

Title of the article

Impact of mHealth interventions on antenatal and postnatal care utilization in low and middle-income countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Contributors

Kant R¹, Yadav P², Kishore S³, Barnwal S⁴, Kumar R⁵, Khapre M⁶

1. **Dr. Ravi Kant**, Additional Professor & Head, General Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Rishikesh, India
Email address - drkantr2006@gmail.com
2. **Poonam Yadav**, Ph.D. Scholar, College of Nursing, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Rishikesh, India
Email address – dryadavpoonam257@gmail.com
3. **Dr. Surekha Kishore**, Director and CEO, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Gorakhpur, India
Email address - surekhakishore@rediffmail.com
4. **Dr. Shruti Barnwal**, Associate Professor, Dermatology, Govt. Doon Medical college, Dehradun, India
Email: drshruti2006@gmail.com
5. **Dr. Rajesh Kumar**, Assistant Professor, College of Nursing, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Rishikesh, India
Email address - rajeshrak61@gmail.com
6. **Dr. Meenakshi Khapre**, Assistant Professor, Community and Family Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Rishikesh, India
Email address- drmeenaxi15@ymail.com

Prior publication: - Nil

Support: - Nil

Conflicts of interest: - Nil

Permissions: - NA

Corresponding Author

Poonam Yadav

Ph.D. Scholar

College of Nursing

All India Institute of Medical Sciences,

Rishikesh, Uttarakhand, India

Email address: - dryadavpoonam257@gmail.com

Word Count- 2619 words (excluding title, abstract, references, and figures)

ABSTRACT

Objective

To evaluate the effectiveness of mHealth interventions on antenatal and postnatal care utilization in low and middle-income countries.

Design

Systematic review and meta-analysis

Setting

Studies from low and middle-income countries were included for analysis.

Participants

We searched the literature through major electronic databases such as PubMed, MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane, Scopus, CINAHL, Clinical key, Google Scholar, Ovid databases with selected keywords, and explored the reference list of articles. Meta-analysis was performed in RevMan 5.4 software; p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. The effect of variables was measured in the Odds ratio with a fixed-effect model. Six published interventional studies were selected as per the eligibility and PICO framed for the systematic review and meta-analysis. Search restricted to articles in the English language, online published, and preprint articles till September 2020.

Primary and secondary outcome measures

We evaluated the effectiveness of mHealth intervention on antenatal care utilization, including four antenatal check-ups, iron-folic acid supplementation, two tetanus toxoid immunizations, and postnatal care utilization, which includes postnatal check-ups of delivered mothers.

Results

Results have been presented in the form of a forest plot. Findings of this meta-analysis depicted the significant increase in four or more antenatal care attendance (OR=1.89, 95% CI- 1.49-2.19), TT immunization (OR=1.63 (95% CI-1.17-2.27), compliance to iron supplementation (OR=1.88, 95% CI- 1.18-3.00) and postnatal care attendance (OR=2.54 (95% CI-2.15-2.99) among those pregnant mothers who received mHealth intervention compared to control group.

Conclusion

This meta-analysis concluded that m-health has the potential to increase the utilization of full antenatal care and postnatal care compared to standard care, although the level of evidence is moderate.

Keywords

Access to health care, Health promotion, Maternal health, Maternal and child health services, Reproductive health services.

Trial registration: - CRD42020204618, PROSPERO, International prospective register of systematic reviews

Article Summary

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This meta-analysis creates an evidence for the effectiveness of mHealth with pooled data of interventional studies with limited sample sizes.
- Technology is changing, but even with limited support like SMS, there was an improvement in antenatal and postnatal service utilization.
- Sensitivity analysis identified possible reasons for heterogeneity among studies.
- Studies included from LMICs so results can be generalized for the respective population.
- mHealth as an intervention is a broad term that created heterogeneity also.

INTRODUCTION

Pregnant women have the right to attain antenatal care throughout the pregnancy for the well-being of the fetus and themselves to promote a positive pregnancy outcome. ^[1] Full antenatal care is a term used to deliver appropriate antenatal care to the pregnant mothers, inclusive of four or more antenatal check-ups, and at least one tetanus toxoid injection with consumption of minimum 100 iron-folic acid tablets. ^[2] A proper antenatal and postnatal check-up provides necessary care to the mother and baby, which helps in timely identification, management, and referral to appropriate facilities to promote a healthy baby's delivery to a healthy mother to reduce the burden of maternal and neonatal mortality. ^[3] According to WHO, nearly 808 women died every day due to preventable causes of pregnancy and childbirth such as hemorrhage, hypertension, infections, and indirect causes, due to the interaction between pre-existing medical conditions and pregnancy and 94% of them from low middle-income countries. ^[4] A systematic analysis done by the UN Maternal Mortality Estimation Inter-Agency Group, based on MMR's sustainable development goal, estimated global projection of MMR for 2030, nearly 161 deaths per 100000 live births. It is estimated as 357 deaths per 100000 live births in Sub-Saharan Africa, 115 deaths per 100000 live births in Southern Asia, 72 deaths per 100000 live births in Southeastern Asia, and 43 deaths per 100000 live births in Northern Africa. ^[5] It is also observed that a woman in low-income countries has 120 times higher risk of mortality due to pregnancy and childbirth-related causes compared to higher-income countries. ^[4, 6] Probable reasons for such bad pregnancy-related outcomes could be administrative, logistic, and technical failures along with insufficient financial support and skilled health personnel, poor accessibility, and non-adherence to maternal and child health services. ^[7] The emergence of mobile technology in health facilitates the opportunity to reach the concerned individual and modify their attitude and behavior for a specific health issue. ^[8] It can also be an effective tool in sensitizing the population and imparting prenatal education as an engagement tool. ^[9] Mobile technologies have effectively created a place through robust communication engagement in treating the disease condition that requires treatment adherence and follow-ups. ^[10] It also has the potential to improve perinatal health outcomes by enhancing the acceptability and accessibility of existing maternal and child health services. ^[11] We have reviewed relevant studies that have evaluated mobile technology's effectiveness in promoting maternal and child health by measuring maternal satisfaction, their attitude and behavior towards available maternal and child health services, their antenatal and postnatal attendance, and maternal and perinatal health as well. ^[12-17] However, it remains inconclusive due to the limited sample size; hence, it is required to integrate and analyze these studies' findings with a systematic review of all available relevant literature and meta-analysis. This study evaluated mHealth interventions' effectiveness in antenatal and postnatal care utilization in low and middle-income countries.

Aim: -To evaluate the effectiveness of mHealth interventions on antenatal and postnatal care utilization in low and middle-income countries.

Objectives: -

1. To assess the effectiveness of mHealth interventions on antenatal visits of pregnant women.
2. To assess the effectiveness of mHealth interventions on tetanus toxoid immunization of pregnant women
3. To assess the effectiveness of mHealth interventions on compliance of pregnant women to iron supplementation.
4. To assess the effectiveness of mHealth interventions on postnatal visits of delivered mothers.

METHODS

Data Sources and Search strategy

We followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) 2009 guidelines for the systematic review. [Additional file]^[18] We reviewed literature from a broad range of databases- PubMed, MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane, Scopus, CINAHL, Clinical key, Google Scholar, Ovid databases. Search restricted to articles in the English language, online published, and preprint articles till September 2020. The search strategy used the keywords as "pregnant women", "antenatal attendance", "ANC visit", "pregnancy", "maternal health", "pregnan*", "Prenatal Care", "antenatal mothers", "postnatal mothers", "postnatal care", "tetanus toxoid", "iron supplementation", "compliance to iron therapy" AND "mHealth", "mobile health", "mobile intervention", "text message", "telemedicine", "mobile technology" AND "LMICs" "resource-limited countries".

PICO framework for eligibility

Participants

Inclusion criteria: - Pregnant mothers aged 18-49 years, in antenatal, intranatal, and postnatal periods and attended ANC visit in institutional or community setting (PHCs, CHCs, and SCs)

Exclusion- Adolescent females

Intervention

mHealth -Any intervention designed with a mobile phone or smartphone to support pregnant women and their neonates' health. It includes text messages, phone calls, and reminders through the app to increase antenatal care of pregnant and postnatal mothers. We excluded the studies which used mobile technology for any other communication purpose or specific disease.

Comparator

In the control group, we included conventional or routine services or non-exposure to intervention.

Outcome

Antenatal care utilization includes four antenatal check-ups, iron-folic acid supplementation, two tetanus toxoid immunization.

Postnatal care utilization includes postnatal check-ups of delivered mothers.

Setting

Inclusion: - Studies conducted in a population of low middle-income countries.

Exclusion: - Studies conducted in high-income countries

Time frame

We included studies conducted in the time frame from 2008 to 2020.

Study designs

Randomized controlled trials, cluster-randomized controlled trials, quasi-randomized trials, case-control, and cohort studies.

Data extraction

After systematic searching of literature, titles and abstracts were screened by two reviewers independently according to inclusion criteria with the help of Rayyan ([https:// rayyan.qcri.org](https://rayyan.qcri.org)), a free web-based software.^[19] The third reviewer has resolved any discrepancies related to the eligibility of studies. After screening articles, eligible studies were extracted into a data extraction file and imported to RevMan software for meta-analysis. After analysis, data have been presented in the form of forest plots separately for each outcome.

Evaluation for the risk of bias

The risk of bias has been evaluated through the Cochrane Risk of Bias Assessment Tool. It is used to assess Random sequence generation (selection bias), Allocation concealment (selection bias), Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias), Blinding of outcome assessment

(detection bias), Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias), Selective reporting (reporting bias) and Other bias through Review Manager software 5.4 version and have been displayed along with forest plot.^[20] Relevant file has been imported from RevMan software to "Summary of Findings" table GRADE Profiler to create a "Summary of Findings" table.^[21] A summary of the intervention effect and a measure of the quality of evidence was noted in the table. Any disagreement was resolved by other reviewers also.

Data analysis

Meta-analysis was performed using RevMan 5.4 software, using a fixed-effect model. P-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. The effect of variables was measured in the Odds ratio between two groups for all outcomes in the included studies. Statistical heterogeneity across studies was assessed using the I^2 test, and the values less than 40% were considered to be indicative of might not be significant heterogeneity.^[22] Subgroup analysis could be done for four ANC only if statistical heterogeneity is higher than 40%. The cluster randomized controlled trial's design effect has been calculated to calculate the effective sample size and, accordingly, events in both treatment and control groups.^[23] Funnel plots have been created to show an effect estimate against its standard error for each outcome.

Patient and Public Involvement statement

This research does not have direct patient and public involvement. We used the relevant data from available literature only.

RESULTS

A total of 319 articles were identified after searching through various databases. A reference list of selected articles was also explored to find the relevant articles. Further, two hundred eighty-seven articles were screened after removing duplicate articles. Thirty-two full-text articles were assessed for eligibility, and 26 articles were excluded due to different study designs, conducted in high-income countries, different outcomes, non-comparable control groups, and only protocol availability. Only six articles were included for the final meta-analysis. (Figure1 -PRISMA, Flow Chart)

Study	Participants	Setting	Intervention	Comparator	Outcome
Adanikin, 2013 ^[17]	1126 interventions and 971 controls	Nigeria	SMS reminders	standard care	postnatal care
Bangal, 2017 ^[16]	200 interventions and 200 controls	India	SMS reminders	standard care	Four or more ANC, TT immunization, Postnatal care
Fedha, 2014 ^[13]	191 interventions and 206 controls	Kenya	SMS reminders	standard care	Four or more ANC and compliance to iron therapy
Kebede, 2019 ^[15]	173 interventions and 169 controls	Ethiopia	SMS reminders	standard care	Four or more ANC, Postnatal care

Lund, 2014 ^[14]	1311 interventions and 1239 controls	Zanzibar	An automated short messaging service (SMS) system and a mobile phone voucher system	standard care	Four or more ANC and TT immunization
Mudey, 2015 ^[12]	178 interventions and 206 controls	India	SMS reminders	standard care	Four or more ANC and compliance to iron therapy

Total participants for the analysis of four or more ANC outcome (1115 interventional and 1133 control group), TT immunization outcome (601 interventional and 611 in the control group), compliance to iron therapy outcome (369 in interventional and 412 in the control group) and postnatal attendance outcome (1499 in interventional and 1340 in the control group) were included. The characteristics of the included studies were shown in table 1. Mudey, 2015^[12], Fedha, 2014^[13], Kebede, 2019^[15], Bangal, 2017^[16] and Adanikin, 2013^[17] included an intervention as SMS reminders and Lund, 2014^[14] included intervention as an automated short messaging service (SMS) system and a mobile phone Voucher system. All studies had comparators as standard care. Lund, 2014^[14] and Kebede, 2019^[15] were the cluster randomized controlled trials, and the sample size has been recalculated for the actual sample size considering the study's design effect. We have performed sensitivity analysis and excluded studies due to methodological issues and different target populations.^[24, 25]

The summary of findings has been shown in table 2. This table has displayed the relative effect (95% CI) in the Odds ratio with events per 1000 participants in both arms. The certainty of evidence and grade have been shown as high, moderate, and low for each outcome variable.

Forest plot [Figure -2, Figure- 3] shows the comparison between mHealth intervention and the control group with pooled data and favors mHealth intervention's effectiveness in utilizing antenatal and postnatal care. Forest plot [Figure-2] favors the mHealth intervention group, (OR= 1.89 (95% CI- 1.49-2.19, I²= 33%) for the outcome of four or more antenatal attendance, forest plot favors the mHealth intervention group, (OR=1.63, 95% CI-1.17-2.27, I²= 0%) for the outcome TT immunization of pregnant mothers, forest plot favors the mHealth intervention group, (OR=1.88, 95% CI- 1.18-3.00, I²=0%) for the outcome of compliance with iron supplementation and forest plot [Figure-3] favors the mHealth intervention group, odds ratio 2.54 (95% CI-2.15-2.99, I²= 36%) for the outcome of postnatal attendance of delivered mothers. A funnel plot has been created to evaluate the publication bias and show an effect estimate against its standard error for antenatal care utilization outcomes. [Figure 4].

Table:- 2 GRADEpro Summary of findings table					
Outcomes	Anticipated absolute effects* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	No of participants (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)
	Events with Control Group	Events with mHealth intervention			
four or more Antenatal check up	539 per 1,000	683 per 1,000 (626 to 734)	OR 1.84 (1.43 to 2.36)	2248 (5 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE ^a
TT Immunization	805 per 1,000	870 per 1,000 (827 to 903)	OR 1.62 (1.16 to 2.26)	1212 (3 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE ^b
Compliance with iron supplementation	857 per 1,000	918 per 1,000 (876 to 947)	OR 1.88 (1.18 to 2.99)	781 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕○○ LOW ^{b, c}
Postnatal care utilization	583 per 1,000	770 per 1,000 (722 to 811)	OR 2.39 (1.86 to 3.07)	2839 (3 RCTs)	⊕⊕○○ LOW ^{b, c}

DISCUSSION

Full antenatal care is a term used to deliver appropriate antenatal care to the pregnant mothers, inclusive of four or more antenatal check-ups, at least one tetanus toxoid injection with consumption of a minimum of 100 iron-folic acid tablets^[2], which helps to promote the delivery of a healthy baby to a healthy mother.^[3] Unfortunately, it is observed that a woman in low-income countries has 120 times higher risk of mortality due to pregnancy and childbirth-related causes compared to higher-income countries.^[4, 6] Although studies have shown the effectiveness of mHealth intervention towards maternal and child health outcomes.^[12-17] In the present meta-analysis, we have pooled the data of selected studies in low- and middle-income countries to create or strengthen the evidence for mHealth's effectiveness towards antenatal and postnatal care utilization. This meta-analysis detected that m-health has the potential to increase antenatal and postnatal attendance compared to the standard approach, although the level of evidence was moderate. Results of this meta-analysis depicted the significant increase in four or more antenatal care attendance, TT immunization, compliance to iron supplementation, and postnatal care attendance among those pregnant mothers who received m-health intervention in comparison to those who did not receive such intervention. These findings were supported by two systematic reviews performed in low- and middle-income countries, although with low and moderate evidence levels.^[26, 27] One systematic review suggests that mHealth intervention can be more effective in enhancing maternal and child health services if we target the mothers during antenatal and postnatal periods.^[27] If we incorporate the findings of a meta-analysis conducted in China, it also clarifies that mHealth apps with social media can also enhance maternal health.^[28] One of the

evidence from the systematic review strengthens the findings that mHealth nutrition interventions also help in improving the dietary intake and nutritional status of pregnant mothers.^[29] However, a mixed-method study performed in South Africa shows that mHealth intervention was not useful in improving pregnant mothers' health knowledge but useful in motivating their self-reported behavior to seek medical services.^[30]

In the rural population, a community-based randomized controlled trial in Ethiopia supports the positive contribution of SMS-based intervention towards maternal health. We even explored this study but excluded while sensitivity analysis due to methodological issues and target populations as community health workers and health extension workers.^[24] A randomized controlled trial shows the higher satisfaction level of pregnant women who received SMS during their antenatal duration than the routine antenatal care group. This study also presented the lower anxiety level among pregnant mothers during their antenatal period, but they did not notice any difference in pregnancy outcomes.^[31] A controlled quasi-experimental study in Tanzania on pregnant women in improving pregnant mothers' knowledge on danger signs and birth preparedness also found a significant difference between mHealth and standard care.^[32] Ultimately it will one step towards improving antenatal and postnatal care attendance. As we have discussed, systematic reviews and meta-analyses have been conducted to examine mobile intervention's effectiveness on different maternal and child health outcomes. However, our meta-analysis findings contribute to mHealth intervention's effectiveness in utilizing full antenatal care and postnatal care among pregnant mothers.

Strengths and limitations of this study

This meta-analysis creates an evidence for the effectiveness of mHealth with pooled data of interventional studies with limited sample sizes. This meta-analysis adheres with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis for Protocols 2009 to ensure the quality of reporting the results. Sensitivity analysis identified possible reasons for heterogeneity among studies. As we included studies from LMICs, so results can be generalized for the respective population. mHealth as an intervention is a broad term that created heterogeneity also.

Conclusion

This meta-analysis concluded that m-health intervention has the potential to increase the utilization of full antenatal and postnatal care compared to the standard approach, although the level of evidence was moderate. Technology is changing, but even with limited support like SMS, there was an improvement in antenatal and postnatal service utilization. It might have a possible solution to enhance maternal and child health services to pregnant mothers and reduce maternal and neonatal mortality. Further studies are required with experimental trials or cluster randomized controlled trials to assess the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of mHealth intervention in community settings with the next step by involving the government health system to implement these findings.

Contributions details

Study conception/design: Yadav P, Kant R,

Data collection: Yadav P, Kant R, Kishore S, Barnwal S

Data analysis, and interpretation: Yadav P, Kumar R, Khapre M, Barnwal S

Drafting Manuscript: Yadav P

Revising manuscript: Yadav P, Kant R, Kishore S, Kuamr R, Khapre M, Barnwal S

Approval of final version of the manuscript for publication: Yadav P, Kant R, Kishore S, Khapre M, Kuamr R, Barnwal S

Responsibility for accuracy and integrity of all aspects of research involvement in drafting or revising the manuscript: Yadav P, Kant R, Kishore S, Khapre M, Kuamr R, Barnwal S

Funding: - none

A competing interest statement: - none

Patient consent for publication: - Not Applicable

PRISMA Checklist: - Supplementary file 1

The original protocol for the study: - Supplementary file 2

Data availability statement: - Data included in meta-analysis have been presented in the manuscript. Additional information related to the study has been uploaded as supplementary files.


References: -

1. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience [Internet]. World Health Organization. 2018 [accessed 13 November 2020]. Available from: http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/maternal_perinatal_health/anc-positive-pregnancy-experience/en/
2. International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS) and ICF. National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4), 2015-16. Mumbai: IIPS; 2017. [accessed Nov 13 2020] Available from <http://rchiips.org/nfhs/pdf/NFHS4/India.pdf>
3. Nhm.gov.in. 2020 [accessed 13 November 2020]. Available from: https://nhm.gov.in/images/pdf/programmes/maternal-health/guidelines/sba_guidelines_for_skilled_attendance_at_birth.pdf
4. World Health Organization: Trends in Maternal Mortality: 1990 to 2013, WHO, [accessed Nov 13, 2020] Available from <http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/monitoring/maternalmortality2013/en.2014>.
5. Alkema L, Chou D, Hogan D, Zhang S, Moller A, Gemmill A et al. Global, Regional, and National Levels and Trends in Maternal Mortality Between 1990 and 2015, With Scenario-based Projections to 2030. *Obstetric Anesthesia Digest*. 2016;36(4):191.
6. Maternal and reproductive health [Internet]. Who. int. 2020 [cited 15 November 2020]. Available from: https://www.who.int/gho/maternal_health/mortality/maternal_mortality_text/en/#:
7. Bazile J, Rigodon J, Berman L, Boulanger VM, Maistrellis E, Kausiwa P, Yamin AE. Intergenerational impacts of maternal mortality: qualitative findings from rural Malawi. *Reprod Health*. 2015;12(1): S1.
8. Higgs ES, Goldberg AB, Labrique AB, Cook SH, Schmid C, Cole CF, Obregon RA. Understanding the role of mHealth and other media interventions for behavior change to enhance child survival and development in low- and middle-income countries: an evidence review. *J Health Commun*. 2014;19 Suppl 1:164–89.
9. Ledford CJW, Canzona MR, Cafferty LA, Hodge JA. Mobile application as a prenatal education and engagement tool: A randomized controlled pilot. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2016 Apr;99(4):578-582.
10. Free C, Phillips G, Galli L, Watson L, Felix L, Edwards P, Patel V, Haines A. The effectiveness of mobile-health technology-based health behavior change or disease management interventions for health care consumers: a systematic review. *PLoS Med*. 2013;10(1): e1001362.
11. Agarwal S, Labrique A. Newborn health on the line: the potential mHealth applications. *JAMA*. 2014; 312:229–30.
12. Mudey DA, Khapre DM, Mudey DG, Goyal DR. An Innovative Approach of Mobile E-Health Intervention in Tracking Antenatal Mothers & Neonates in Selected Rural Areas of a District in Central India: An Ice Breaking Footstep for Revolution. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2015 Oct 1;44(suppl_1): i95–6.
13. Fedha T. Impact of Mobile Telephone on Maternal Health Service Care: A Case of Njoro Division. *Open J Prev Med* [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2020 Oct 18];04(05):365–76.
14. Lund S, Nielsen BB, Hemed M, Boas IM, Said A, Said K, et al. Mobile phones improve antenatal care attendance in Zanzibar: a cluster randomized controlled trial. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2014 Jan 17; 14:29.

15. Kebede AS, Ajayi IO, Arowojolu AO. Effect of enhanced reminders on postnatal clinic attendance in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a cluster randomized controlled trial. *Glob Health Action*. 2019 May 24;12(1).
16. Bangal VB, Borawake SK, Gavhane SP, Aher KH. Use of mobile phone for improvement in maternal health: a randomized control trial. *Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol* 2017; 6:5458-63
17. Adanikin AI, Awoleke JO, Adeyiolu A. Role of reminder by text message in enhancing postnatal clinic attendance. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. 2014 Aug;126(2):179-80.
18. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group TP. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med* 2009;6: e1000097.
19. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan — a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Sys Rev* 2016; 5:210.
20. RevMan. Review Manager. 53rd ed. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration; 2014.
21. GRADEpro: GRADEpro. Hamilton: McMaster University; 2014.
22. Holger Schünemann, Jan Brožek, Gordon Guyatt, Andrew Oxman, and other grade working group. Handbook for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations using the GRADE approach. [Internet]. 2013. Available from: <https://gdt.grade.org/app/handbook/handbook.html#h.g2dqzi9je57e>. [Last accessed on 2020 Nov 13].
23. Chapter 23: Including variants on randomized trials [Internet]. [accessed 2020 Oct 18]. Available from: /handbook/current/chapter-23
24. Atnafu A, Otto K, Herbst CH. The role of mHealth intervention on maternal and child health service delivery: findings from a randomized controlled field trial in rural Ethiopia. *Mhealth*. 2017 Sep 14; 3:39.
25. Flueckiger RM, Thierno DM, Colaço R, Guilavogui T, Bangoura L, Reithinger R, Fitch ER, Taton JL, Fofana A. Using Short Message Service Alerts to Increase Antenatal Care and Malaria Prevention: Findings from Implementation Research Pilot in Guinea. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2019 Oct;101(4):806-808.
26. Colaci D, Chaudhri S, Vasan A. mHealth Interventions in Low-Income Countries to Address Maternal Health: A Systematic Review. *Ann Glob Health*. 2016 Sep-Oct;82(5):922-935.
27. Feroz A, Perveen S, Aftab W. Role of mHealth applications for improving antenatal and postnatal care in low and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2017 Nov 7;17(1):704.
28. Chan KL, Chen M. Effects of Social Media and Mobile Health Apps on Pregnancy Care: Meta-Analysis. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2019 Jan 30;7(1): e11836.
29. Saronga NJ, Burrows T, Collins CE, Ashman AM, Rollo ME. mHealth interventions targeting pregnancy intakes in low and lower-middle-income countries: Systematic review. *Matern Child Nutr*. 2019 Apr;15(2): e12777.
30. Lau YK, Cassidy T, Hacking D, Brittain K, Haricharan HJ, Heap M. Antenatal health promotion via short message service at a Midwife Obstetrics Unit in South Africa: a mixed-methods study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2014 Aug 21; 14:284.


- 31.** Jareethum R, Titapant V, Chantra T, Sommai V, Chuenwattana P, Jirawan C. Satisfaction of healthy pregnant women receiving short message service via mobile phone for prenatal support: A randomized controlled trial. *J Med Assoc Thai.* 2008 Apr;91(4):458-63.
- 32.** Masoi TJ, Kibusi SM. Improving pregnant women's knowledge on danger signs and birth preparedness practices using an interactive mobile messaging alert system in Dodoma region, Tanzania: a controlled quasi-experimental study. *Reprod Health.* 2019 Dec 12;16(1):177.

Flow chart (PRISMA)




Outcome: Four or more antenatal attendance of pregnant mothers

Study or Subgroup	mHealth Group		Control Group		Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
	Events	Total	Events	Total		
Bangal 2017	101	200	79	200	24.6%	1.56 [1.05, 2.32]
Fedha 2014	177	191	166	204	7.4%	2.89 [1.51, 5.53]
Kebede 2019	87	124	79	124	14.8%	1.34 [0.79, 2.28]
Lund 2014	185	422	124	399	45.1%	1.73 [1.30, 2.30]
Mudey 2015	163	178	163	206	8.0%	2.87 [1.53, 5.36]
Total (95% CI)		1115		1133	100.0%	1.81 [1.49, 2.19]
Total events	713		611			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5.94, df = 4 (P = 0.20); I ² = 33%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 6.08 (P < 0.00001)						




Outcome: TT Immunization of pregnant mothers

Study or Subgroup	mHealth Group		Control Group		Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
	Events	Total	Events	Total		
Fedha 2014	191	191	205	206	0.9%	2.80 [0.11, 69.04]
Mudey 2015	161	178	175	206	27.7%	1.68 [0.89, 3.15]
Lund 2014	155	232	112	201	71.3%	1.60 [1.08, 2.36]
Total (95% CI)		601		613	100.0%	1.63 [1.17, 2.27]
Total events	507		492			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.13, df = 2 (P = 0.94); I ² = 0%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.91 (P = 0.004)						




Outcome: Compliance with iron supplementation

Study or Subgroup	mHealth Group		Control Group		Weight	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
	Events	Total	Events	Total		
Fedha 2014	175	191	180	206	53.5%	1.58 [0.82, 3.05]
Mudey 2015	164	178	173	206	46.5%	2.23 [1.15, 4.33]
Total (95% CI)		369		412	100.0%	1.88 [1.18, 3.00]
Total events	339		353			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.53, df = 1 (P = 0.47); I ² = 0%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.67 (P = 0.007)						



Forest plot for outcome - postnatal attendance of delivered mothers



Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)
- (B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)
- (C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)
- (D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
- (E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)
- (F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)
- (G) Other bias

