**Experience**
Abebaw et al. 2019 (33)	18-24 (207) 25-34 (570) 35-44 (65) 45-69 (22)	Male (527) Female (327)	Gynaecologist (5) Resident (10) GP (65) Emergency surgeon (48) health officer (105) midwife (341) nurse (290)	Orthodox (705) Muslim (117) Protestant (21) Other (21)	Married (394) Not married (470)	<5 years (481) 5-40 years (299)
Adekunle et al. 2000 (41)	<20 (5) 21-30 (237)	Male (189) Female (546)	Physicians (183) Nurses (436)	Pentecostal (354) Protestant (124) Muslim (112) Catholic	Single (205) married (485) cohabiting (6) widowed (13)	NR

	31-40 (313) 41-50 (130) 51-60 (34) 61+ (2) NR* (14)		Social workers (50) Pharmacists (38) hospital administrators (16) medical record officers (12).	(101) other (19) None (7) NR (18)	separated (11) divorced (4) NR (11)	
Atuahene et al. 2016 (34)	Mean: 31.5 years (SD: 9.8)	Male (13) Female (57)	Midwife (7) SRN (1) CHN (55) enrolled nurse (1) HCA (1), other (3)	NR	NR	<1 year (15) 1-2 years (34) 3+ years (21)
Blanchard et al. 2014 (47)	SA: median: 43 (29-69) Zimbabwe: median: 39 (20-74)	SA: Male (62), female (547) Zimbabwe: Male (145), female (674)	SA: Nurses (528) Physicians (86) Zimbabwe: Nurses (792) Physicians (38)	NR	NR	SA: FP training (399) HIV training (510) Zimbabwe: FP training (503) HIV training (629)
Byamugisha et al. 2007 (52)	21-30 (105) 21-30 (84) >40 (33) NR* (25)	NR	Midwives/nurses (185) Clinical officer (16) Doctors (27) Gynaecologist (11) Other (8)	NR	NR	NR
Caplan et al. 2018 (40)	NR	Female (18) Male (13)	Clinical officer (3) Nurse/ Nurse-technician (20) Medical assistant (8)	Catholic (5) Protestant (20) Other Christian (4)	NR	NR

				Muslim (1)		
Ebuehi et al. 2006 (42)	NR	Female (132) Male (124)	Physician (116) Nurse (69) Pharmacist (46) CHW (25)	NR		Years of experience: <10 (37.5%) 11-20 (50.4%) 21-30 (11.3%) >31 (0.8%)
Gutin et al. 2011 (48)	**NOT REPORTED**					
Judge et al. 2011 (36)	**NOT REPORTED**					
Morhason-Bello et al. 2014 (43)	20-23 (5) 24-27 (127) 28-31 (54) 32-35 (10) NR (10)	Female (79) Male (126)	Doctors (205)	Christianity (166) Islam (32) Other (4) NR (3)	Single (181) Married (23) Divorced (1)	On internship (205)
Morse et al. 2013 (49)	Median (range): SA: 43 (23-69) Zimbabwe: 40 (20-74)	SA: Female (547) Male (62) Zimbabwe: Female (674) Male (145)	SA: Physicians (86) Nurses (528) Zimbabwe: Physicians (38) Nurses (792)	NR	NR	NR
Mwafulirwa et al. 2016 (39)	20-29 (12) 30-39 (14) ≥40 (11)	Female (24) Male (13)	Clinical officer (1) Medical assistant (4) RN (7) Nurse midwife (23)	NR	NR	NR

			Counsellor (2) Not reported (25)			
Nalwadda et al. 2011 (53)	NR	NR	Medical officer (6) Clinical officer (6) Midwife/nurse (68) Nursing assistant (22)	NR	NR	FP experience: ≤ 5 years (50) 6-10 years (32) >10 years (20)
Newmann et al. 2013 (38)	Median (range): 33 (30-55)	NR	Clinician (18) CHW (13)	NR	NR	Median (range): 3 years (1-26)
Oriji et al. 2011 (44)	NR	NR	GPs (40) Surgeons (17) Obstetricians/gynaecologist (12) Physicians (9)	NR	NR	0-5 years (58) 6-10 years (30) >10 years (12)
Rupley et al. 2015 (35)	Median (Range): 30 (22-60) **Physicians**: 31 (25-51) **Midwives**: 29 (22-60)	**Females (65):** Physicians (13) Midwives (52) **Males (26):** Physicians (26) Midwives (26)	Physicians (39) Midwives (52)	NR	NR	NR
Schwandt et al. 2017 (45)	NR	**Health facility Providers:** Female (1313) Male (166) **Pharmacy:** Female (191)	**Health facility Providers (1479):** Doctor (86) CHEW (478) Nurse/Midwife (886) Pharmacist (0) Other (26)	**Health facility providers:** Christian (1019) Islam/Other (460) **Pharmacy:** NR	NR	NR

		Male (212) NR (12)	NR (3) **Pharmacy (415):** Doctor (0) CHEW (4) Nurse/Midwife (1) Pharmacist (140) Other (270) NR (3) **PMVs (483):** Doctor (4) Nurse/Midwife (56) CHEW (44) Pharmacists (9) Other (369) NR (1)			
Sibanda et al. 2017 (50)	Mean (range): 35.73 (20-61)	Female (228) Male (40)	EN (29) Professional Nurse (172) Medical intern (41) Medical officer (OB/GYN) (11) Registrar (OB/GYN) (14) Specialist (OB/GYN) (1)	NR	NR	NR
Sidze et al. 2014 (46)	**NOT REPORTED**					
Speizer et al. 2000 (51)	**NOT REPORTED**					
Tshitenge et al. 2018 (32)	20-29 (34) 30-39 (24)	Female (42) Male (38)	Nurse (50) Doctor (30)	Christian (78) Non-believer/other (2)	Single (40) Married (33)	<5 years (26) 5-10 years

	40-49 (14) 50-59 (7) >60 (1)				Living together (6) Widow (1)	(26) 11-15 years (12) 16-20 years (11) >20 years (5)
Tumlinson et al. 2015 (37)	21-29 (218) 30-39 (196) 40-49 (143) 50+ (119)	Female (487) Male (188) NR (1)	Doctors (18) Medical/Clinical officer (115) RN (282) CN (184) VCT provider (77)	Catholic (188) Protestant/Christian (457) Muslim/other (31)	NR	<2 years (71) 2-4 years (143) 5-9 years (126) 10-19 years (135) 20+ years (200) NR (1)

NR, not reported; GP, general practitioner; SRN, senior registered nurse; RN, registered nurse; EN, enrolled nurse; CN, community nurse; CHN, community health nurse; HCA, healthcare administrator; CHW, community health worker; CHEW, community health extension worker; VCT, voluntary counselling and testing; SA, South Africa; FP, family planning; HIV, human immunodeficiency virus.

Quality of studies

Using the quality assessment tool designed specifically for KAP studies, a total score out of 20 was assigned to each study (27). Eight studies (32–34,42,45,47,49,53) scored at least 15 or higher indicating good quality and eleven (35–37,41,43,44,46,48,50–52) scored 14 or less indicating low quality. The three studies (38–40) that utilised a mixed-method study design were indicative of good quality. The quality of the studies is outlined in Table 4.

Table 4. Quality appraisal for the risk of bias among cross-sectional and mixed-method studies assessing the knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of long-acting reversible contraceptive methods among healthcare workers in sub-Saharan Africa, 2000-2020.

Risk of Bias for Cross-Sectional Surveys of Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices						
Study Reference	Is the source population representative of the population of interest?	Is the response rate adequate?	Is there little missing data?	Is the survey clinically sensible?	Is there any evidence for the reliability and validity of the survey instrument?	**Total Score (out of 20)**
Abebaw et al. 2019 (33)	*4*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*3*	***17***
Adekunle et al. 2000 (41)	*3*	*4*	*3*	*2*	*1*	***13***
Atuahene et al. 2016 (34)	*4*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*2*	***16***
Blanchard et al. 2015 (57)	*4*	*3*	*3*	*4*	*4*	***18***
Byamugisha et al. 2007 (52)	*4*	*4*	*3*	*3*	*1*	***15***
Ebuehi et al. 2006 (42)	*4*	*4*	*3*	*4*	*4*	***19***
Gutin et al. 2011 (48)	*3*	*4*	*4*	*1*	*1*	***13***
Judge et al. 2011 (36)	*3*	*3*	*2*	*2*	*2*	***12***
Morhanson-Bello et al. 2014 (43)	*4*	*4*	*3*	*2*	*1*	***14***
Morse et al. 2016 (49)	*4*	*3*	*3*	*4*	*4*	***18***
Nalwadda et al. 2011 (53)	*4*	*1*	*4*	*4*	*3*	***16***
Oriji et al. 2011 (44)	*3*	*4*	*2*	*1*	*1*	***11***
Rupley et al. 2015 (35)	*4*	*2*	*3*	*1*	*3*	***13***
Schwandt et al. 2017 (56)	*4*	*3*	*4*	*4*	*3*	***18***
Sibanda et al. 2017 (50)	*2*	*4*	*3*	*1*	*3*	***13***
Sidze et al. 2014 (46)	*4*	*2*	*2*	*1*	*1*	***10***
Speizer et al. 2000 (51)	*3*	*3*	*3*	*2*	*2*	***13***
Tshitenge et al.	*4*	*4*	*3*	*4*	*4*	***19***

2018 (54)						
Tumlinson et al. 2015 (37)	*3*	*4*	*4*	*1*	*2*	***14***

Risk of bias for Mixed-Method studies					
	Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed-methods design to address the research question?	Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?	Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?	Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?	Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?
Caplan et al. 2018 (40)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mwafulirwa et al. 2016 (39)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Newmann et al. 2013 (38)	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Key: 4, definitely yes (low risk of bias); 3, probably yes; 2, probably no; 1, definitely yes (high risk of bias).

Synthesis of results

HCW knowledge concerning family planning:

Two questions relating to HCW training and HCW willingness to provide family planning counselling to their clients were used to assess their knowledge. The lowest reported proportion of 38% (95% CI: 29%, 48%) of HCW's who had not received family planning training was seen in a study conducted in East Africa (53). The highest proportion of HCW's who had received FP training was 85% (95% CI: 82%, 88%) observed in a Kenyan study (37). The overall proportion of HCW's who reported having training in family planning across the nine included studies was 62% (95% CI: 48%, 76%; Chi^2= 728.06; degrees of freedom [df]= 8; $p<0.001$; I^2= 98.9%). Concerning the provision of family planning counselling, the lowest proportion was observed in Ethiopia at only 31% (95% CI: 23%, 40%) in the Addis Ababa, Amhara, Oromiya, Tigray and the Southern Nations, Nationalities and People's Region's compared to the highest of 87% (95% CI: 81%, 92%) also in Ethiopia but conducted only in the Amhara Region (33). The analysis, based on five studies, showed that a total of 60% (95% CI: 41%, 80%; Chi^2= 165.17; df= 4; $p<0.001$; I^2= 98.58%) of HCW's provided this service to their clients.



Figure 2. Forest plots showing meta-analyses of studies assessing question 1 and 2 relating to the knowledge of family planning counselling among healthcare workers in sub-Saharan Africa

Knowledge of emergency contraception

There was a high proportion (88%; 95% CI: 82%, 94% Chi^2= 53.93; df= 4; p<0.001; I^2= 92.58%) of HCW's aware of EC (from five studies) but only 36% (95% CI: 21%, 51%; Chi^2= 436.81; df= 7; p<0.001; I^2= 98.40%) (from eight studies) knew of the Cu-IUDs suitability to be used in clients presenting for EC (Figure 3).



Figure 3. Forest plots showing meta-analyses of studies assessing question 3 and 4 relating to the knowledge of emergency contraception among healthcare workers in sub-Saharan Africa.

Knowledge of IUCD and contraceptive implants

Six studies (32,33,35,39,47,48) reporting on seven different regions were suitable for inclusion in the analysis to investigate the proportion of HCW's trained in IUCD insertion. The lowest proportion of HCW's trained in IUCD insertion was seen in a study by Blanchard et al. (47) in which 15% (95% CI: 13%, 19%) of HCW respondents in South Africa and 13% (95%CI: 11%, 15%) of respondents in Zimbabwe. Contrary to this, 86% (95% CI: 79%, 91%) of HCW's in the Amhara Region of Ethiopia were seen to have IUCD insertion training. The overall proportion of HCW's across seven studies in East, West and Southern Africa who had received IUCD insertion training was 41% (95% CI: 20% to 61%; Chi^2=706.88; df= 6; p<0.001; I^2= 99.51%). Data from four studies showed that 63% (95% CI: 44%, 81%; Chi^2=131.63; df= 3; p<0.001; I^2= 97.72%) of HCW's expressed a desire to receive IUCD insertion training. A meta-analysis on the knowledge relating to the implant was not conducted as there were insufficient studies reporting findings that could be appropriately pooled. However, two studies (39,53) conducted in Malawi and Uganda, respectively, provided some insight into implant knowledge. In Malawi, only 51% of HCW's reported receiving training on implant insertion while 47% of Ugandan HCW's felt competent to provide the method to their clients.



Figure 4. Forest plots showing meta-analyses of studies assessing question 5 and 6 relating to the knowledge of intrauterine contraceptive devices among healthcare workers in sub-Saharan Africa.

Attitudes and perceptions concerning IUCD and implant contraceptives

The attitudes and perceptions held by HCW's towards IUCD were assessed on their views regarding the safety of the method for HIV-infected women, and their restrictions imposed on its provision based on age and parity. The lowest proportion of HCWs perceiving IUCD as safe for WLWHIV was observed in nationally representative surveys (47) in South Africa (4%; 95% CI: 3%, 6%) and Zimbabwe (5%; 95% CI: 4%, 7%). The highest proportion reported (72%; 95% CI: 53%, 86%) was from HCW's in Cape Town and Umtata, South Africa (48). A meta-analysis of five studies found that 27% (95% CI: 18%, 36%; Chi^2= 146.64; df= 4; p<0.001; I^2= 97.27%) of HCW's from the included studies considered IUCD to be suitable and safe for HIV-infected women (Figure 5). With regards to the implant (not included in the meta-analysis as only two studies reported relevant findings), one Zimbabwean study (49) reported 29% of HCW's willing to provide the method to HIV-infected women and 35.5% in a Kenyan study (37).

Additional restrictions were observed based on age in which 56% (95% CI: 33%, 78%; Chi^2= 571.52; df= 4; p<0.001; I^2= 99.3%) of HCW's (from five studies) imposed minimum age restrictions (most often to adolescent clients) for the provision IUCD. Although not as prevalent, 29% (95% CI: 9%, 50%; Chi^2= 472.53; df= 4; p<0.001; I^2= 99.15%) of HCW's (from five studies) suggested that they required a minimum parity before feeling comfortable to provide IUCD to their client. In Senegal (46), 45% of HCW's based in public facilities required a minimum age to provide the implant. Similarly, of 433 Kenyan HCW's, 44% required clients to be at least 20 years of age before inserting an implant (37). Within the same study, of 90 HCW's who reported imposing minimum parity restrictions for the provision of the implant, 56.2% required at least one child, 32.6% required at least two and 11.2% required three or more (37). A meta-analysis for the attitudes and perceptions of among HCWs regarding the implant was not conducted due to an insufficient number of studies reporting relevant findings.



Figure 5: Forest plots showing meta-analyses of studies assessing question 7, 8 and 9 relating to the attitudes and perceptions of intrauterine contraceptive devices among healthcare workers in sub-Saharan Africa.

HCW attitude and perceptions concerning injectable contraceptives

From four studies included in the meta-analysis for question 10, it was observed that 60% (95% CI: 36%, 84%; Chi^2= 765.55; df= 3; p<0.001; I^2= 99.61%) of HCW's imposed minimum age restrictions for the provision of injectable contraceptives. Moreover, analysis of three studies showed that 36% (95% CI: 16%, 56%) of HCWs imposed minimum parity restrictions concerning the provision of injectables.



Figure 6. Forest plots showing meta-analyses of studies assessing question 10 and 11 relating to the attitudes and perceptions of injectable contraceptives among healthcare workers in sub-Saharan Africa.

Publication bias

Through the use of the Egger's test at a significance level of p< 0.05 and visual exploration of symmetry from funnel plots, it was found that only two questions (7, 10) of the 11 included in the meta-analysis had evidence for publication bias (Figure 7). The results from these two questions should therefore be interpreted with caution.



Figure 7. Funnel plot showing the likelihood of publication bias among included studies for question 7 relating to HCWs perceptions of IUCD suitability for HIV-infected women in sub-Saharan Africa.

Sub-group analysis

A sub-group analysis was conducted based on the region in which the studies were conducted (West, East and, Southern Africa). The analysis showed that the lowest proportion of HCW's who had received FP counselling training was seen in West Africa (43%; 95% CI: 41%, 45%) while 65% (95%CI: 58%, 73%) in the region reported providing it to their clients. In terms of IUCD insertion training, only 26% (95% CI: 13%, 38%) had received this in Southern Africa compared to 69% (95% CI: 48%, 86%) in West Africa and 86% (95% CI: 79%, 91%) in East Africa. Further to this, Southern Africa imposed the most restrictions for HIV-infected women with only 16% (95% CI: 8%, 24%) considering the method suitable. However, West Africa imposed the most severe restrictions based on age for IUCD and injectables (91%; 95% CI: 89%, 93%, and 80%; 95% CI: 78%, 82%, respectively). The West African region also had the highest proportion of HCW's who imposed restrictions based on parity at 52% (95% CI: 49%, 56%) for IUCD and 56% (95% CI: 53%, 58%) for injectables.

DISCUSSION

The slow uptake and underutilisation of LARC methods pose potential barriers to improving SRH across SSA. The burden of unintended pregnancies, in part attributable to the low utilisation of LARC methods, has far-reaching consequences for both maternal and child

health outcomes (58). This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to assess the knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions of LARC methods among HCW's within SSA based on studies published between January 2000 and January 2020. A total of 22 studies were included in the analysis. From the results, knowledge about LARCs was low with only 62% of HCW's stating that they readily provide family planning and contraceptive counselling to their clients; this is unsurprising as only 60% of HCW's included in this study had ever received family planning training. This is lower than observed in an Indian study of medical interns and nurses in which 90% and 78%, respectively, had received in-service family planning training (59). However, the findings concur with evidence indicating a high unmet need for quality family planning counselling identified by women across SSA countries, including Ghana (60), Cameroon (61), and Ethiopia(62). This is concerning as previous research highlights the positive impact that training HCW's in contraceptive counselling has on increasing LARC utilisation (63,64).

A lack of knowledge was also seen in HCW's ability to insert IUCD as only 41% reported having received adequate training. Similarly, a Nigerian study (65) indicated that 56% of HCW's in the study were familiar with IUCDs. However, training in IUCD's is not a guarantee for skill. One Nigerian-based study showed that among HCW's who had received training, many lacked any real-world experience or confidence to insert it (38). The results of this study are not uncommon. A global systematic review of health providers (66) and a systematic review across developed countries (67) both showed that HCW's regularly lacked adequate knowledge of IUCD, particularly on correct candidate selection and insertion ability. There is a clear need to increase HCW's exposure to appropriate IUCD training using conventional medical training programmes as well as real-world training (68). Evidence from multiple studies suggests further and regular training of HCW's (specifically residents, doctors, and nurses) is highly effective in improving knowledge of IUCD's and confidence to provide the method (69–71). This study further indicated that HCW's were prone to imposing unnecessary and medically unsubstantiated restrictions of all LARC methods based on age, parity, and HIV-status. This result is consistent with studies exploring women's experiences of provider imposed biases when presenting for contraception services (72–74). In this study, only 27% of HCW's considered IUCD safe for HIV-infected women; this is lower than reported in a Nepal-based study showing a proportion of 36% of family planning providers considering

IUCD safe for this population (75). With the rates of unintended pregnancies highest among WLWHIV (76) compared to all other groups, there is a need to improve the dialogue between HCW's and their HIV-infected clients desiring effective contraception. Moreover, the study results indicate that adolescents are also negatively affected by HCW attitudes and perceptions. The meta-analysis showed that 56% and 60% of HCW's restricted the provision of IUCD's and injectables based on minimum age. The result from this study is slightly higher than that found in Nepal (75) in which 40% of HCW's restricted the provision of IUCD's to girls under 17 and Pakistan (77) where 50% of physicians restricted access to girls 19 years and younger. The difference in findings may be attributable to the conservative cultural context present within some SSA countries.

Of concern when HCW's refuse LARC methods to a particular subset of clients are the resulting behaviour of turning to SARC methods or abandoning contraception altogether. The implication of this is an increase in unintended pregnancies, with the possibility to increase unsafe abortions and ultimately increase the maternal and infant mortality rates. Across SSA, misconceptions and fears among women in communities are known to influence their desire to use LARC methods (78). Our findings, however, show that HCW's knowledge of the methods, attitudes, and perceptions may also have a profound impact on their uptake. With the Family Planning 2020 initiative aiming to increase access to modern contraceptives to an additional 120 million women across the world's poorest countries, efforts to achieve this should not be hindered, but rather aided by HCW's. Access to reliable and effective contraception underpins a core principle in achieving universal health coverage (UHC); for this reason, a knowledgeable, unbiased health workforce is imperative. Our recommendations to achieve this are grounded in mobilisation to provide quality, routine training for HCW's across all cadres in family planning counselling, LARC insertion skill and education focussing on eliminating misconceptions of appropriate candidates for each method. Secondly, further research that is cadre specific about the KAP of HCW's is needed as well as more exploration of the KAP among HCW's about contraceptive implants, as this is currently limited.

A strength of this study is that, to our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and proportion meta-analysis exploring the KAP of HCW's regarding LARC methods in SSA. Limitations must also be acknowledged. High heterogeneity was observed within each of the analyses. This may be explained by the varying cultural and sociodemographic differences

among the HCW's across sub-Saharan Africa. In addition to this, the difference in tools used to assess KAP across different studies and the differences in the way in which they were administered may also have contributed to the high heterogeneity through possible selection bias. Another limitation was the inability to separate the analysis based on the HCW cadre. Lastly, publication bias was evident in question seven and nine of the meta-analysis; these results should, therefore, be interpreted with caution.

Conclusion

Long-acting reversible contraceptive methods have the potential to greatly increase women's overall access to contraception, family planning, and birth spacing practices. However, HCW's knowledge of these methods, attitudes and perceptions towards providing them appears to influence women's choice to utilise them. This can consequently influence the success or failure of strategies that are implemented by governments to increase access to these methods to women. The results from this study have identified a gap in knowledge among HCW's concerning LARC's. There is clear evidence that personal attitudes and perceptions held by HCW's impact their willingness to provide certain methods to a particular set of clients. This was especially seen in the context of HIV-infected women, adolescents, and nulliparous women.

List of abbreviations

EC: Emergency contraception

FP: Family planning

HCW: Healthcare worker

IUCD: Intrauterine contraceptive device

KAP: Knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions

LARC: Long-acting reversible contraceptive

PRISMA: Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses

SSA: sub-Saharan Africa

References:

1. Silumbwe A, Nkole T, Munakampe MN, Milford C, Cordero JP, Kriel Y, et al. Community and health systems barriers and enablers to family planning and contraceptive services provision and use in Kabwe District, Zambia. BMC Health Serv Res. 2018 May;18(1):390.

2. World Health Organization. Maternal mortality : level and trends 2000 to 2017. Sexual and Reproductive Health. 2019. Available from: https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/maternal-mortality-2000-2017/en/

3. Hajizadeh M, Nghiem S. Does unwanted pregnancy lead to adverse health and healthcare utilization for mother and child? Evidence from low- and middle-income countries. Int J Public Health. 2020;65(4):457–68.

4. Bearak J, Popinchalk A, Ganatra B, Moller AB, Tunçalp Ö, Beavin C, et al. Unintended pregnancy and abortion by income, region, and the legal status of abortion: estimates from a comprehensive model for 1990–2019. Lancet Glob Heal. 2020;8(9):e1152–61.

5. Yazdkhasti M, Pourreza A, Pirak A, Abdi F. Unintended pregnancy and its adverse social and economic consequences on health system: A narrative review article. Iranian Journal of Public Health. 2015;44(1):12-21.

6. Tsui AO, Brown W, Li Q. Contraceptive Practice in sub-Saharan Africa. Popul Dev Rev. 2017;43(Suppl Suppl 1):166-191.

7. Benova, Cleland, Daniele, Ali. Expanding Method Choice in Africa with Long-Acting Methods: IUDs, Implants or Both? Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2018;43(4):183-191.

8. United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Family Planning and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Data Booklet. 2019. (Available from: https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/publications/pdf/family/familyPlanning_DataBooklet_2019.pdf).

9. Flemming C. Review Long-acting reversible contraceptives. Obstet Gynaecol.

2009;11:83–8.

10. Foster-Rosales A, Stewart FH. Contraceptive Technology. In: Handbook of Women's Sexual and Reproductive Health. 2011.

11. Itriyeva K. Use of Long-Acting Reversible Contraception (LARC) and the Depo-Provera Shot in Adolescents. Curr Probl Pediatr Adolesc Health Care. 2018;48(12):321–32.

12. Goldthwaite LM, Shaw KA. Immediate postpartum provision of long-acting reversible contraception. Current Opinion in Obstetrics and Gynecology. 2015.

13. Goldstuck ND, Wildemeersch D. Practical Advice for Emergency IUD Contraception in Young Women. Obstet Gynecol Int [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2020 Sep 14];2015:1–6. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2015/986439

14. Cleland J, Ali M, Benova L, Daniele M. The promotion of intrauterine contraception in low- and middle-income countries: a narrative review. Contraception. 2017;95(6):519-528.

15. Aliyu AA. Family Planning Services in Africa: The Successes and Challenges. 2018. (Available from: http://www.intechopen.com/books/family-planning/family-planning-services-in-africa-the-successes-and-challenges).

16. Statistics SA. Mid-year population estimates. Statistical release P0302. 2020. (Available from: www.statssa.gov.za).

17. Nanda K, Stuart GS, Robinson J, Gray AL, Tepper NK, Gaffield ME. Drug interactions between hormonal contraceptives and antiretrovirals. Vol. 31, Aids. 2017. 917–952 p.

18. Krishna GR, Haddad LB. Interactions Between Hormonal Contraception and Anti-Retroviral Therapy: an Updated Review. Curr Obstet Gynecol Rep. 2020;9(3):98–104.

19. Gerland P, Raftery AE, Ševčíková H, Li N, Gu D, Spoorenberg T, et al. World population stabilization unlikely this century. Science. 2014;346(6206):234-7.

20. Society T, Health A. Improving Knowledge About, Access to, and Utilization of Long-Acting Reversible Contraception Among Adolescents and Young Adults. J Adolesc Heal. 2017;60(4):472–4.

21. Berlan ED, Pritt NM, Norris AH. Pediatricians' Attitudes and Beliefs about Long-Acting Reversible Contraceptives Influence Counseling. J Pediatr Adolesc Gynecol. 2017;30(1):47–52.

22. Malelelo-Ndou H, Ramathuba DU, Netshisaulu KG. Challenges experienced by health care professionals working in resource-poor intensive care settings in the Limpopo province of South Africa. Curationis. 2019;42(1):1–8.

23. Brown A, Harries J, Cooper D, Morroni C. Perspectives on contraceptive implant use in women living with HIV in Cape Town, South Africa: A qualitative study among primary healthcare providers and stakeholders. BMC Public Health. 2019;19(1):1–9.

24. Nyaga VN, Arbyn M, Aerts M. Metaprop: A Stata command to perform meta-analysis of binomial data. Arch Public Heal. 2014;72(1):1–10.

25. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Rand et al. Supplement- Additional Resources: Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. Annu Intern Med. 2009;151(4):264–9.

26. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan-a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. Syst Rev. 2016;5(210):2–10.

27. Agarwal A, Guyatt G, Busse J. Risk of Bias Instrument for Cross-Sectional Surveys of Attitudes and Practices. 2011. Available from: https://www.evidencepartners.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Risk-of-Bias-Instrument-for-Cross-Sectional-Surveys-of-Attitudes-and-Practices.pdf

28. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. (Available from: http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/nosgen.pdf).

29. Hong QN, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, Dagenais P, et al. The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. Educ Inf. 2018.

30. Von Hippel PT. The heterogeneity statistic I2 can be biased in small meta-analyses.

BMC Med Res Methodol. 2015;15(35).

31. Kleijnen J, Antes G. Systematic Reviews in Health Care. Meta-analysis in Context. Int J Epidemiol. 2002.

32. Tshitenge ST, Nlisi K, Setlhare V, Ogundipe R. Knowledge, attitudes and practice of healthcare providers regarding contraceptive use in adolescence in Mahalapye, Botswana. South African Fam Pract. 2018;60(6):181–6.

33. Abebaw Y, Berhe S, Abebe SM, Adefris M, Gebeyehu A, Gure T, et al. Providers' knowledge on postpartum intrauterine contraceptive device (PPIUCD) service provision in Amhara region public health facility, Ethiopia. PLoS One. 2019;14(4):e0214334.

34. Atuahene MD, Afari EO, Adjuik M, Obed S. Health knowledge, attitudes and practices of family planning service providers and clients in Akwapim North District of Ghana. Contracept Reprod Med. 2016;1(5).

35. Rupley DM, Morhe ESK, Moyer CA, Dalton VK. Maternity care provider knowledge, attitudes, and practices regarding provision of postpartum intrauterine contraceptive devices at a tertiary center in Ghana. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2015;128(2):137–40.

36. Judge S, Peterman A, Keesbury J. Provider determinants of emergency contraceptive counseling and provision in Kenya and Ethiopia. Contraception. 2011;83(5):486–90.

37. Tumlinson K, Okigbo CC, Speizer IS. Provider barriers to family planning access in urban Kenya. Contraception. 2015;92(2):143–51.

38. Newmann SJ, Mishra K, Onono M, Bukusi EA, Cohen CR, Gage O, et al. Providers' Perspectives on Provision of Family Planning to HIV-Positive Individuals in HIV Care in Nyanza Province, Kenya. AIDS Res Treat. 2013;2013:915-923.

39. Mwafulirwa T, O'Shea MS, Hamela G, Samuel E, Chingondole C, Chipangula V, et al. Family planning providers' experiences and perceptions of long-acting reversible contraception in Lilongwe, Malawi. Afr J Reprod Heal. 2016;20(2):62–71.

40. Caplan MR, Phiri K, Parent J, Phoya A, Schooley A, M. Hoffman R. Provider perspectives on barriers to reproductive health services for HIV-infected clients in

Central Malawi. Clin Obstet Gynecol Reprod Med. 2018;4(1):1–6.

41. Adekunle AO, Arowojolu AO, Adedimeji AA, Okunlola MA. Emergency contraception: survey of knowledge, attitudes and practice of health care professionals in Ibadan, Nigeria. J Obstet Gynaecol .2000;20(3):284–9.

42. Ebuehi OM, Ebuehi OAT, Inem V. Health care providers' knowledge of, attitudes toward and provision of emergency contraceptives in Lagos, Nigeria. Int Fam Plan Perspect. 2006;32(2):89–93.

43. Morhason-Bello IO, Adedokun BO, Mumuni TO, Bello FA, Abdus-Salam RA, Lawal OO, et al. Knowledge and use of emergency contraception by medical doctors on internship in a tertiary healthcare facility in Nigeria. Niger J Clin Pract. 2014;17(4):431–5.

44. Oriji VK, Omietimi JE. Knowledge, attitude, and practice of emergency contraception among medical doctors in Port Harcourt. Niger J Clin Pract. 2011;14(4):428–31.

45. Schwandt HM, Speizer IS, Corroon M. Contraceptive service provider imposed restrictions to contraceptive access in urban Nigeria. BMC Health Serv Res. 2017;17(1):268.

46. Sidze EM, Lardoux S, Speizer IS, Faye CM, Mutua MM, Badji F. Young women's access to and use of contraceptives: the role of providers' restrictions in urban Senegal. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2014;40(4):176–83.

47. Blanchard K, Chipato T, Ramjee G, Nhemachena T, Harper CC. Clinicians' perceptions and provision of hormonal contraceptives for HIV-positive and at-risk women in Southern Africa: An original research article. Contraception. 2014;90(4):391–8.

48. Gutin SA, Mlobeli R, Moss M, Buga G, Morroni C. Survey of knowledge, attitudes and practices surrounding the intrauterine device in South Africa. Contraception. 2011 ;83(2):145–50.

49. Morse J, Chipato T, Blanchard K, Nhemachena T, Ramjee G, McCulloch C, et al. Provision of long-acting reversible contraception in HIV-prevalent countries: Results from nationally representative surveys in southern Africa. BJOG An Int J Obstet

Gynaecol. 2013;120(11):1386–93.

50. Sibanda E, Titus MJ. Knowledge, attitudes and practices of health professionals in public health institutions on emergency contraception in Pietermaritzburg, Kwazulu-natal Province, South Africa. S Afr J Obstet Gynaecol. 2017;23(1):7–11.

51. Speizer IS, Hotchkiss DR, Magnani RJ, Hubbard B, Nelson K. Do service providers in Tanzania unnecessarily restrict clients' access to contraceptive methods? Int Fam Plan Perspect. 2000;26(1):13–20.

52. Byamugisha JK, Mirembe FM, Faxelid E, Gemzell-Danielsson K. Knowledge, attitudes and prescribing pattern of emergency contraceptives by health care workers in Kampala, Uganda. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2007;86(9):1111–6.

53. Nalwadda G, Mirembe F, Tumwesigye NM, Byamugisha J, Faxelid E. Constraints and prospects for contraceptive service provision to young people in Uganda: providers' perspectives. BMC Health Serv Res. 2011;11:220.

54. Tshitenge ST, Nlisi K, Setlhare V, Ogundipe R. Knowledge, attitudes and practice of healthcare providers regarding contraceptive use in adolescence in Mahalapye, Botswana. South African Fam Pract. 2018;60(6):181–6.

55. Morse J, Chipato T, Blanchard K, Nhemachena T, Ramjee G, McCulloch C, et al. Provision of long-acting reversible contraception in HIV-prevalent countries: results from nationally representative surveys in southern Africa. BJOG. 2013;120(11):1386–94.

56. Schwandt HM, Speizer IS, Corroon M. Contraceptive service provider imposed restrictions to contraceptive access in urban Nigeria.BMC Health Serv Res. 2017;17 (268).

57. Blanchard K, Chipato T, Ramjee G, Nhemachena T, Harper C. Clinicians' perceptions and provision of hormonal contraceptives for HIV-positive and at-risk women in Southern Africa: an original research article. Contraception. 2014;90(4):391–8.

58. Secura G. Long-acting reversible contraception: A practical solution to reduce unintended pregnancy. Minerva Ginecol. 2013;65(3):271-7.

59. Gupta M, Verma M, Kaur K, Iyengar K, Singh T, Singh A. Competency assessment of the medical interns and nurses and documenting prevailing practices to provide family planning services in teaching hospitals in three states of India. PLoS One. 2019;14(11).

60. Guure C, Tei Maya E, Dery S, da-Costa Vrom B, Alotaibi RM, Ragab Rezk H, et al. Factors influencing unmet need for family planning among Ghanaian married/union women: a multinomial mixed effects logistic regression modelling approach. Arch Public Health. 2019;77(11).

61. Ajong AB, Njotang PN, Yakum MN, Essi MJ, Essiben F, Eko FE, et al. Determinants of unmet need for family planning among women in Urban Cameroon: a cross sectional survey in the Biyem-Assi Health District, Yaoundé. BMC Women's Health. 2015; 16(4).

62. Solomon T, Nigatu M, Gebrehiwot TT, Getachew B. Unmet need for family planning and associated factors among currently married reproductive age women in Tiro Afeta District, South West Ethiopia, 2017: cross-sectional study. 2019;19(170).

63. Potgieter F, Kapp P, Coetzee F. Factors influencing post-partum women's choice of an implantable contraceptive device in a rural district hospital in South Africa. South African Fam Pract. 2018;60(6):174-180.

64. Dehingia N, Dixit A, Averbach S, Choudhry V, Dey A, Chandurkar D, et al. Family planning counseling and its associations with modern contraceptive use, initiation, and continuation in rural Uttar Pradesh, India. Reprod Health. 2019;16(178).

65. Onwuhafua PI, Kantiok C, Olafimihan O, Shittu OS. Knowledge, attitude and practice of family planning amongst community health extension workers in Kaduna State, Nigeria. J Obstet Gynaecol. 2005;25(5):494–9.

66. Daniele MAS, Cleland J, Benova L, Ali M. Provider and lay perspectives on intra-uterine contraception: A global review. Reprod Health. 2017;14(1).

67. Ouyang M, Peng K, Botfield JR, McGeechan K. Intrauterine contraceptive device training and outcomes for healthcare providers in developed countries: A systematic review. PLoS One. 2019;(1497):e0219746.

68. Schubert FD, Herbitter C, Fletcher J, Gold M. IUD knowledge and experience among family medicine residents. Fam Med. 2015;47(6):474-7.

69. Lewis C, Darney P, De Bocanegra HT. Intrauterine contraception: Impact of provider training on participant knowledge and provision. Contraception. 2013;88(2):226-231.

70. Kemeny F, Digiusto E, Bateson D. Insertion of intrauterine contraceptive devices by registered nurses in Australia. Aust New Zeal J Obstet Gynaecol. 2016;56(1):92-6.

71. Romero D, Maldonado L, Fuentes L, Prine L. Association of reproductive health training on intention to provide services after residency: The family physician resident survey. Fam Med. 2015;47(1):22-30.

72. Omishakin MYJ. Women ' s Health & Gynecology Knowledge , Attitude and Practice of Family Planning among Healthcare Providers in Two Selected Health Centres in Osogbo Local Government , Osun State. Womens Heal Gynecol. 2015;1(2):2–5.

73. Sieverding M, Schatzkin E, Shen J, Liu J. Bias in Contraceptive Provision to Young Women Among Private Health Care Providers in South West Nigeria. Int Perspect Sex Reprod Health. 2018;44(1):19–29.

74. Solo J, Festin M. Provider bias in family planning services: A review of its meaning and manifestations. Global Health Science and Practice. 2019;7(3):371-385.

75. Chakraborty NM, Murphy C, Paudel M, Sharma S. Knowledge and perceptions of the intrauterine device among family planning providers in Nepal: A cross-sectional analysis by cadre and sector. BMC Health Serv Res. 2015;15(39).

76. Cohen SA. Hiding in Plain Sight: The Role of Contraception in Preventing HIV. Guttmacher. 2008.

77. Agha S, Fareed A, Keating J. Clinical training alone is not sufficient for reducing barriers to iudprovision among private providers in Pakistan. Reprod Health. 2011;8(40).

78. Daniele MAS, Cleland J, Benova L, Ali M. Provider and lay perspectives on intrauterine contraception: a global review. BMC Reprod Heal. 2017;14(119).