

TITLE

Factors associated with home birth in Peru: An analysis of the Demographic and Health Survey, 2019

AUTHOR NAMES AND AFFILIATIONS

Jackeline Huapaya-Torres ^a, Yuly Santos-Rosales ^a, Victor Moquillaza-Alcántara ^{b (*)}

a. Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos. Lima, Peru.

Postal address: Grau Avenue 1110, Lima, Peru.

b. Asociación Vía Libre. Lima, Peru.

Postal address: Shred Paraguay 490, Lima, Peru.

(*) *Corresponding author*

EMAIL

Jackeline Huapaya-Torres: jackeline.huapaya@unmsm.edu.pe

Yuly Santos-Rosales: ysantosr@unmsm.edu.pe

Victor Moquillaza-Alcántara: vmoquillaza.vialibre@gmail.com

ORCID:

Jackeline Huapaya-Torres: 0000-0001-5698-4107

Yuly Santos-Rosales: 0000-0002-4536-8293

Victor Moquillaza-Alcántara: 0000-0002-0362-907X

Declaration of interest's statement: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Financing: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Author contribution statement

Jackeline Huapaya-Torres: He conceived and designed the study, wrote the protocol, monitored the administrative requirements, interpreted the results, wrote the article, and approved the final version.

Yuly Santos-Rosales: Advised the execution of the study, interpreted the results, wrote the article, and approved the final version.

Victor Moquillaza-Alcántara: Advised the execution of the study, analyzed the data, interpreted the results, wrote the article, and approved the final version.

HIGHLIGHTS

- The proportion of home births in Peru is low, although it reaches high values in the amazon and rural areas.
- Sociodemographic determinants such as poverty and low educational level are risk factors for home birth.
- Obstetric determinants such as having few prenatal controls or had having previously multiple deliveries are risk factors for home birth.

ABSTRACT

Objective: To determine the proportion and factors associated with home birth in Peru, 2019. **Material and methods:** Cross-sectional analytical design study where the 2019 Peruvian Demographic and Family Health Survey was analyzed. The association was evaluated using Poisson Regression, supplemented with the crude prevalence ratio (cPR) and adjusted (aPR). **Results:** The records of 18,401 women were evaluated, where 5.39% (95%CI:4.83-6.03%) presented home birth. The probability of a home birth occurs increases when the pregnant woman is from the andean (aPR:1.24; 95%CI:1.02-1.48) and amazon region (aPR:1.38; 95%CI:1.16-1.64), resides in rural areas (aPR:3.34; 95%CI:2.61-4.29), presents less than 6 prenatal care (aPR:1.66; 95%CI:1.39 -1.96), it is very poor (aPR:9.62; 95%CI:5.13-18.1) or poor (aPR:2.39; 95%CI:1.26-4.52), it has not studied (aPR:2.66; 95%CI:2.02-3.50) or reached primary education (aPR:2.18: 95%CI:1.85-2.58) and has 2 children (aPR:1.64; 95%CI:1.46-1.85) or 3 or more children (aPR:2.18; 95%CI:1.67-2.87). On the other hand, having higher educational instruction (aPR:0.49; 95%CI:0.31-0.78) is associated with a lower probability of a home birth. **Conclusions:** There is a low proportion of home births; however, this indicator increases significantly according to various geographical, sociodemographic, and obstetric factors that have been identified.

Keywords: Home Childbirth, Social Determinants of Health, Epidemiology, Health surveys (Source: MeSH, NLM)

INTRODUCTION

Delivery care must be humanized and have the assistance of a qualified professional, which can be done at home if the pregnancy is low risk. Currently, several countries have legislated home care, seeking to promote the autonomy of women during childbirth (1–3), thus avoiding medicalized, bureaucratic processes with little cultural adaptation, also favoring the satisfaction of the user when being cared for in the comfort of her home with greater control of this experience (4–7). Despite this, there are maternal and neonatal risks associated with home birth that should promote the formulation of new health strategies (7,8).

In countries with medium and low income, there have been efforts to favor institutional delivery; However, after a first hospital birth, women choose to practice home birth (9-11), which can be attributed to the poor cultural adaptation of the institutions, such as an act of protest or an appreciation of the guidance of women midwives and their partners (12). In Peru, even though the proportion of home births have been decreasing (13), the behavior is different inside the country, being more frequent in rural regions, which is characteristic of environments where there are remarkable economic gaps and social inequalities. (14,15).

The present study seeks to determine where the practice of home birth prevails, in order to focus support from the authorities. Also, it seeks to recognize the determinants that favor this practice, which will allow the generation of health strategies that strengthen the adaptation of institutional delivery to the own experiences of a community, which is not yet regulated in the country (16). Due to the aforementioned, the objective of the study was to determine the proportion and factors associated with home birth in Peru.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study desing

This report is a secondary base analysis of the Demographic and Family Health Survey (ENDES, for its acronym in Spanish) of Peru for the year 2019, with a cross-sectional analytical design.

Data set

The database of the Demographic and Family Health Survey of 2019 was used, which is an annual survey carried out by the National Institute of Statistics and Informatics of Peru. The instrument is a public initiative that seeks to estimate indicators of the national budget programs, it also provides demographic information and, mainly health status of mother and children (17).

Study sampling and participants

The survey selects its clusters (primary units) through a systematic random sampling, then the households (secondary units) are determined through balanced sampling. During 2019, the survey had 3 254 conglomerates, which contained 36 760 homes, distributed among department capitals, urban cities, and rural areas. These processes guarantee that it is the most representative survey at national level (17).

People that participated were women between the ages of 12 to 49 and children under 12 years old, who must stay overnight in the household, since the last night of being interviewed, giving a total of 40,809 participants. For this study, those who had not have a pregnancy during the last 5 years and presented incomplete data for all the questions considered as study variables were excluded, giving a sample of 18 401 complete records (**Figure 1**).

Measurements

The place where the last living child of the interviewed was born was considered as the dependent variable of the study. The question, assigned as 426A in the database, was "Where did she give birth to her (her last child)?" The responses were recategorized and it was coded as 1 when the participant indicated that her delivery was at home (own house or midwife's house), in addition, it was coded as 0 when it was indicated that the delivery was institutional (health center, hospital, non-governmental organization or private establishment).

The independent variables considered for the study were the natural region where it comes from, the area of residence, the number of prenatal cares, trimester in which prenatal care begins, wealth index, highest educational level attained, age, birth

order, newborn size, health insurance and presence of violence (emotional, physical, and sexual). The coding used in each variable of the study is found in **Table 1**.

Statistical analysis

The analysis was made in STATA version 14 software, where the databases were downloaded in the beginning. Those are divided into chapters and the required ones for the study were joined by means of the “merge” command, considering as a binding variable the person identifier (assigned as "CASEID" in the database) (18). In the same way, all estimates considered the characteristics of the complex sampling presented by the survey.

Within the descriptive analysis, absolute frequencies and weighted proportions were determined according to complex sampling, accompanied by the 95% confidence interval. On the other hand, the characteristics of the participants were compared according to the place where their delivery occurred (bivariate analysis), the difference in the proportions was evaluated using Pearson's Chi-square test, considering as associated that value of p less than 0.05.

Subsequently, a multivariate analysis was made through the Poisson Regression test, where the results were adjusted among all the variables that reached statistical significance. Crude Prevalence Ratios (cPR) and adjusted (aPR) were estimated with their respective 95% confidence interval and, finally, the p value was considered less than 0.05 like significant.

Ethical review

Due to the study is a secondary base analysis with public access (<http://inei.inei.gob.pe/microdatos/>), it does not merit the approval of an ethics committee.

RESULTS

Among the 18 401 records analyzed, it is estimated that 5.39% (95%CI:4.83-6.03%) of women in Peru have a home birth, however, the proportion reaches 19.59% (95%CI:17.26-22.17%) in rural areas and 17.85% (95%CI:15.21-20.84%) in the Peruvian amazon. Within the sociodemographic characteristics, being very poor (21.91%), having no education (28.21%) or only primary education (20.64%) were the categories that presented high prevalence of home birth. On the other hand, when evaluating certain obstetric characteristics, it was found that women with 3 or more deliveries (21.40%) and those with a small newborn (7.20%) showed a higher proportion of home births. Regarding prenatal care, it was found that home birth is more frequent when pregnant women have less than 6 prenatal care (13.69%) and when they start after the first trimester of pregnancy (5.43%). (**Table 1**)

Next, a crude and adjusted analysis was carried out to evaluate which characteristics were associated with a home birth, which can be seen in **Table 2**. Risk factors that were found: living in the andean (aPR:1.24; $p<0.001$), amazon (aPR:1.38; $p<0.001$), or in rural areas (aPR:3.34; $p<0.001$), have less than 6 prenatal care (aPR:1.66; $p<0.001$), have a very poor wealth index (aPR:9.62; $p<0.001$) or poor (aPR:2.39; $p=0.008$), have no education (aPR:2.66; $p<0.001$) or have achieved primary education (aPR:2.18; $p<0.001$) and having had 2 (aPR:1.64; $p<0.001$) or more live births (aPR:2.18; $p<0.001$). On the other hand, having reached a higher education was shown to be a protective factor against home birth (aPR:0.49; $p=0.003$).

DISCUSSION

This study sought to determine those factors that are associated with the practice of home birth in Peru, owing to, despite the fact that the proportion has been decreasing, this reduction is not homogeneous in all regions of the country. It was found that those regions that are part of the Peruvian amazon and Andes are more likely to present cases of home births, which matches with a similar study that had the same geographical area (19). It should be noted that these regions are characterized by sociodemographic hurdle, which leads to the inaccessibility of health services (20–22). According to many authors, other reasons why women in the Peruvian Amazon prefer to have a home birth is the cultural pattern and the lack of cohesiveness with health facilities (23), which is why it is suggested to continue promoting the adequacy of intercultural delivery.

On the other hand, the present study showed that women living in rural areas are more likely to have home births, which is consistent with a recent systematic review (24). One possible explanation lies in the fact that pregnant women in rural areas feel fear that their privacy and traditions are not going to be respected in health facilities, and some indicated that they were afraid of being victims of abuse by health professionals (25–27), which highlights the marked gap between the rural population and health care.

Having less than 6 prenatal care (APN) makes it difficult to monitor the pregnant woman, preventing screening for lot of complications (28–30) and raising awareness of the importance of an institutional delivery (31). It should be noted that the number of APN alone does not determine the type of delivery, because the decision is multifactorial (32,33). However, the presence of a non-refocused routine APN, which is one where the birth plan, family education and multisectoral work with community leaders are not given importance (34), favors migration to home birth. On the other hand, the evidence shows that the absence of prenatal care or its beginning after 16 weeks widely increases the probability of a home birth, which can be explained by the limited information and procedures that can be developed over time rest that remain, reducing the expected quality in APNs (35).

Considering the wealth index, being very poor or poor increases the probability of having a home birth, which is similar to studies carried out in Tanzania (36) and Ethiopia (37). This might be due to the difficulties inherent to limited income, which creates a gap to pay for transportation, medicines, and medical care (38). Given this, it is the government that must guarantee that the necessary means are generated for the development of prenatal, delivery and postpartum care for those women who do not have the necessary resources (39).

It was found that having no education or having primary education increases the probability of a home birth, while having a higher education level reduces this probability. Data that is similar to those found in Peruvian studies (19) and in African countries, where reinforces the need to implement educational programs, that emphasizes the importance of institutional care and friendly services focused on those with limited economic resources, during pregnancy. (36,40). On the other hand, women with higher education usually have access to information about the risks or complications for the mother and her baby and value the importance of the APN, as well as greater purchasing power that allows them to pay for the services described in the previous paragraph (41–43).

Finally, the study determined that as there are more living children, the probability of having a home birth increases. This premise has also been determined in previous studies, which is explained by the bad experience that pregnant women have inside the institutions, which motivates them to change the place of delivery (44). In this regard, initiatives have been proposed that incorporate traditional midwives within (inside) the institution, where they can establish educational discussions, due to it has been identified that the usual clinical environment does not allow to establish appropriate communication (45–47). These proposals can be applied to improve care, which would improve adherence to institutional care, where there are tools to sort out complications in a timely manner.

The results of the study need to be limited to certain limitations. In the first place, there is the possibility that the interviewees do not remember certain characteristics of an event that could have happened during the last 5 years. Also, the cross-sectional analysis of the variables does not allow to establish a direct causality, but only a link that needs to be explored in future studies.

It is concluded that there are determinants that favors the occurrence of home births. It is necessary to approach a promotional preventive work from educational institutions and within families, so with that a pregnancy would be planned and its prenatal care will begin in a timely manner before 13 weeks, likewise, that the personal who provides the care are qualified and offer a refocused prenatal care, considering interculturality, multisectorality and that work is coordinated with the different social agents.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Claudia Ordoñez-Vargas and Kervyn Ynocente-Lazares for reviewing and correcting the translation of the article.


REFERENCIAS

1. Borges L, Sánchez R, Domínguez R, Pérez S. El parto humanizado como necesidad para la atención integral a la mujer. *Rev Cubana Obstet y Ginecol.* 2018;44(3):1–12.
2. Feeley C, Thomson G, Downe S. Understanding how midwives employed by the National Health Service facilitate women's alternative birthing choices: Findings from a feminist pragmatist study. *PLoS One.* 2020;15(11): e0242508. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242508>
3. Birthrights. Human rights in maternity care. [Internet] United Kingdom; 2017.
4. Denis W. Improving Maternity Services: Small is Beautiful - Lessons from a Birth Centre. 2006.
5. Van Teijlingen E. A Critical Analysis of the Medical Model as used in the Study of Pregnancy and Childbirth. *Sociol Res Online.* 2005;10(2):63–77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5153%2Fsro.1034>
6. Dodwell M, Newburn M. Normal birth as a measure of the quality of care. London; 2010.
7. Sánchez-Redondo M, Cernada M, Boix H, Espinosa M, González-Pacheco N, Martín A, et al. Home births: A growing phenomenon with potential risks. *An Pediatr.* 2020;93(4): 266.e1-266.e6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anpede.2020.04.012>
8. Rodríguez-Garrido P., Goberna-Triclas J. (In)seguridad del parto en el domicilio: una revisión bibliográfica. *Matronas profesión.* 2020;21(2): e37–46.
9. Ministerio de Salud. Plan Nacional Concertado de Salud. Lima; 2007.
10. Johnson F, Padmadas S, Matthews Z. Are Women Deciding against Home Births in Low and Middle Income Countries? *PLoS One.* 2013;8(6): e65527. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0065527>
11. Organización Panamericana de la Salud. Recomendaciones de la OMS Cuidados durante el parto para una experiencia de parto positiva. Washington D.C.; 2019.
12. Rodríguez-Garrido P, Goberna-Triclas J. Birth cultures: A qualitative approach to home birthing in Chile. *PLoS One.* 2021;16(4): e0249224. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249224>
13. Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática. Encuesta Demográfica y de Salud Familiar. Lima, Perú. 2018.
14. Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática. Perú: Indicadores de Resultados de los Programas Presupuestales, 2014-2019. Lima, Perú. 2020.
15. Devkota B, Maskey J, Pandey A, Karki D, Godwin P, Gartoulla P, et al. Determinants of home delivery in Nepal - A disaggregated analysis of marginalised and non-marginalised women from the 2016 Nepal Demographic

- and Health Survey. PLoS One. 2020;15(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228440>
16. Ministerio de Salud. Guías Nacionales de Atención Integral de la Salud Sexual y Reproductiva. Lima; 2004.
 17. Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática. Ficha Técnica-Encuesta Demográfica y de Salud Familiar. Lima; 2019.
 18. Hernández-Vásquez A, Chacón-Torrico H. Manipulación, análisis y visualización de datos de la Encuesta Demográfica y de Salud Familiar con el programa R. Rev Peru Med Exp Salud Publica. 2019;36(1):128–33. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17843/rpmesp.2019.361.4062>
 19. Hernández-Vásquez A, Chacón-Torrico H, Vargas-Fernández R. Factors associated with home births in Peru 2015-2017: A cross-sectional population-based study. Heliyon. 2021;7(3): e06344. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06344>
 20. Collins J, Bowie D, Shannon G. A descriptive analysis of health practices, barriers to healthcare and the unmet need for cervical cancer screening in the Lower Napo River region of the Peruvian Amazon. Women's Heal. 2019; 15:1–19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745506519890969>
 21. Moscoso-Porras M, Fuhs A, Carbone A. Access barriers to medical facilities for people with physical disabilities: the case of Peru. Cad Saude Publica. 2019;35(12): e00050417. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311X00050417>
 22. Gianella C, Pesantes M, Ugarte-Gil C, Moore D, Lema C. Vulnerable populations and the right to health: lessons from the Peruvian Amazon around tuberculosis control. Int J Equity Health. 2019;18(28):1–13. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-019-0928-z>
 23. Del Mastro I, Tejada-Llacsá P, Reinders S, Pérez R, Solís Y, Alva I, et al. Home birth preference, childbirth, and newborn care practices in rural Peruvian Amazon. PLoS One. 2021;16(5): e0250702. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250702>
 24. Ayenew A, Nigussie A, Zewdu B. Childbirth at home and associated factors in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arch Public Heal. 2021;79(1):1-18. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250702>
 25. Atukunda E, Mugenyi G, Obua C, Musiimenta A, Najjuma J, Agaba E, et al. When Women Deliver at Home Without a Skilled Birth Attendant: A Qualitative Study on the Role of Health Care Systems in the Increasing Home Births Among Rural Women in Southwestern Uganda. Int J Womens Health. 2020;12(1):423–34. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2147/IJWH.S248240>
 26. Mayra K, Matthews Z, Padmadas S. Why do some health care providers disrespect and abuse women during childbirth in India? Women and Birth. 2021; S1871-5192(21):00032–9. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2021.02.003>

27. dos Santos A, Brentani A, Fink G. Associations between neighborhood violence during pregnancy and birth outcomes: evidence from São Paulo's Western Region Birth Cohort. *BMC Public Health*. 2021;21(1):865. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-10900-y>
28. Ministerio de Salud. Norma Técnica de Salud: Atención Integral de Salud Materna. Lima; 2013.
29. Hong K, Hwang H, Han H, Chae J, Choi J, Jeong Y, et al. Perspectives on antenatal education associated with pregnancy outcomes: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Women and Birth*. 2021 May 1;34(3):219–30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wombi.2020.04.002>
30. Shiferaw K, Mengiste B, Gobena T, Dheresa M. The effect of antenatal care on perinatal outcomes in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(1): e0245003. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245003>
31. Křepelka P, Velebil P, Měchurová A, Straňák Z, Feyereisl J. Complications of planned home births in the Czech Republic between 2016–2017. *Cent Eur J Public Heal*. 2020;28(3):230–6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21101/cejph.a5641>
32. Descieux K, Kavasseri K, Scott K, Beth Parlier A. Why Women Choose Home Birth: A Narrative Review. *MAHEC Online J Res*. 2017;3(2):1–10.
33. Declercq E, Lockwood C, Eckler K. Planned home birth. Available from: <https://www.porod-doma.cz/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Planned-home-birth-UpToDate.pdf>
34. Gurara M, Van Geertruyden J, Gutema B, Draulans V, Jacquemyn Y. Maternity waiting homes as component of birth preparedness and complication readiness for rural women in hard-to-reach areas in Ethiopia. *Reprod Health*. 2021;18(27). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-021-01086-y>
35. Siyoum M, Astatkie A, Mekonnen S, Bekele G, Taye K, Tenaw Z, et al. Home birth and its determinants among antenatal care-booked women in public hospitals in Wolayta Zone, southern Ethiopia. *PLoS One*. 2018 Sep 1;13(9): e0203609. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0203609>
36. Moshi F, Mbotwa C. Determinants for choice of home birth over health facility birth among women of reproductive age in Tanzania: an analysis of data from the 2015-16 Tanzania demographic and health survey and malaria indicator survey. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2020;20(1):561. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-020-03266-3>
37. Tessema Z, Tiruneh S. Spatio-temporal distribution and associated factors of home delivery in Ethiopia. Further multilevel and spatial analysis of Ethiopian demographic and health surveys 2005-2016. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2020;20(1):342. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-020-02986-w>

38. Budu E. Predictors of home births among rural women in Ghana: Analysis of data from the 2014 Ghana Demographic and Health Survey. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2020;20(1): 523. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-020-03211-4>
39. Diario oficial “El Peruano”. Decreto Legislativo que establece Disposiciones para la Extensión de la Cobertura Poblacional del Seguro Integral de Salud en Materia de Afiliación al Régimen de Financiamiento Subsidiado. Lima, Perú. 2013.
40. Ikeako L, Onah H, Iloabachie G. Influence of formal maternal education on the use of maternity services in Enugu, Nigeria. *J Obstet Gynaecol (Lahore)*. 2006;26(1):30–4. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443610500364004>
41. Fekadu M, Regassa N. Skilled delivery care service utilization in Ethiopia: Analysis of rural-urban differentials based on national demographic and health survey (DHS) data. *Afr Health Sci*. 2014;14(4):974–84. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314%2Fahs.v14i4.29>
42. Adatarara P, Strumphier J, Ricks E. Exploring the reasons why women prefer to give birth at home in rural northern Ghana: A qualitative study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2020;20(1):500. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-020-03198-y>
43. Laza C. Factores relacionados con la preferencia de las mujeres de zonas rurales por la partera tradicional. *Rev Cuba Salud Pública*. 2015;41(3):487–96.
44. Swain P, Singh P, Priyadarshini S. Determinants of home deliveries - Findings from India DLHS 4 analysis. *J Fam Med Prim Care*. 2020;9(9):4728. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_751_20
45. Myhre E, Lukasse M, Reigstad M, Holmstedt V, Dahl B. A qualitative study of Norwegian first-time mothers’ information needs in pre-admission early labour. *Midwifery*. 2021; 100: 103016. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2021.103016>
46. Ngunyulu R, Mulaudzi F, Peu M. Traditional birth attendants’ experiences during the provision of post-natal care in Mopani district, Limpopo province of South Africa. *Heal SA Gesondheid*. 2020; 25:1468. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4102/hsag.v25i0.1468>
47. Hulsbergen M, van der Kwaak A. The influence of quality and respectful care on the uptake of skilled birth attendance in Tanzania. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2020;20(1):681. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-020-03278-z>



* Estimates made considering the specifications of the sampling complex
CI95%: 95% confidence interval

Figure 1. Participant selection flowchart

Table 1. Description and analysis coding plan of selected variables of the study

	Description and Categorization	Analysis Coding
Outcome variable		
Home birth	Place where the interviewee gave birth to her last living child (11=Respondent's home, 12=Midwife's home, 21-27=Hospital, 31-33=Private institution, 41-42=Non-governmental organizations)	Options were recoded as follows: 11&12 as 1= Home birth >12 as 0= Institutional birth
Independent variables		
Natural region	Region where participant resides (1=Lima, 2=Rest of coast, 3=Andean, 4=Amazon)	Options were recoded as follows: 1&2 as 1= Coast 3 as 2= Andean 4 as 3= Amazon
Place of residence	Type of place of residence (1=Urban, 2=Rural)	Options were recoded as follows: 1 as 0= Urban 2 as 1= Rural
Antenatal visits	Total number of antenatal visits that the interviewee had during the pregnancy of her last living child (0=No antenatal visits, 1-97=same numeric value, 98=DK)	Options were recoded as follows: 0-5 as 1= <6 >6 as 0= 6 or more 98 was not considered for analysis
Timing of 1st antenatal check	Months of pregnancy that the interviewee was when she had her first antenatal visit (1-9=same numeric value, 98DK)	Options were recoded as follows: 1-3 as 0= First trimester >3 as 1= >First trimester 98 was not considered for analysis
Wealth index	Wealth that the home has (1=Poorest, 2=Poorer, 3=Middle, 4=Richer, 5=Richest)	Used same coding
Highest educational level	Highest level of study passed (0=No education, 1=Primary, 2=Secondary, 3=Higher)	Used same coding
Age	Current age (0= Less than 1 year, 1-96=same numeric value, 97=>97, 98=DK)	Options were recoded as follows: <12 was not considered for analysis 12-17 as 1= 12-17 years 18-24 as 2= 18-24 years 25-34 as 3= 25-34 years 35-49 as 4= 35-49 years >49 was not considered for analysis

Index to birth history	Serial number at birth of each child under 6 years of age (continuous)	Options were recoded as follows: 1= 1 2= 2 >2= 3 or more
Child size at birth	Size of child at birth (1=very large, 2=larger than average, 3=average, 4=smaller than average, 5=very small, 8 = DK)	Options were recoded as follows: 1&2 as 1= Large 3 as 2= Average 4&5 as 3= Small 8 was not considered for analysis
Affiliated with health insurance during pregnancy	Coverage of Health Insurance or Maternal-Infant Insurance during pregnancy (0=No, 1=Yes)	Used same coding
Emotional violence	Ever any emotional violence (0=No, 1=Yes)	Used same coding
Physical violence	Ever any physical violence (0=No, 1=Yes)	Used same coding
Sexual violence	Ever any sexual violence (0=No, 1=Yes)	Used same coding

DK: Do not Know

Table 2. Characteristics associated with presenting a home birth in the last delivery during the last 5 years in Peru, 2019

	Home birth		
	Absolute frequency (n/N)	Weighted ratio * (IC95%)	p †
Natural region			
Coast	204/8498	3.40 (2.67-4.32)	<i>Ref.</i>
Andean	297/6233	6.92 (5.71-8.36)	<0.001
Amazon	378/3670	17.85 (15.21-20.84)	<0.001
Place of residence			
Urban	133/13241	1.37 (1.08-1.72)	<i>Ref.</i>
Rural	746/5160	19.59 (17.26-22.15)	<0.001
Antenatal visits			
< 6	247/1895	13.69 (11.52-14.55)	<0.001
6 or more	632/16506	4.43 (3.94-4.98)	<i>Ref.</i>
Timing of 1st antenatal check			
First trimester	178/5305	3.74 (2.79-4.69)	<i>Ref.</i>
> First trimester	618/13096	5.43 (5.06-5.80)	<0.001
Wealth index			
Poorest	730/5095	21.91 (20.93-22.89)	<0.001
Poorer	109/5025	2.06 (1.82-2.30)	<0.001
Middle	31/3664	0.79 (0.53-1.05)	<i>Ref.</i>
Richer	5/2709	0.21 (0.07-0.35)	0.002
Richest	4/1908	0.19 (0.01-0.36)	0.009
Highest educational level			
No education	72/291	28.21 (23.55-32.87)	<0.001
Primary	454/3435	20.64 (19.45-21.83)	<0.001
Secondary	322/8577	4.09 (3.71-4.47)	<i>Ref.</i>
Higher	31/6098	0.39 (0.23-0.56)	<0.001
Age			
12 – 17 years	25/270	10.12 (6.72-13.52)	<i>Ref.</i>
18 – 24 years	226/4193	7.37 (6.68-8.06)	0.057
25 – 34 years	368/8563	5.81 (5.38-6.24)	0.002
35 – 49 years	260/5375	6.22 (5.64-6.80)	0.013

Index to birth history			
1	765/16006	5.13 (5.10-5.16)	<i>Ref.</i>
2	249/2270	11.27 (10.99-11.55)	<0.001
3 or more	26/125	21.40 (19.33-23.47)	<0.001
Child size at birth			
Small	259/3957	7.20 (6.42-7.98)	<0.001
Average	411/9546	4.97 (4.55-5.39)	<i>Ref.</i>
Large	209/4898	4.76 (4.19-5.33)	0.566
Affiliated with health insurance during pregnancy			
Yes	781/13208	6.96 (6.56-7.36)	<0.001
No	98/5193	2.05 (1.68-2.42)	<i>Ref.</i>
Emotional violence			
Yes	169/3980	4.73 (4.04-5.42)	0.002
No	742/14421	5.94 (5.55-6.33)	<i>Ref.</i>
Physical violence			
Yes	226/4870	5.31 (4.66-5.96)	0.069
No	685/13531	5.81 (5.40-6.22)	<i>Ref.</i>
Sexual violence			
Yes	59/843	7.42 (5.64-9.20)	0.118
No	852/17499	5.59 (0.49-6.31)	<i>Ref.</i>

95%CI: 95% confidence interval; *Ref.*: Reference category

* The weightings were carried out considering the characteristics of the complex sampling

† Evaluated with Poisson regression with sampling weighting.

Table 3. Characteristics associated with presenting a home birth in the last delivery during the last 5 years in Peru, 2019

	Home birth			
	cPR (CI95%)	p †	aPR (CI95%)	p †
Natural region				
Coast	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Andean	2.11 (1.53-2.91)	<0.001	1,24 (1,02-1,48)	<0,001
Amazon	6.17 (4.51-8.45)	<0.001	1,38 (1,16-1,64)	<0,001
Place of residence				
Urban	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Rural	17.6 (13.3-23.3)	<0.001	3,34 (2,61-4,29)	<0,001
Antenatal visits				
< 6	3.42 (2.80-4.17)	<0.001	1,66 (1,39-1,96)	<0,001
6 or more	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Timing of 1st antenatal check				
First trimester	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
> First trimester	1.47 (1.19-1.82)	<0.001	0,99 (0,84-1,16)	0,881
Wealth index				
Poorest	24.3 (17.0-34.6)	<0.001	9,62 (5,13-18,1)	<0,001
Poorer	2.56 (1.73-3.81)	<0.001	2,39 (1,26-4,52)	0,008
Middle	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Richer	0.22 (0.08-0.56)	0.002	0,32 (0,07-1,48)	0,147
Richest	0.25 (0.09-0.70)	0.009	0,86 (0,23-3,27)	0,824
Highest educational level				
No education	6.60 (5.35-8.16)	<0.001	2,66 (2,02-3,50)	<0,001
Primary	4.75 (4.21-5.36)	<0.001	2,18 (1,85-2,58)	<0,001
Secondary	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Higher	0.13 (0.09-0.19)	<0.001	0,49 (0,31-0,78)	0,003
Age				
12 – 17 years	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
18 – 24 years	0.69 (0.47-1.01)	0.057	1,18 (0,67-2,10)	0,568
25 – 34 years	0.56 (0.38-0.82)	0.002	1,16 (0,66-2,05)	0,613
35 – 49 years	0.62 (0.42-0.90)	0.013	1,05 (0,59-1,86)	0,877

Index to birth history				
1		<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>
2	2.29 (2.02-2.60)	<0.001	1,64 (1,46-1,85)	<0,001
3 or more	4.39 (3.17-6.08)	<0.001	2,18 (1,67-2,87)	<0,001
Child size at birth				
Small	1.59 (1.40-1.81)	<0.001	1,03 (0,88-1,20)	0,710
Average	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Large	1.04 (0.91-1.19)	0.566	0,95 (0,80-1,12)	0,541
Affiliated with health insurance during pregnancy				
Yes	3.13 (2.55-3.86)	<0.001	0,85 (0,67-1,10)	0,215
No	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Emotional violence				
Yes	0.78 (0.67-0.92)	0.002	0,93 (0,75-1,15)	0,516
No	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Physical violence				
Yes	0.88 (0.76-1.00)	0.069	0,93 (0,76-1,12)	0,440
No	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	
Sexual violence				
Yes	1.22 (0.95-1.57)	0.118	1,15 (0,84-1,58)	0,389
No	<i>Ref.</i>		<i>Ref.</i>	

† Evaluated with Poisson regression with sampling weighting.

cPR y aPR: Crude and adjusted prevalence ratio, 95%IC: 95% confidence interval; *Ref.*: Reference category.

40 809
Interviews conducted

Reasons for exclusion:
Women who have not had
a pregnancy in the last 5
years

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.06.01.21258100>; this version posted June 2, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under aCC-BY 4.0 International license.

21 154
Women with data from the
last childbirth

18 401
Women with complete data

Home birth (n=879)
5,39%
(CI95%: 4,83-6,03) *

**Institutional birth
(n=17522)**
94,61%
(CI95%: 93,97-95,17) *