

1 **Full title:** *“She helped from the first minute to the last”* – experiences of respectful
2 maternal and newborn care during the COVID-19 pandemic in Nampula Province,
3 Mozambique

4
5 **Short title:** Respectful maternal and newborn care during the COVID-19 pandemic in Mozambique

6
7 **Authors:** Megan M Lydon^{1*}, Joaquim Vilanculos^{2*}, Carter Crew³, Américo Barata⁴, Emily Keyes¹

8 *Co-first authors

9
10 **Affiliations:**

11 1 FHI 360, Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn and Child Health Division, Durham, North Carolina, USA

12 2 FHI 360, Alcançar, Nampula, Nampula, Mozambique

13 3 FHI 360, Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn and Child Health Division, Washington D.C., USA

14 4 National Institute of Health, Nampula, Mozambique

15
16 [†]*Corresponding author:* Megan M Lydon, 359 Blackwell St #200, Durham, NC, 27701, USA

17 E-mail: mlydon@fhi360.org

18

19

20 Abstract

21 Pandemic-related health service adaptations raised concerns about provision of quality, respectful
22 maternity care globally. Despite this, little research has focused on the experiences of those using
23 intrapartum care during this time. This study aimed to elevate the voices and document the experiences
24 of birthing people in Nampula Province, Mozambique during the COVID-19 pandemic. We conducted a
25 longitudinal qualitative study from March-August 2021 and present an analysis of the 17 follow-up in-
26 depth interviews conducted with participants who had a vaginal live birth. Interviews explored
27 participants' experience of labor and delivery care. They were conducted in Makua and Portuguese,
28 audio-recorded, transcribed and translated. We applied thematic content analysis. Overall, participants
29 did not express major concerns about COVID-19 or related service adaptations when describing their
30 experiences of intrapartum care. Some noted its negative effects on elements of respectful care such as
31 restricting birth companions. Overcrowding became more concerning due to the threat of infection.
32 While unclear if affected by the pandemic, all participants who gave birth at a health facility reported
33 experiencing at least one form of mistreatment, some recounting threats of cesarean delivery. Most
34 explained that they and their newborns received care without their consent, especially regarding
35 enemas and episiotomies. At the same time, respondents described a range of intrapartum experiences
36 that included both respectful and disrespectful care. Most recalled positive verbal communication with
37 their providers and many described receiving continuous attentive care. Participants explained that their
38 satisfaction with childbirth services was tied to their birth outcome and their experience of respectful
39 care. The findings indicate that steadfast commitments to quality care are critical to ensure families
40 benefit from high-quality, respectful care at all times. The ramifications of the COVID-19 pandemic were
41 limited but nonetheless signal a need for tighter connections between maternal health and emergency
42 preparedness stakeholders.

43 Introduction

44 In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, health systems around the world quickly adapted service
45 delivery to prevent viral transmission and manage higher caseloads. Some of these adaptations raised
46 concerns about the ability to offer quality, respectful maternity services.(1) Early pandemic reports
47 documented disrespect and poor quality care including performing unnecessary cesarean deliveries and
48 other obstetric interventions to avoid transmission from laboring clients with COVID-19, abandoning
49 laboring clients, disallowing birth companions, and separating postpartum clients from their
50 newborns.(2, 3)

51

52 The World Health Organization defines quality of care as encompassing both the *provision* and the
53 *experience* of care.(4) Experience of care has been associated with childbirth satisfaction and selection
54 of delivery location.(5) Further, respectful, dignified care is a human right.(1) During shocks to a health
55 system, respectful care may be sacrificed while focusing on managing the shock, such as the COVID-19
56 pandemic. As such, it is critical to document experience of care during health system shocks to hold
57 systems accountable, to offer learnings for future health shocks, and to inform routine service delivery
58 such that care during these periods of stress may highlight underlying service delivery inadequacies.

59

60 Limited research has continued to explore the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on client experience of
61 childbirth care. These studies, largely set in high-income countries, affirm early reports. Restrictions on
62 partner access during childbirth were observed in Ireland, Italy, and Spain.(6, 7) Clients perceived
63 receiving lower quality of care in Spain and reported lower childbirth satisfaction in the United States of
64 America during the pandemic compared to clients pre-pandemic.(8, 9) There was an increased use of
65 obstetric interventions reported in Canada and Italy.(10, 11) A 12-country European study identified
66 gaps in informed consent, breastfeeding support and infection prevention practices.(12) A global survey,

67 comprising mainly high- and middle-income respondents, found that 17% of maternal and newborn
68 health workers reported that their ability to provide respectful care during the COVID-19 pandemic was
69 somewhat or substantially lower than before the pandemic.(13)

70

71 Less is known about the pandemic experiences of childbirth in low-income countries. A study conducted
72 in northwest Ethiopia during COVID-19 found that 66% of providers did not explain procedures to
73 birthing clients prior to performing them and 64% did not obtain consent for procedures during labor
74 and delivery but it is unclear how these rates compare to those pre-pandemic.(14) This research offers
75 important insights about provider adherence to respectful maternity care standards, however, there
76 remains a notable gap in documenting client experience throughout the pandemic. Following this, the
77 current study aimed to explore client experience of intrapartum care during the pandemic in
78 Mozambique.

79 Study setting

80 There have been steady increases in institutional delivery rates in Mozambique from 50% to 64%
81 between 2003(15) and 2020(16). At the same time, maternal and neonatal mortality and morbidity
82 remain high. The maternal mortality ratio was estimated at 408 deaths/100,000 live births(17) and the
83 neonatal mortality rate at 24 deaths/1,000 live births in the last demographic and health surveys.(18)
84 The national emergency obstetric care assessment of 2012 revealed gaps in service delivery such that
85 54% of health centers had not provided parenteral anticonvulsants in the last three months, 46% had
86 not removed retained products of conception and 43% had not administered parenteral antibiotics.(19)
87 Cause-specific fatality rates were high with a 7.0% mortality rate among those with postpartum sepsis,
88 5.2% fatality rate among those with a ruptured uterus and a 3.2% rate among those who experienced
89 postpartum hemorrhage.(19) As such, critical efforts to improve quality of care have emerged including

90 Mozambique's establishment of a Department of Management and Quality Assurance, as well as the
91 development and implementation of a quality improvement supervision guide for health facilities.(20)

92 The first case of COVID-19 in Mozambique was confirmed on March 22, 2020, and quickly prompted
93 large-scale lockdowns. The government of Mozambique announced a State of Emergency on March 31,
94 2020, with accompanying policies to limit COVID-19 spread. While confirmed cases remained relatively
95 low in Mozambique, health system adaptations were instituted to prevent interpersonal
96 transmission.(21)

97 This study took place in Nampula Province, located in northern Mozambique. The province is the most
98 populous in the country, home to over 6 million inhabitants, constituting 20% of the national
99 population.(22) Nampula has a 6.1 total fertility rate and the highest adolescent birth rate in the country
100 (17). Nampula lags behind the national institutional delivery rate whereby 52% of women delivered at a
101 health facility in 2020.(18) Research has shown that there was a drop in facility deliveries at the onset of
102 the COVID-19 pandemic in Nampula Province but that rates returned to pre-pandemic levels by April
103 2021.(23) This study focuses on Erati and Nacala-Porto districts, representing a rural and urban area,
104 respectively. Both are home to the Makhua-speaking population but differ in religious representation. In
105 Erati, 53% identify as Catholic and 40% as Muslim whereas those in Nacala-Porto predominantly identify
106 as Muslim.(24, 25) As a coastal region, Nacala-Porto sees a convergence of different populations and
107 working classes.

108 Methods

109 Design and data collection

110 This was a longitudinal qualitative study whereby in-depth interviews (IDIs) were conducted with
111 participants while pregnant and again postpartum. Participants were recruited with support from health
112 providers and community health workers in the two study districts. Those eligible for the study were 18
113 years or older, currently pregnant, had attended at least one antenatal care (ANC) visit for their current
114 pregnancy, and resided in a study district. We aimed to include an equal number of participants from
115 each study district with a variety of delivery location intentions (at the health facility, outside of the

Table 1.

116	Post-partum IDI domains	health facility, uncertain), as the primary goal of the study
117	Initiation of labor and delivery	was to investigate care-seeking behavior. To have sufficient
118	Infection concerns/COVID-19	data to reach 80% saturation, we aimed to include
119	Interpersonal support and interactions	approximately eight participants in each of the three
120	Procedures/clinical care	profiles.(26) The secondary objective of the research was to
	Comfort measures & respectful care	
	Perceptions of intrapartum care	

121 explore the experience of care during the pandemic, which is the focus of this paper.

122 We conducted 24 antenatal IDIs March 2-5, 2021, and followed-up with participants after their expected
123 delivery dates to conduct postpartum IDIs. Those who had a non-surgical live birth were eligible for
124 follow-up to focus on the experience of routine intrapartum care. Among the 24 initial participants, 20
125 were eligible for the postpartum interview; of these, two were lost-to-follow-up and one discontinued
126 participation. We conducted 17 postpartum IDIs August 17-27, 2021, using a semi-structured interview
127 guide exploring participants' experience of intrapartum care (Table 1). Interviews were conducted by
128 two female research assistants from Nampula who were given training in research ethics and qualitative
129 research. The research assistants were current medical students, allowing them to understand
130 intrapartum processes, and spoke the local language. Interviews took place at a location chosen by the

131 participant, often their home or local health facility, and were conducted in Makua or Portuguese,
132 depending on participant preference. Postpartum interviews lasted 75 minutes on average. IDIs were
133 audio-recorded, directly transcribed into Portuguese, and translated into English.

134 Data analysis

135 We applied thematic content analysis to identify themes and sub-themes. A codebook was developed *a*
136 *priori* based on the domains of the IDI guide (Table 1). It was further refined through immersive reading
137 of initial transcripts. Coding was conducted by one analyst using Nvivo v.12.(27) Data reduction and
138 synthesis took place through the creation of results matrices. Analytical memos were developed and
139 summarized by two female American analysts. Results were shared with the Mozambique research
140 team for validation. The results presented here center on participants' experience of intrapartum care.

141 Ethical considerations

142 This study was approved by FHI 360's Office of International Research Ethics and the Nampula Provincial
143 Delegation of the National Institute of Health in Mozambique. Written informed consent was obtained
144 from all participants.

145 Results

146 Participant characteristics

147 Among the 17 postpartum participants, 8 were located in Erati and 9 in Nacala-Porto. They ranged in
148 age from 18-32 years, with an average age of 24. Nearly all were married. Participants in Erati tended to
149 have primary school education and most identified as farmers. Most of those in Nacala-Porto had
150 attended at least some secondary school, with some reporting engaging in formal employment (Table
151 2). Participants reported birthing between 0 and 5 times prior to the study, such that 35% experienced
152 their first birth within the context of this study. A couple of participants had previously experienced

153 miscarriage and a couple had children who had died. All births took place between March and August
 154 2021. All participants identified as women and described their partners as men, as such, the associated
 155 pronouns are used throughout the findings.

156 **Table 2.** Sociodemographic characteristics of participants, by district

Characteristic	Erati (n=8)		Nacala-Porto (n=9)		Total (n=17)	
Age, mean (range)	23.0	(18-32)	25.3	(21-32)	24.3	(18-32)
Married, % (n)	100%	(8)	89%	8	94%	(16)
Education, % (n)						
None:	13%	(1)	0%	(0)	6%	(1)
Primary:	63%	(5)	0%	(0)	29%	(5)
Secondary:	25%	(2)	89%	(8)	59%	(10)
Tertiary:	0%	(0)	11%	(1)	6%	(1)
Work, % (n)						
Employed:	0%	(0)	33%	(3)	18%	(3)
Homemaker:	13%	(1)	56%	(5)	35%	(6)
Farmer:	88%	(7)	0%	(0)	41%	(7)
Student:	0%	(0)	11%	(1)	6%	(1)
No. pregnancies, * mean (range)	3.3	(0-5)	2.1	(0-4)	2.6	(0-5)
No. births, mean (range)	2.3	(0-5)	0.9	(0-4)	1.5	(0-5)
No. living children, mean (range)	2.1	(0-5)	0.8	(0-4)	1.4	(0-5)

157 *Prior to the pregnancy at the time of ANC interview

158

159 [Experience of intrapartum care](#)

160 Among the 17 postpartum participants, one delivered at home, two delivered on their way to the health
 161 facility and one was referred between two health facilities. All others gave birth at the first health facility
 162 they attended, all of which were publicly operated facilities. The experiences of the participant who
 163 birthed at home are included only when relevant (e.g., they brought their newborn into the health
 164 facility so descriptions of newborn care experience, general perceptions of what constitutes a positive or
 165 negative birth experience, and reasons for level of birth satisfaction are included).

166 Health facility admissions:

167 Most participants reported being attended to “*immediately*” or “*very fast*” upon arrival at the health
168 facility. Several however described encountering delays at the health facility, explaining that providers
169 were busy with other patients, or the room was being cleaned.

170 Participants consistently reported having their blood pressure and temperature measured at
171 admissions. About half of participants noted their provider took a urine sample or asked them if they
172 were experiencing vaginal bleeding or headaches. Many recounted having their “*belly*” measured,
173 referring to measuring uterine height, and receiving an initial vaginal exam. All participants reported
174 feeling at ease with these initial screening measures such that one explained, “*That was really*
175 *comfortable and confident for me because it is a normal procedure.*” Among those who did not receive
176 screening tests, one recounted that she had arrived after regular health facility hours so there were not
177 enough providers to do a comprehensive intake, while another explained the providers were busy when
178 she arrived.

179 Labor and childbirth:

180 Participants described a range of experiences that included both respectful and disrespectful care. All
181 participants who gave birth at a health facility reported experiencing at least one form of mistreatment
182 during labor and delivery. The results are organized according to Bohren and colleagues’ (2015) typology
183 of the mistreatment of laboring persons during childbirth.(28) We expanded this framework to include a
184 corresponding equivalent typology of *respectful* care during childbirth to capture the positive
185 experiences reported by respondents. Select quotes are featured in Table 3. Some of the experiences
186 described by participants align with more than one theme but have been presented only once for
187 brevity.

188 *Physical abuse/ Physical support*

189 There were no reports of physical abuse. In contrast, many participants described receiving physical
190 support from their providers. This included receiving assistance with walking and changing positions in
191 bed to improve comfort and aid in labor progression.

192 *They helped me to walk in order to facilitate the delivery process*

193 Participants appreciated receiving massages to manage labor pain and assistance with personal hygiene.
194 Several said the midwife “*touched my body very well*” and explained that they felt respected when
195 provided with physical support.

196 *Verbal abuse/ Caring and supportive language*

197 **Harsh versus caring language**

198 Most participants recalled positive verbal communication with their providers, saying “*she talked to me*
199 *very well,*” however, one respondent noted that her midwife shouted at her during labor and delivery.
200 Some expressed surprise by the positive communication they received at the health facility, such that
201 one participant explained, “*[the midwife] treated me very well, they didn’t shout at me, they didn’t even*
202 *insult me. In some hospitals the health staff usually slap the patients.*” This suggests that participants
203 expected negative interactions at the health facility but discovered better care than anticipated.

204 **Threats and blaming**

205 Some participants reported experiences of threats and blaming. A couple recounted that their midwife
206 made derogatory remarks about their baby’s sex.

207 *After delivery she said that delivering a girl is not good because girls never help their relatives.*

208 A few others shared that their provider threatened them with a cesarean delivery, one of whom
209 additionally recalled the providers threatening to withhold care if she did not make more progress. The

210 participants perceived this behavior as acceptable and useful in their birth experience, whereby one
211 said, *“They simply threatened me because I wasn’t making enough effort for the delivery, and then the*
212 *health staff decided to use this technique in order to encourage me to make more effort for a safe*
213 *delivery.”* Despite this justification, she later went on to note that *“my least favorite part of the*
214 *experience was when they threatened me for caesarian operation,”* indicating that while the approach
215 has been normalized, participants were willing to express discontent.

216 *Stigma and discrimination/ Inclusive and equitable care*

217 There were no reports of stigma or discrimination directed towards the birthing person. Participants
218 consistently reported that they were not subject to derogatory remarks about their physical
219 appearance, sexual activity, ethnicity, race, tribe, culture, religion, age, marital status, level of education
220 or literacy, economic circumstances, or HIV status. One unmarried participant described that the
221 providers did not make any negative comments about her marital status and *“even asked [her] other*
222 *questions for motivation,”* highlighting how her providers continued to respectfully and meaningfully
223 engage with her despite her marital status.

224 *Failure to meet professional standards of care / Appropriate, high-quality, evidence-based care*

225 **Informed consent and physical examinations and procedures**

226 Most participants recalled that their provider listened to their fetal heart beats at some point during
227 labor. In almost all cases, participants reported that their provider explained the purpose of this
228 procedure and asked permission before placing the fetoscope on their stomach. All participants said
229 they felt comfortable with the level of privacy during this procedure and most enjoyed the experience
230 saying, *“I liked it too much”* and *“that was an interesting experience!”* such that they felt connected to
231 their child and reassured about their child’s well-being.

232 We asked participants about their experience of vaginal exams and any major interventions performed
233 during labor and delivery including both evidence-based and non-evidence-based care. To note, the
234 WHO does not recommend pubic shaving, routine episiotomy, or enema on admission.(29) All but one
235 participant who delivered at a health facility received a vaginal exam, most reported receiving an enema
236 or some form of rectal cleaning, about half received episiotomies, and many received stitches to
237 manage vaginal tearing or episiotomy. Several reported receiving some form of “*injection*” to induce or
238 augment labor, however, participants were unsure of the specifics. There were no reports of vaginal
239 shaving. No participants described having an assisted vaginal delivery, an intervention that is
240 recommended when indicated.(30)

241 Most respondents reported experiences of unconsented care. While most said their provider asked
242 permission before performing a vaginal exam, about half noted that their provider did not explain the
243 purpose of the exam or its necessity. Most participants said their experience of the vaginal exam “*was*
244 *fine*” or was an “*interesting experience.*” A couple acknowledged the physical discomfort of the
245 procedure such that one explained, “*nobody likes her genitals to be touched, and it is also very*
246 *uncomfortable.*” Many expressed discomfort with the lack of privacy during vaginal exams. One
247 participant echoed the sentiments shared by others saying, “*They touched my vagina and that wasn’t*
248 *comfortable for me because there were five people in the delivery room.*”

249 Several respondents reported not being asked permission or provided with an explanation for
250 interventions performed, particularly for enemas and episiotomies. Participants perceived the
251 procedure of anal cleaning as “*normal*” even when unconsented, saying they felt it contributed to good
252 “*hygiene.*” One participant described the prevalence of unconsented care as standard practice saying,
253 “*they didn’t explain to me the reason for performing such procedures. Health staff usually don’t explain*
254 *why they have to perform a certain procedure.*” While lack of informed consent may have been typical, a

255 few participants expressed a desire for a different standard of care. One who experienced manual
256 removal of her placenta and rectal cleaning, explained:

257 *They didn't ask me, maybe they were doing their job and didn't find it relevant for me. I think*
258 *they should have explained for me in order to be aware of the situation. In brief, it affected me*
259 *because I felt that they don't value pregnant women or even other patients in general.*

260 Regarding newborn care, most participants recounted holding their baby “immediately” or within
261 minutes after delivery. A few participants reported holding their newborn for the first time 1-2 hours
262 after delivery, but they did not know what caused this delay. In contrast, one mother was given her baby
263 immediately after delivery but was unable to hold them given her medical condition, explaining, “[the
264 midwife] didn't support me, she simply took my baby, cleaned them and gave them to me while I was
265 still weak and bleeding.” A minority of participants recalled providers performing any procedures on
266 their newborn including suctioning, blood testing, administration of antibiotic eye ointment or vitamin K
267 injection. Among those whose infants received a medical procedure, all noted that their provider first
268 asked their permission but nearly all also said the provider did not explain the purpose or necessity of
269 the intervention. Overall, participants described meeting their child as “exciting” and feeling very
270 “happy.”

271 **Pain relief**

272 Several of those who birthed in the health facility were not offered any form of pain relief. Among those
273 who received pain relief, most described being prescribed “pills” and one explained she received an
274 unspecified “injection.” One participant recounted receiving stitches without anesthesia and described
275 this as the moment that broke her trust in her providers:

276 *I got some stitches because the baby was big and heavy, that's why they had to open my vagina*
277 *more to allow the removal the baby from there. It was a very painful procedure because they*

278 *didn't use anesthesia for that [...] I was confident about their skills when they advised and helped*
279 *me during the delivery process; however, I didn't feel confident when they enlarged my vagina in*
280 *order to remove the baby from there and that was extremely painful due to lack of anesthesia.*

281 While medical options for pain relief were limited, several described how the nursing staff or their birth
282 companions were able to offer comfort measures such as massage, movement, and alternating birth
283 positions such that respondents described the midwife “*moved my body*” and “*advised me to do some*
284 *exercises.*” Participants were deeply appreciative of such care.

285 **Neglect versus attentive care**

286 A couple participants reported being ignored or neglected by providers. One justified her experience
287 saying that “*maybe the midwife was busy.*” Another participant was left unattended while hemorrhaging
288 even though she requested assistance:

289 *I felt neglected by the midwife who was working during the night, she only received my money*
290 *but didn't support me [...] they left me bleeding*

291 Many participants however recounted experiencing continuous, attentive care, such that some
292 explained, “*[the midwife] helped from the first minute to the last minute.*” Further, nearly all felt that
293 their providers responded to their concerns.

294 *When I was feeling bad, I asked my mother to call [the nurse] and she came very quickly and*
295 *gave me all necessary assistance and prescribed some medication [...] during delivery services*
296 *[the nurse] was patient and understood my situation.*

297 *Poor rapport between clients and providers / Positive relationship between clients and providers*

298 **Communication**

299 One participant described being unable to communicate in a common language with her providers, with
300 no option for language interpretation, saying, *“I didn’t feel comfortable with that situation because*
301 *problems related to communication are very embarrassing.”* Participants recounted feeling respected
302 when providers engaged in active listening, were patient and understanding of their circumstances, and
303 approached them with a *“humble”* attitude.

304 **Supportive care**

305 Nearly all participants had the support of one or more birth companion during labor and delivery.
306 Respondents strongly appreciated that support, which was seen as complementing the care received
307 from facility staff. They described their birth companions, usually female relatives and traditional birth
308 attendants, as offering motivation, reassurance, and comfort, and providing physical support in the form
309 of comfort measures, mobility assistance and performing daily activities such as washing clothes.
310 Participants felt their birth companions had very positive interactions with the health staff.
311 In some cases, while birth companions were permitted in the health facility, they were not allowed in
312 the labor and delivery room. Participants believed this to be attributed to COVID-19 prevention
313 measures and/or to ensure privacy for patients. In all cases it was upsetting for the birthing clients.

314 *I wasn’t with anyone because they don’t allow other people to be there. I think it is due to*
315 *COVID-19 prevention measures [...] It wasn’t fine for me because the support of our relatives is*
316 *very important.*

317 Another couple of participants noted they were limited to one companion in the maternity unit, so they
318 had to choose between the members of their support team which sometimes included their husband,
319 mother, sister, and/or traditional birth attendant.

320 *She only allowed the traditional birth attendant. Due to COVID-19, there is a restriction on entry*
321 *of people. They allow only one person [...] My mother was very sad due to my situation. Because*
322 *my mother wasn't allowed to get into the delivery room due to COVID-19 restrictions.*

323 **Autonomy**

324 The WHO recommends oral fluid and food intake during labor for low-risk clients, as well as a birth
325 position of their choice including upright positions.(29) In this study, most participants remembered
326 being permitted to drink fluids during labor and recalled drinking “water” or “tea.” At the same time,
327 most reported not being allowed to eat during labor. Several said that this requirement did not affect
328 them negatively with one explaining that she thought “*it is not recommended to eat any food during the*
329 *delivery process, otherwise it may cause other complications like defecation.*” When asked about their
330 preferred birthing position, respondents exclusively said, “*the lying down position.*” One participant
331 noted, “*I think the position is the only one...you know?*”, indicating a lack of awareness about other
332 potential labor positions.

333 Most participants recounted feeling supported to birth in their chosen position, the supine position. At
334 the same time, one respondent said she had no choice to select another position, and another described
335 feeling uncomfortable lying down and “*wanted to change the position but the health staff didn't allow*
336 *[her].*” While birth positions were limited, several participants described receiving assistance with
337 walking and physical movement in support of their bodily autonomy.

338 *Health system conditions and constraints / Functional and enabling health systems*

339 **Health facility environment**

340 Most participants felt comfortable with their labor and delivery setting, noting it was “*clean*” and they
341 felt “*happy.*” Despite this, most also described the privacy measures as unsatisfactory. One participant

342 highlighted this saying, *“It was an embarrassing situation for me and affected me psychologically. In*
343 *brief, I felt exposed to everyone who was passing in that delivery area.”*

344 The pandemic shaped participants’ comfort with the health facility environment such that over half felt
345 concerned about COVID-19 transmission at the health facility. This concern stemmed from a general
346 worry about the danger of this virus and feeling that the risk of exposure was high at the health facility.
347 Those who said they were unconcerned explained that they felt comfortable due to the prevention
348 measures in place and adherence to these measures.

349 Many respondents reported being screened for fever upon arrival at the health facility, but none were
350 tested for COVID-19. All reported that providers were wearing personal protective equipment and that
351 prevention measures such as masking, social distancing and handwashing were in place. A few
352 respondents remarked that the maternity unit was crowded, and a couple explained that *“after delivery,*
353 *the midwife put two women in each bed,”* violating social distancing. This made a respondent feel
354 particularly uncomfortable as she *“was afraid of being infected by COVID-19.”*

355 **Facility culture**

356 There were no reports of providers making unreasonable demands of participants, such as requesting
357 they clean up their own bodily fluids. Most participants reported no challenges related to payment for
358 services with some explaining *“it is for free.”* There were still some reports of extortion whereby
359 respondents described being ignored by providers, receiving substandard care, or being in conflict with
360 providers, until they could make payment. One participant explains:

361 *I was held up due to inability to pay money to some midwives. But, after some time I paid the*
362 *money and services got better. In some health facilities when you don’t pay some money to the*
363 *midwives, they never treat very well.*

364 Several participants reported that the COVID-19 pandemic negatively affected their ability to save and
365 pay for transport or service costs related to delivery. They described facing economic hardship including
366 loss of work, loss of wages, and increasing prices. For example, one participant shared:

367 *We didn't face any constraint about transport because we have a car in our house, but for*
368 *delivery services, that was a sacrifice for us. [...] I lost my job due to COVID-19 and the situation*
369 *was very hard for me.*

370 In one case, the intention to uphold COVID-19 prevention measures became a barrier to care. A
371 participant who experienced a precipitous birth and delivered *en route* to the health facility recounted
372 that she and her husband were initially denied entry to the health facility as they did not have masks
373 with them:

374 *After arriving in the main gate of health facility, the security officer demanded us to wear masks,*
375 *but we didn't have any masks, and suddenly my husband entered the health facility by force and*
376 *the health staff gave us all necessary support.*

377 Satisfaction

378 The majority of participants said they felt satisfied with the services they received, with only one
379 outright indicating dissatisfaction. Most explained they felt satisfied with their experience "*Because I*
380 *delivered my baby without any constraint,*" referring to delivering without any major complications.

381 Several shared that they felt satisfied because of the positive interactions they had with providers, as
382 described by one participant saying, "*I was extremely happy because I had achieved what I was*
383 *expecting about delivery services. The midwives were entirely committed with their service in order to*
384 *help me.*" One respondent who had described major incidents of mistreatment still said she felt very
385 satisfied with the services, explaining,

386 *That was excellent for me because of the experience of delivering my second baby who is healthy*
387 *and beautiful. Regarding the second midwife, it is a situation which regularly occurs in our health*
388 *facilities, so I left it behind.*

389

Table 3. Examples of reported experiences of respect and disrespect during intrapartum care

Disrespectful care		Respectful care	
<i>Physical abuse</i>		<i>Physical support</i>	
Use of force (Client beaten, slapped, kicked, or pinched during delivery)	Not reported	Comfort measures (Use of comfort measures, massage, hydrotherapy, temperature regulation, etc.)	<i>some of them [midwives] gave me some physical massages and others gave me tea</i> <i>[the midwife] advised me to do some exercises.</i>
Physical restraint (Client physically restrained to the bed or gagged during delivery)	Not reported	Free mobility (Client is encouraged and supported to ambulate and change positions during labor and delivery)	<i>[she] supported me psychologically and physically.</i> <i>when I decided to change from one bed into another, she allowed without any problem.</i>
<i>Sexual abuse</i>		<i>Trauma-informed care</i>	
Sexual abuse (Sexual abuse or rape)	Not reported	Trauma-informed care (Provider awareness and sensitivity to all forms of trauma)	Not reported
<i>Verbal abuse</i>		<i>Caring and supportive language</i>	
Harsh language (Harsh or rude language, judgmental or accusatory comments)	<i>After delivery she said that delivering a girl is not good because girls never help their relatives.</i>	Supportive language (Words of encouragement and reassurance)	<i>the services were excellent, the way they talked to me.</i> <i>They talked to me very well.</i>
Threats and blaming (Threats of withholding treatment or poor outcomes, blaming for poor outcomes)	<i>Did anybody threaten you to do caesarian operation? Yes, they did. But, I think it was a way of helping and motivating me to make more effort for quick and safe delivery.</i> <i>the second midwife in the following day threatened to suspend medical care because I wasn't making enough effort for the baby's</i>	Honest communication (Client receives accurate updates on their medical status and clear explanation about what is needed from them)	<i>the midwives interacted with us in a very humble way</i>

	<i>delivery, and once again that was motivational</i>		
Stigma and discrimination		Inclusive and equitable care	
Discrimination based on sociodemographic characteristics (Discrimination based on ethnicity/race/religion, age, socioeconomic status)	Not reported	Non-judgmental care (Clients are treated with the highest standard of care and respect regardless of personal characteristics)	<i>Did they make any negative comment about your marital status? No, they didn't. They even asked me other questions for motivation.</i>
Discrimination based on medical conditions (Discrimination based on HIV status)	Not reported	Non-judgmental care (Clients are treated with the highest standard of care and respect regardless of medical condition)	Not reported
Failure to meet professional standards of care		Appropriate, high-quality, evidence-based care	
Lack of informed consent and confidentiality (Lack of informed consent process, breaches of confidentiality)	<i>I think they should have asked for permission and explained to me the reasons of performing such procedures. They didn't ask me, maybe they were doing their job and didn't find it relevant for me. I think they should have explained for me in order to be aware of the situation. In brief, it affected me because I felt that they don't value pregnant women or even other patients in general.</i>	Full informed choice (Engages in informed consent process with client prior to initiating procedures, asks permission before touching body, ensures confidentiality)	<i>Did the midwife explain the motivation of such procedures? Yes, she did. Did you feel involved about the decision? Yes, I did. Did she ask for permission? Yes, she did.</i>
Physical examinations and procedures (Painful vaginal exams, refusal to provide pain relief, performance of unconsented surgical operations)	<i>She didn't give me any medication. Uhhmm...I was extremely sad when I realized there was no injection, but I made an effort to deliver the baby safely. It wasn't easy for me because it was too painful. There was no medication to relieve pain.</i>	Evidence-based care (Offers appropriate and timely pain relief, provides all necessary preventive care, undertakes least invasive procedures as necessary, performs surgical procedures with consent)	<i>I really appreciated the pills I can remember that she checked my blood pressure, body temperature, measured my belly when I was feeling bad, I asked my mother to call her and she came very quickly and gave me all</i>

			<i>necessary assistance and prescribed some medication.</i>
Neglect and abandonment (Neglect, abandonment, or long delays, skilled attendant absent at time of delivery)	<i>I felt neglected by the midwife who was working during the night, she only received my money but didn't support me [...] they left me bleeding</i>	Attentive care (Regular monitoring of client, addresses client concerns, skilled attendant present at time of delivery)	<i>She helped from the first minute to the last minute.</i>
<i>Poor rapport between clients and providers</i>		<i>Positive relationship between clients and providers</i>	
Ineffective communication (Poor communication, dismissal of client's concerns, language and interpretation issues, poor staff attitudes)	<i>I didn't feel comfortable with that situation because problems related to communication are very embarrassing</i>	Effective communication (Clear communication, listens to client's concerns, language interpretation is available, positive staff attitudes)	<i>That was an excellent interaction. During delivery services, they responded positively to all requests.</i>
Lack of supportive care (Lack of supportive care from health workers, denial or lack of birth companions)	<i>sometimes [the midwife] didn't allow other people to get inside the delivery room, but after delivering my baby, she allowed my mother to come in. I wasn't with anyone because they don't allow other people to be there. I think it is due to COVID-19 prevention measures [...] It wasn't fine for me, because the support of our relatives is very important.</i>	Supportive care (Encouragement of and collaboration with birth companions, supports clients with basic functions and offers emotional support)	<i>I felt protected...[My cousin] gave me physical support and gave me food when I needed it. They treated me very well, from the main entrance to the delivery room.</i>
Loss of autonomy (Clients treated as passive participants during childbirth, denial of food, fluids, or mobility, lack of respect for client's preferred birth positions, denial of safe traditional practices, objectification of client, detainment in facilities)	<i>I wanted to change my position, but the health staff didn't allow me I had no choice to select another position.</i>	Autonomy and empowerment (Clients actively involved during childbirth, allowed food, fluids and mobility, support client's preferred birth positions, support safe traditional practices, humanity of client is centered)	<i>they allowed water and tea.</i>
<i>Health system conditions and constraints</i>		<i>Functional and enabling health system</i>	
Lack of resources (Physical conditions of facilities, staffing constraints, staffing shortages, supply constraints, lack of privacy)	<i>that was not comfortable for me because there were no curtains and I felt exposed to everyone who was moving around that delivery</i>	Well-resourced facility (Physical conditions of facilities, available staffing, functional supply chain, privacy measures in place)	<i>there were curtains and partitions. I was happy with the delivery place because that was a quiet place and</i>

	<i>there was a negligence from health staff because they put two women in one bed.</i>		<i>there were no other patients in that place</i>
Lack of policies (Lack of redress)	Not reported	Client rights upheld in policies (Clients are made aware of their rights and options for redress)	Not reported
Facility culture (Bribery and extortion, unclear fee structures, unreasonable requests of clients by health workers)	<i>the major concern was the payment, [the midwife] charged me some money. After the payment everything was fine.</i>	Positive facility culture (Clear fee structure that is adhered to, staff perform all duties assigned, staff are supportive of one another and work towards a common goal)	<i>Did midwife ask you to clean blood, urine, feces or other kinds of liquids? No, they didn't. They usually do that themselves.</i>

390 Discussion

391 Overall, this study demonstrated that COVID-19 negatively affected some aspects of maternal and
392 neonatal quality of care, however, the effects were limited. There were some cases in which pandemic-
393 related adaptations restricted involvement of birth companions, limiting social support and countering
394 cultural practices, and one case in which a family was initially prevented from accessing care. Pre-
395 existing conditions of overcrowding became more worrisome to clients during the pandemic due to the
396 fear of infection transmission. These scenarios suggest a need for the development of cohesive policies
397 and appropriate enforcement of such policies that balance the need to address shocks to the health
398 system with the need to continue delivering high quality person-centered care regardless of the
399 circumstance. At the same time, most of the quality-of-care issues highlighted in this research, including
400 disrespect, appear to be chronic health system struggles, not necessarily associated with, or
401 exacerbated by, the pandemic.

402 The results are consistent with previous research documenting disrespectful care in Mozambique prior
403 to the pandemic. One study conducted in two Maputo City district hospitals showed widespread
404 disrespect and abuse during childbirth with high levels of non-confidential care, non-consented care,
405 and abandonment.(31) Similarly, this study found widespread unconsented care for both women and
406 newborns and some cases of abandonment. This study adds to the research by identifying that
407 unconsented care is normalized in this context. Another study in southern Mozambique demonstrated
408 that birthing persons who experienced disrespect and abuse in childbirth reported lower levels of
409 satisfaction with their care, which aligns with the findings in the current study whereby participants
410 linked health service satisfaction with respectful care.(32)

411 The current study results highlight several gaps in the provision and experience of care that should be
412 considered for intervention. First, participant reports of screening at admissions suggest a missed

413 opportunity. Skipping simple questions about danger signs and symptoms during intake can delay
414 diagnosis and treatment of major maternal and newborn complications. This challenge has similarly
415 been documented by other studies and across settings.(33-35) Health planners might explore the use of
416 an admissions checklist to ensure these critical, but easily bypassed steps, are consistently conducted.

417 Second, the frequent reports of non-evidence-based interventions such as episiotomies and enemas are
418 concerning. Episiotomy can be a useful technique, however, professional associations such as the
419 International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) and the American College of Obstetricians
420 and Gynecologists (ACOG) recommend “judicious” and “restrictive” use rather than routine
421 application.(30, 36, 37) The benefits of episiotomy must be carefully weighed against the increased risks
422 of blood loss, depth of posterior perineal injury, anal sphincter damage, increased pain, and long-term
423 urinary incontinence.(38-40) The many reports of episiotomy in this study indicate a need to investigate
424 the prevalence of this practice and to support providers in alternative management practices, as
425 possible, to reduce use of episiotomy.

426 Similarly, reports of enemas were commonplace in this study even though there is no evidence to
427 support any benefits of routine enema during the first stage of labor.(41) Routine rectal enema is
428 deemed an unnecessary intervention that may cause discomfort to clients, increase the workload of
429 providers and increase the cost to the health system.(41) While enema is not recommended, many
430 participants in this study noted they were favorable towards the procedure, making statements
431 suggesting that defecation during delivery was not socially acceptable. Women should certainly be
432 supported in their health care decisions, however, it is important to ensure they are truly given a choice
433 in their health care. A practice of routine enemas and related social norms can create an environment in
434 which women feel shame about their natural bodily response to defecate during labor leading them to
435 feel disempowered to decline the procedure. Actions may be needed to reduce such stigma to ensure
436 women have a full range of choice in their birth care options that allow for bodily autonomy.

437 Third, there was a considerable gap in offering pain management. This is unsurprising considering the
438 shortage of anesthesiologists and anesthesia technicians in Mozambique, who are needed to administer
439 common pain management options in labor such as epidural, inhaled analgesia and local anesthetic
440 nerve block.(42) Some participants were offered “pills,” however, oral non-opioid medications offer
441 limited pain relief and there is little evidence to support their effectiveness in reducing labor pain.(43)
442 While some participants expressed appreciation for the pills they received and described it as a
443 contributor to their birth satisfaction, this is more likely related to having their concerns heard rather
444 than a reduction in physical pain. There are of course non-pharmacological interventions that can be
445 used to manage discomfort in labor. There is evidence indicating that massage, relaxation techniques
446 and immersion in water can reduce pain during labor.(43) In addition, research has found that
447 continuous labor support (for example, of a doula or labor companion) is associated with a decreased
448 likelihood in the use of intrapartum analgesia, suggesting that birth companions may assist with pain
449 management.(44) Indeed, the current study documented several examples of nurses and birth
450 companions offering comfort measures to manage labor pains. In a context of health workforce
451 constraints and commodity stockouts, more widespread dissemination of non-pharmacological
452 approaches to pain management could provide women with at least one option for effective pain relief.
453 Offering doula training to traditional birth attendants could fill this important gap while simultaneously
454 allowing for better integration of traditional birth attendants in the health system.

455 Overall, both positive and negative experiences of care were reported in this research. While there is
456 mounting evidence that disrespect and abuse during childbirth exists and at unacceptable levels, there is
457 a need to also capture *respectful* care in action. Maternity providers face tremendous challenges in their
458 work including lack of decision-making power and autonomy, unsafe work environments, gender
459 inequities, violence, under- and inconsistent pay, lack of mental health support, understaffing and
460 unsustainable work hours, among others.(45) From this, it is clear that efforts to improve respectful

461 maternity care must address these health systems issues. Nevertheless, there is a role for provider
462 behavior change to achieve respectful care. To enable this behavior change, it will be helpful, and
463 potentially more effective, to offer providers positive examples of care that can be modeled and
464 emulated rather than emphasizing only the problematic behaviors.

465 The many positive care experiences shared in this study offer hope, however, we must underscore the
466 serious mistreatment of women during childbirth that was also recorded. Globally, as there is well-
467 documented gender bias in health care and minimization of women's experience of pain, it is critical to
468 keep monitoring disrespectful maternity care. Participants in this study experienced threats of cesarean
469 section, sexism towards their newborns, suturing without anesthesia, non-evidence-based care, neglect,
470 extortion, and unconsented care. These represent a violation of human rights and, fundamentally, of
471 human dignity. We urge health system actors in Mozambique to take swift action to uphold the dignity
472 of all women.

473 There are a few limitations that should be considered when interpreting the results of this study. First,
474 this study does not have a pre-pandemic comparison, making it difficult to disentangle the extent to
475 which the COVID-19 pandemic may have contributed to pre-existing quality of care challenges. Further
476 research documenting the health sector experience during the pandemic in Mozambique may help
477 elucidate any shifts in quality of care that are less visible to clients of the system. Second, the focus of
478 this study was on non-surgical live births. As such, additional quality issues associated with surgery and
479 maternal and newborn mortality have not been captured here. The aim of the current study, however,
480 was to document the common experience of birth during the pandemic, which is mainly represented by
481 those with a non-surgical live birth. Even with this focus, the research readily identified mistreatment
482 during childbirth, indicating a substantial need to improve routine intrapartum care. Third, this study
483 captures self-reported experiences of care which may be affected by social desirability bias. At the same
484 time, recent research comparing labor observations to postpartum client self-report found comparable

485 prevalence estimates for most forms of mistreatment.(46) Further, in taking a person-centered
486 approach to health care, it is important to consider self-report as the reference standard. Finally,
487 provider recruitment of participants may have invoked some selection bias. However, clients were
488 recruited at their first ANC visit when the later labor experience was yet unknown, and the recruiting
489 provider would not necessarily be involved in the client’s birth support.

490 There are several key implications from the findings. First, as many participants were surprised by the
491 respectful, quality care they received, there is a need to better communicate health system
492 improvements to the community, which may help increase uptake of institutional delivery. Second,
493 documenting client birth satisfaction through patient feedback mechanisms is insufficient since the
494 findings show that in this setting clients largely base satisfaction on birth outcome rather than the full
495 gamut of their experience of care. To gain insight into client experience, more nuanced questions are
496 required about interactions with providers, procedures received and the conditions of the health facility.
497 Third, it will be important to harness positive examples of care to grow a culture of respectful care. Only
498 highlighting disrespectful care gives way to a punitive environment that encourages secrecy about
499 mistreatment. Given respectful care is already being practiced, recognizing and rewarding this behavior
500 may be more effective in fostering organizational norms of respectful care than focusing on negative
501 behavior. Fourth, some forms of disrespect and mistreatment have been normalized in this context by
502 clients. To meaningfully shift these practices will require a combination of provider behavior change and
503 social norms interventions. Finally, there is a need to invest in health systems approaches to create an
504 enabling environment that can support a shift in organizational culture and social norms.

505

506

507 Acknowledgements

508 We sincerely appreciate all the participants in this study who generously shared their time and stories
509 with us. We thank you for your courage and willingness to recount your experiences. We are grateful to
510 the FHI 360 Alcançar team and the Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn and Child Health Division at FHI
511 360 for their support in this effort. Special thanks to Geoffrey Ezepue, Fulgencio Estrada, and Donna
512 McCarraher. We greatly appreciate Holly Burke's critical review of the draft manuscript.

513

514 Author contributions

515 MML led study conceptualization and methodology design in collaboration with JV and EK. JV led project
516 administration and supervision of data collection as well as data validation. AB contributed to project
517 administration and data validation. CC and MML performed formal analysis. MML wrote the original
518 draft manuscript with review and editing from CC, AB, JV and EK.

519

520 References

- 521 1. Jolivet RR, Warren CE, Sripad P, Ateva E, Gausman J, Mitchell K, et al. Upholding Rights Under
522 COVID-19: The Respectful Maternity Care Charter. *Health Hum Rights*. 2020;22(1):391-4.
- 523 2. Sadler M, Leiva G, Olza I. COVID-19 as a risk factor for obstetric violence. *Sex Reprod Health Matters*.
524 2020;28(1):1785379.
- 525 3. Reingold RB, Barbosa I, Mishori R. Respectful maternity care in the context of COVID-19: A human
526 rights perspective. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. 2020.

- 527 4. Tunçalp Ö, Were WM, MacLennan C, Oladapo OT, Gülmezoglu AM, Bahl R, et al. Quality of care for
528 pregnant women and newborns-the WHO vision. *Bjog*. 2015;122(8):1045-9.
- 529 5. Bohren MA, Hunter EC, Munthe-Kaas HM, Souza JP, Vogel JP, Gülmezoglu AM. Facilitators and
530 barriers to facility-based delivery in low- and middle-income countries: a qualitative evidence
531 synthesis. *Reprod Health*. 2014;11(1):71.
- 532 6. Keating NE, Dempsey B, Corcoran S, McAuliffe FM, Lalor J, Higgins MF. Women's experience of
533 pregnancy and birth during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative study. *Ir J Med Sci*. 2021:1-8.
- 534 7. Colaceci S, Anderson G, Ricciuto V, Montinaro D, Alazraki G, Mena-Tudela D. Experiences of Birth
535 during COVID-19 Pandemic in Italy and Spain: A Thematic Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.
536 2022;19(12).
- 537 8. Mariño-Narvaez C, Puertas-Gonzalez JA, Romero-Gonzalez B, Peralta-Ramirez MI. Giving birth during
538 the COVID-19 pandemic: The impact on birth satisfaction and postpartum depression. *Int J Gynaecol
539 Obstet*. 2021;153(1):83-8.
- 540 9. Janevic T, Maru S, Nowlin S, McCarthy K, Bergink V, Stone J, et al. Pandemic Birthing: Childbirth
541 Satisfaction, Perceived Health Care Bias, and Postpartum Health During the COVID-19 Pandemic.
542 *Matern Child Health J*. 2021;25(6):860-9.
- 543 10. Rice KF, Williams SA. Making good care essential: The impact of increased obstetric interventions
544 and decreased services during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Women Birth*. 2021.
- 545 11. Inversetti A, Fumagalli S, Nespoli A, Antolini L, Mussi S, Ferrari D, et al. Childbirth experience and
546 practice changing during COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study. *Nurs Open*. 2021;8(6):3627-
547 34.
- 548 12. Lazzerini M, Covi B, Mariani I, Drglin Z, Arendt M, Nedberg IH, et al. Quality of facility-based
549 maternal and newborn care around the time of childbirth during the COVID-19 pandemic: online

- 550 survey investigating maternal perspectives in 12 countries of the WHO European Region. *Lancet Reg*
551 *Health Eur.* 2022;13:100268.
- 552 13. Asefa A, Semaan A, Delvaux T, Huysmans E, Galle A, Sacks E, et al. The impact of COVID-19 on the
553 provision of respectful maternity care: findings from a global survey of health workers. *medRxiv.*
554 2021:2021.05.05.21256667.
- 555 14. Kebede AA, Taye BT, Wondie KY, Tiguh AE, Eriku GA, Mihret MS. Adherence to respectful maternity
556 care guidelines during COVID-19 pandemic and associated factors among healthcare providers
557 working at hospitals in northwest Ethiopia: A multicenter, observational study. *Clinical Epidemiology*
558 *and Global Health.* 2021;12:100830.
- 559 15. Ministerio da Saude (MISAU), Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE), Measure DHS+. Mozambique
560 Demographic and Health Survey 2003. Maputo, Mozambique: MISAU, INE and ICFI 2005.
- 561 16. Instituto Nacional de Saúde (INS), Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE), Johns Hopkins University
562 (JHU). Sistema de Vigilância de Eventos Vitais e Causas de Morte (COMSA), Moçambique 2020. INE,
563 INS, JHU; 2020.
- 564 17. (MISAU) MdS, (INE) INdE, (ICFI) II. Mozambique Demographic and Health Survey 2011. Calverton,
565 Maryland, USA: MISAU, INE and ICFI; 2011.
- 566 18. (INE) INdE, (ICFI) II. Mozambique Demographic and Health Survey 2022-23. Maputo, Mozambique
567 and Rockville, Maryland, USA: INE and ICF; 2023.
- 568 19. Augusto O, Keyes EE, Madede T, Abacassamo F, de la Corte P, Chilundo B, et al. Progress in
569 Mozambique: Changes in the availability, use, and quality of emergency obstetric and newborn care
570 between 2007 and 2012. *PLOS ONE.* 2018;13(7):e0199883.
- 571 20. Government of Mozambique. Boletim da Republica: publicação oficial da Republica de
572 Moçambique. Maputo, Mozambique: Imprensa Nacional De Moçambique, E.P; 2023.

- 573 21. Plotkin MK, Williams KM, Mbinda A, Oficiano VN, Nyauchi B, Walugembe P, et al. Keeping essential
574 reproductive, maternal and child health services available during COVID-19 in Kenya, Mozambique,
575 Uganda and Zimbabwe: analysis of early-pandemic policy guidelines. BMC Public Health.
576 2022;22(1):577.
- 577 22. Estatística INd. Mozambique national census 2017. Maputo, Mozambique: Instituto Nacional de
578 Estatística (INE); 2017.
- 579 23. Lydon MM, Vilanculos J, Martinez A, Barata A, Keyes E. Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on
580 maternal and perinatal health service utilisation and outcomes in Mozambique: an interrupted time
581 series analysis. BMJ Open. 2022;12(11):e062975.
- 582 24. Instituto Nacional de Estatística. Estatísticas do distrito Erati. 2012.
- 583 25. Instituto Nacional de Estatística. Estatísticas do distrito Nacala Porto. 2012.
- 584 26. E N, Guest G, McKenna K, Chen M. Evaluating Bang for the Buck: A Cost-Effectiveness Comparison
585 Between Individual Interviews and Focus Groups Based on Thematic Saturation Levels. American
586 Journal of Evaluation. 2016;37(3):425-40.
- 587 27. Lumivero. Nvivo. 12 ed: Lumivero; 2017.
- 588 28. Bohren MA, Vogel JP, Hunter EC, Lutsiv O, Makh SK, Souza JP, et al. The Mistreatment of Women
589 during Childbirth in Health Facilities Globally: A Mixed-Methods Systematic Review. PLoS Med.
590 2015;12(6):e1001847; discussion e.
- 591 29. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations: Intrapartum care for a positive childbirth
592 experience. Geneva; 2018.
- 593 30. Wright A, Nassar AH, Visser G, Ramasauskaite D, Theron G, Motherhood ftFS, et al. FIGO good
594 clinical practice paper: management of the second stage of labor. International Journal of
595 Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2021;152(2):172-81.

- 596 31. Galle A, Manaharlal H, Cumbane E, Picardo J, Griffin S, Osman N, et al. Disrespect and abuse during
597 facility-based childbirth in southern Mozambique: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Pregnancy*
598 *Childbirth*. 2019;19(1):369.
- 599 32. Mocumbi S, Högberg U, Lampa E, Sacoor C, Valá A, Bergström A, et al. Mothers' satisfaction with
600 care during facility-based childbirth: a cross-sectional survey in southern Mozambique. *BMC*
601 *Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2019;19(1):303.
- 602 33. Lydon MM, Maruf F, Tappis H. Facility-level determinants of quality routine intrapartum care in
603 Afghanistan. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2021;21(1):438.
- 604 34. Mhyre JM, D'Oria R, Hameed AB, Lappen JR, Holley SL, Hunter SK, et al. The Maternal Early Warning
605 Criteria: A Proposal from the National Partnership for Maternal Safety. *Journal of Obstetric,*
606 *Gynecologic & Neonatal Nursing*. 2014;43(6):771-9.
- 607 35. Osborne S, Douglas C, Reid C, Jones L, Gardner G. The primacy of vital signs--acute care nurses' and
608 midwives' use of physical assessment skills: a cross sectional study. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2015;52(5):951-
609 62.
- 610 36. Committee on Practice Bulletins-Obstetrics. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 198: Prevention and
611 Management of Obstetric Lacerations at Vaginal Delivery. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2018;132(3):e87-e102.
- 612 37. Nassar AH, Visser GHA, Ayres-de-Campos D, Rane A, Gupta S, Motherhood tFS, et al. FIGO
613 Statement: Restrictive use rather than routine use of episiotomy. *International Journal of*
614 *Gynecology & Obstetrics*. 2019;146(1):17-9.
- 615 38. Woolley RJ. Benefits and risks of episiotomy: a review of the English-language literature since 1980.
616 Part I. *Obstet Gynecol Surv*. 1995;50(11):806-20.
- 617 39. Woolley RJ. Benefits and risks of episiotomy: a review of the English-language literature since 1980.
618 Part II. *Obstet Gynecol Surv*. 1995;50(11):821-35.

- 619 40. Frigerio M, Mastrolia SA, Spelzini F, Manodoro S, Yohay D, Weintraub AY. Long-term effects of
620 episiotomy on urinary incontinence and pelvic organ prolapse: a systematic review. Arch Gynecol
621 Obstet. 2019;299(2):317-25.
- 622 41. Reveiz L, Gaitán HG, Cuervo LG. Enemas during labour. Cochrane Database Syst Rev.
623 2013;2013(7):Cd000330.
- 624 42. Lyon CB, Merchant AI, Schwalbach T, Pinto EF, Jeque EC, McQueen KA. Anesthetic Care in
625 Mozambique. Anesth Analg. 2016;122(5):1634-9.
- 626 43. Jones L, Othman M, Dowswell T, Alfirevic Z, Gates S, Newburn M, et al. Pain management for
627 women in labour: an overview of systematic reviews. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.
628 2012(3).
- 629 44. Bohren MA, Hofmeyr GJ, Sakala C, Fukuzawa RK, Cuthbert A. Continuous support for women during
630 childbirth. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2017;7(7):Cd003766.
- 631 45. Betron ML, McClair TL, Currie S, Banerjee J. Expanding the agenda for addressing mistreatment in
632 maternity care: a mapping review and gender analysis. Reprod Health. 2018;15(1):143.
- 633 46. Mehrtash H, Bohren MA, Adu-Bonsaffoh K, Irinyenikan TA, Berger BO, Maya E, et al. Comparing
634 observed occurrence of mistreatment during childbirth with women's self-report: a validation study
635 in Ghana, Guinea and Nigeria. BMJ Glob Health. 2023;5(Suppl 2).
- 636