Results from a maternal, newborn and child health program targeting pregnant, married adolescent girls in northern Nigeria

Authors: Erica Felker-Kantor, Mary Phillips, Meghan Cutherell, Roselyn Odeh, Stacy Louis, Alhaji Bulama, Abednego Musau

Corresponding author:
Mary Philips
mphillips@psi.org

Dr. Erica Felker-Kantor
Population Services International, Washington D.C.
efkantor@psi.org, e.felker.kantor@gmail.com

Mary Phillips
Population Services International, Washington D.C.
mphillips@psi.org

Meghan Cutherell
Population Services International, Washington D.C.
mcutherell@psi.org

Roselyn Odeh
Society for Family Health, Abuja, Nigeria
Rodeh@sfhnigeria.org

Stacy Lois
Society for Family Health, Abuja, Nigeria
Slouis@sfhnigeria.org

Alhaji Bulama
Society for Family Health, Abuja, Nigeria
Alhassanbulama@outlook.com

Dr. Abednego Musau
Population Services International, Nairobi, Kenya
amusau@psi.org

Abstract

Adolescent pregnancy is a significant public health concern in Nigeria where adolescent girls (15-19 years) face high rates of maternal morbidity and mortality compared to older women. Interventions that address the unique needs of pregnant adolescents in the Nigerian context are critical to improve pregnancy-related health outcomes. This paper presents results from a longitudinal quasi-experimental study evaluating the effectiveness of a maternal, newborn and child health (MNCH) intervention on pregnancy and postpartum outcomes among married adolescent girls in northern Nigeria. The study included an intervention and comparison group and was conducted in Kaduna and Jigawa states. Data were collected at baseline, 3-months post intervention, and at 8-weeks postpartum. Results from the cross-sectional postpartum survey are presented in this paper. The postpartum survey sample included 846 married adolescent girls aged 15-19, 392 (46%) in the comparison group and 454 (54%) in the intervention group. Compared to adolescent girls in the comparison group, those exposed to the intervention were more likely to attend any antenatal care visit (IRR: 1.66; 95%CI: [1.50, 1.84]), attend antenatal care at an earlier gestational age (β: -0.57; 95%CI: [-0.89, -0.26]), attend more antenatal care visits (β: 1.44; 95%CI: [1.08, 1.79]), use nutritional supplements during pregnancy (IRR: 1.45; 95%CI: [1.31, 1.59]), give birth at a health facility (IRR: 2.36; 95%CI: [1.93, 2.89]), use postpartum family planning (IRR: 3.13; 95%CI: [2.447, 3.996]), and receive postnatal care (IRR: 1.52; 95%CI: [1.28, 1.80]). The adolescent-friendly MNCH intervention demonstrated positive and statistically significant effects on pregnancy and postpartum outcomes among married adolescent girls in northern Nigeria. Involving adolescents in program design played an important role in creating a program that addressed the specific needs of pregnant adolescent girls. Scaling up such interventions to improve health outcomes for pregnant adolescent girls can impact their immediate health but also their future health trajectories and that of their children.

Key words: adolescent girls, Nigeria, pregnancy, antenatal care, postnatal care, post-partum family planning

Short title: Evaluation of a maternal health program in Northern Nigeria

Background

Complications from pregnancy and childbirth are among the leading causes of death for adolescent girls aged 15-19 globally (1). While adolescent pregnancy rates have decreased, an estimated 21 million adolescent girls give birth each year in low- and middle- income countries (LMICs) (2). Adolescent mothers often face heightened risk for eclampsia and systemic infections, and babies born to adolescent mothers have an increased risk of premature birth and low birth weight (3, 4). This increased risk may be explained by physiological differences during adolescence and physical immaturity compared to older women as well as demographic and socio-economic characteristics (5). Ensuring that pregnant adolescent girls have access to quality maternal and newborn health services is critical for mitigating the risks that come with adolescent pregnancy.

There is strong evidence that antenatal care (ANC) reduces pregnancy risks and improves outcomes for all pregnant women (1). Initiating care early in pregnancy is also associated with improved maternal health and fewer adverse birth outcomes or interventions in late pregnancy (6). Women who attend ANC receive health education on pregnancy risk factors, nutrition during pregnancy, and are more likely to deliver in a health facility with a skilled birth attendant (7). Although evidence on the linkage between receiving ANC and attending postnatal care (PNC) and postpartum family planning (PPFP) remains mixed, ANC visits and presence of a skilled provider during birth provide an opportunity to educate women about the health benefits of PNC, birth spacing, and contraceptive use after child birth (8).

In 2016, the World Health Organization (WHO) changed the number of recommended ANC visits from 4 to 8, following evidence which showed that a higher frequency of antenatal contacts with a skilled provider reduced the likelihood of stillbirth (9, 10). Despite the benefits of ANC being well documented, timely uptake of ANC among adolescents in LMICs remains low due to many factors including limited autonomy with respect to decision-making, lack of

151 awareness, financial resources, transportation restrictions, social norms, lack of age-appropriate
152 health services and for married adolescent girls, power imbalances and mobility or permission
153 restrictions (11). Compared to their older counterparts, adolescents also have significantly lower
154 coverage of PNC due to similar factors (12).

155 A recent systematic review by Sabet et al. reported on evidence-based interventions to
156 improve health outcomes including uptake of ANC, PNC and use of nutritional supplements for
157 pregnant women and adolescent girls in LMICs (13). Results found that most interventions were
158 not specific to adolescents and there was limited quantitative evidence specifically related to
159 improving pregnancy care, delivery, abortion, or PNC for adolescents, and no interventions
160 focused on PPFP uptake. Two of the more effective but resource intensive interventions focused
161 on increasing health facility births through conditional cash transfer programs (14, 15).
162 According to the authors, however, one of the largest gaps in the body of literature was the lack
163 of programming focused on pregnancy-related health outcomes informed by adolescent-friendly
164 approaches. A critical aspect of adolescent healthcare is recognizing adolescents as partners
165 for designing creative and effective health programming to address their unique needs within
166 their specific cultural contexts.

167
168 *Nigeria*
169

170 Nigeria has the largest population in Africa with an estimated 205 million inhabitants and
171 half the population under the age of 24 (16). The average age of marriage for Nigerian women
172 is 19 and nearly one in five adolescent girls give birth to their first child between ages 15-19
173 (17). In northwest Nigeria, 29% of adolescent girls have started childbearing by the age of 19
174 compared to just 6% in the southwest (16, 17). The proportion of pregnant women receiving
175 ANC from a skilled provider increased nationally from 58% to 67% between 2008 and 2018
176 before decreasing to 63% in 2023. Adolescent girls are less likely to receive ANC from a skilled
177 provider compared to other age groups (age 15-19: 57%; age 20-34: 69%; age 35-49: 65%)

178 (18). Regional differences in ANC also exist, with the lowest rates of ANC occurring in the
179 northwest (54%) and the highest in the southeast (89%) (18). Multiple factors may contribute to
180 why adolescents are less likely to access and receive ANC including financial constraints,
181 cultural and religious beliefs (especially in northern Nigeria), minimal autonomy, lack of
182 awareness and low education, and distance to a health facility, among others. According to the
183 WHO, the country contributes the largest number of obstetric and postpartum deaths of any
184 country. The national maternal morality ratio (MMR) is 512 maternal deaths per 100,000 live
185 births and the lifetime risk of maternal death indicates that 1 in 34 women will have a death
186 related to maternal causes (11, 19). The highest rate of maternal death occurs in the northwest
187 where 60% of women deliver at home. Adolescent girls aged 15-19 have the second highest
188 MMR in the country just behind young women aged 20-24, with an MMR of 30% (18).
189 In 2016, with funding from the Gates Foundation and the Children's Investment Fund
190 Foundation (CIFF), Population Services International (PSI) launched Adolescents 360 (A360), to
191 increase demand for, and voluntary uptake of modern contraception among girls aged 15-19 in
192 Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Nigeria (20). In Nigeria, Society for Family Health leads the
193 implementation of A360's intervention called *Matasa Matan Arewa (MMA),* in four northern
194 states, Kaduna, Nasarawa, Jigawa, and Kano where there are high rates of adolescent
195 pregnancy. MMA was designed using a human-centered design (HCD) approach, incorporating
196 insights and feedback from married girls living in the region. Implemented within local primary
197 health structures, MMA mobilizes married adolescent girls to receive adolescent-friendly
198 contraceptive services at nearby primary health centers. The intervention also offers girls the
199 chance to attend a series of four, two-hour mentored group sessions called Life, Family, Health
200 (LFH). LFH sessions cover topics such as sexual and reproductive health (SRH), family
201 nutrition, child spacing, interpersonal communication, goal setting and financial management
202 (20). As part of MMA, men are also engaged by male interpersonal communication agents
203 (IPCAs) who facilitate discussions about contraceptive use for married adolescent girls at spots

204 where men congregate and distribute referral cards that men can provide to their wives to
205 access services. In 2021, A360 received additional funding to augment the existing intervention
206 with a maternal, newborn and child health (MNCH) component. This MNCH component was co-
207 designed with adolescents using an HCD approach to address barriers to healthy pregnancies
208 including a lack of planning for pregnancy, cultural norms that discourage early ANC
209 attendance, general uncertainty about the value of ANC, low uptake of PPFP, and agency to
210 seek care. The MNCH component includes an educational session, integrated into LFH, on pre-
211 conception care, nutrition, ANC, delivery, PNC, and PPFP for girls at risk for pregnancy and
212 pregnant girls. Girls attending this session learn how to prepare for a healthy pregnancy, the
213 benefits of attending ANC and having a facility-based birth, and the importance of PNC and
214 PPFP for birth spacing. The sessions are facilitated by trusted community female mentors
215 trained on the benefits of ANC and PNC, facility-based delivery, and PPFP. Government ANC
216 providers also attend the sessions to provide clinical information and to build trust with the girls.
217 At the end of the sessions, pregnant girls are provided with pregnancy journey maps based on
218 their gestational age at the time of enrollment. The girls are instructed to take the journey map
219 home and complete the information about their pregnancy and birth plan with their husbands.
220 Husbands are also targeted with messaging from male IPCAs on the importance of ANC during
221 pregnancy and to promote positive involvement from husbands in supporting their wife's health-
222 seeking behaviors during pregnancy. At the facility-level, ANC providers receive informational
223 sessions about MMA's MNCH component as well as reminders on how to provide adolescent-
224 friendly services, high-quality ANC, and record-management for effective client tracking. Finally,
225 pregnant girls receive follow-up visits from the trained female mentors to help with ANC
226 retention and encourage facility-based birth.
227 To evaluate the effectiveness of the MNCH component, we conducted a longitudinal
228 quasi-experimental study in Kaduna and Jigawa states in northern Nigeria. The study included a
229 baseline survey (pre-intervention), 3-month follow-up survey (post-intervention), and an 8-week

postpartum survey (pregnant girls only). This paper presents results from the postpartum survey. Results from the baseline and 3-month follow-up surveys are presented elsewhere.

Materials and Methods

Setting

Kaduna state has a population of approximately nine million (21). Kaduna has a high fertility rate with an average of 5 children per woman of reproductive age (WRA) (17). The median age for first marriage among women is 16 and for first birth 18. Slightly more than 30% of girls aged 15-19 have begun childbearing and 13% of pregnancies end in abortion (17). Maternal mortality is high in Kaduna with an MMR of 452.6 deaths per 100,000 live births (22). Jigawa state has an estimated population of 7.5 million with many internally displaced populations due to Boko Haram conflicts in a neighboring region. The fertility rate is 7 children per WRA (17). The median ages for first marriage and first birth among women are 15.8 and18 respectively and 45% of marriages are polygamous. Slightly more than 29% of girls aged 15-19 have begun childbearing. Maternal mortality is particularly high with an estimated MMR of 1,012 deaths per 100,000 live births (23).

Study design

The evaluation of the MNCH component employed a quasi-experimental design with an intervention and comparison group. Within Jigawa, five local government areas (LGAs) where MMA is implemented were selected as study locations, three as intervention sites and two as comparison sites. In Kaduna, two LGAs were selected as intervention sites and two as comparison sites. The intervention and comparison groups were similar in terms of demographics, socio-economic status and health. The intervention group received the integrated MMA intervention, inclusive of both its original SRH and new MNCH components. The comparison group received the original SRH-focused MMA intervention. The study opted to

256 compare the MNCH component outcomes against outcomes resulting from implementation of
257 the traditional SRH-focused MMA intervention. Results were intended to measure incremental
258 effectiveness and not a counterfactual comparison to adolescent girls in non-MMA locations.
259 The primary target population was married adolescent girls aged 15-19 who were at risk for
260 pregnancy, were pregnant, or became pregnant by the 3-month follow-up. To be eligible to
261 participate in the study, girls were required to be aged 15-19, married, reside in study setting,
262 not be using a contraceptive method (non-pregnant girls) or be less than 25 weeks pregnant
263 (pregnant girls), and provide written informed consent. Girls under 18 were considered
264 emancipated minors and treated as adults as per Nigerian guidelines. Written informed consent
265 was obtained on an electronic consent form and participants were provided a paper copy with
266 contact information. Data collection went from November 10, 2023, to November 4, 2024. The
267 study received ethical approval from PSI's Research Ethics Board (# 1735.2023) and Kaduna
268 and Jigawa Health Research Ethics Committees (# MOH/ADM/744/Vol.1/1158 and
269 JHREC/2023/176) in Nigeria. The study was also registered as a clinical trial (Clinicaltrials.gov,
270 NCT06680765).
271 Trained female mentors who were familiar with MMA were used to recruit potential study
272 participants. Girls who expressed interest in the study were assessed for eligibility. Those who
273 were eligible were asked to provide the mentor with contact details which were provided to the
274 data collection team for study enrollment. Sample size determination was estimated using a
275 two-sided Wald Z-test accounting for repeated measures and clustering within groups and
276 assuming no change for the primary outcome(s) within the comparison group. To detect an
277 effect size of 10% between baseline and the 3-month follow-up a sample size of 545 girls per
278 group was estimated under the following conditions: power of 80%, two-sided 95% confidence
279 interval, design effect of 1.2 ,10% loss to follow-up, and 10% non-response rate. Sample
280 allocation between girls who were already pregnant and those at-risk for pregnancy was
281 assigned using a ratio of 3:1 to power the study to detect pregnancy-related outcomes.

Data collection

The baseline and 3-month follow-up surveys were conducted with both girls who were at risk for pregnancy and pregnant girls who met eligibility criteria. The surveys focused on preconception knowledge, practices, and beliefs. The postpartum survey was administered to participants who were pregnant at baseline or became pregnant between baseline and the 3-month follow-up. The postpartum survey was conducted approximately 8-weeksafter delivery and focused on ANC, PNC, behaviors during pregnancy, birth location, and PPFP uptake. Surveys were administered electronically by trained female enumerators and conducted in English and Hausa languages. Participants received $2 USD on completion of the 3-month and postpartum follow-up surveys.

Data analysis

Several outcome measures were used to examine pregnancy and postpartum-related behaviors: *ANC attendance (attended or received any ANC during pregnancy from a skilled provider), # of ANC visits during pregnancy, gestational age in weeks at first ANC visit, consistent use of nutritional supplements (e.g., prenatal vitamin or folic acid) throughout pregnancy, place of birth, receiving PNC from a skilled provider within 48 hours of delivery,* and, *girl or husband doing something to prevent or space subsequent pregnancy or birth after delivery.* Covariates included age, education, parity, and the multidimensional poverty index (24). Statistical analysis of the postpartum data included univariate descriptive statistics (frequencies and means), bivariate tests of comparison between intervention and comparison groups (e.g., between group t-tests and chi-square tests of comparison), and multivariate linear and modified Poisson regression with robust standard errors (25, 26). In adjusted models, we also controlled for LGA (site) to account for within group clustering. Variables that created 10% or greater difference between the unadjusted and adjusted effects were considered confounders and controlled for in the final model. Stata version 17 was used for all analysis.

Results

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the postpartum survey participants by study group. The total analytic sample was 846 adolescent girls (n=454 intervention group, n=392 comparison group). The average age across the sample was 18 (SD=1.03). Three quarters (75.1%) of girls in the intervention group and 68.6% of girls in the comparison group were age 18 or 19. There was no significant difference in age by study group. Most girls were in monogamous marriages with only 16.5% of girls in the intervention group and 14.3% in the comparison group reporting polygamous relationships. There was no significant difference in relationship type by study group. Among the study sample, 52.5% were from Kaduna state and 47.5% from Jigawa state. Jigawa state had a slightly higher proportion of participants in the intervention group compared to the comparison group, 52.6% vs. 41.6%, and Kaduna state had a higher proportion of participants in the comparison group vs. the intervention group (58.4% vs. 47.4%, $p<0.001$). Most study participants were of Islamic religion (92.9%). All participants in the intervention group reported Islam as their religion compared to 84.7% in the comparison group ($p<0.001$). For education, 10.8% of girls in the intervention group were in-school at the time of the study compared to 18.4% in the comparison group ($p=0.002$). Among girls not in-school, 57% in the intervention group and 49.4% in the comparison group had completed secondary education. The proportion of girls with no education was higher in the comparison group compared to the intervention group, 24.7% vs. 9.1%. Primary education also differed by group with more girls in the intervention group having completed primary education (22.7% vs. 13.7%). Differences in education levels achieved by study group were statistically significant ($p<0.001$). Most participants (69%) were poor according to the multidimensional poverty index, with a slightly higher proportion of deprived households in the intervention group than the comparison group, 73% vs. 64.8% ($p=0.013$). Nearly 30% of the sample had been pregnant prior to their current pregnancy. The average age at first pregnancy was 16.

335

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of study participants by study group					
	Intervention n (%) / mean (SD) (n=454)	**Comparison n (%) / mean (SD) (n=392)**	**Total n (%) / mean (SD) (N=846)**	**Test of significance**	**p-value**
Age category					
15 years	15 (3.3%)	13 (3.3%)	28 (3.3%)	Pearson chi2=6.41	p=0.170
16 years	22 (4.9%)	30 (7.6%)	52 (6.2%)		
17 years	76 (16.7%)	80 (20.4%)	156 (18.4%)		
18 years	186 (41.0%)	136 (34.7%)	322 (38.1%)		
19 years	155 (34.1%)	133 (33.9%)	288 (34.0%)		
Relationship type					
Monogamous	379 (83.5%)	336 (85.7%)	715 (84.5%)	Pearson chi2=0.80	p=0.370
Polygamous	75 (16.5%)	56 (14.3%)	131 (15.5%)		
State					
Kaduna	215 (47.4%)	229 (58.4%)	444 (52.5%)	Pearson chi2=10.32	p<0.001
Jigawa	239 (52.6%)	163 (41.6%)	402 (47.5%)		
Religion					
Christianity	0 (0.0%)	60 (15.3%)	60 (7.1%)	Pearson chi2=74.79	p<0.001
Islam	454 (100%)	332 (84.7%)	786 (92.9%)		
Education					
Currently in school	49 (10.8%)	72 (18.4%)	121 (14.3%)	Pearson chi2=9.84	p=0.002
Highest level of schooling (not in currently in school)					
None	37 (9.1%)	79 (24.7%)	116 (16.0%)	Pearson chi2=37.16	p<0.001
Primary	92 (22.7%)	44 (13.7%)	136 (18.8%)		
Secondary	231 (57.0%)	158 (49.4%)	389 (54.7%)		
Higher	4 (0.9%)	5 (1.6%)	9 (1.2%)		
Islamiyah school	41 (10.1%)	34 (10.6%)	75 (10.3%)		

Multi-dimensional poverty index (% deprived households)	330 (73.0%)	254 (64.8%)	584 (69.0%)	Pearson chi2=6.13	p=0.013
Previous pregnancy	156 (34.4%)	114 (29.1%)	270 (31.9%)	Pearson chi2=2.69	p=0.110
Average age (years) at first pregnancy among those with previous pregnancy	15.98 (1.01)	16.17 (1.66)	16.06 (1.33)	Two-sample t test	p=0.251
Notes. SD=standard deviation; less than 10% missing on frequencies/means.					

Tables 2a and b present bivariate regression results for key pregnancy and postpartum indicators. The mean gestational age at first ANC visit was 4.9 months for the intervention group and 5.3 months for the comparison group. Compared to the comparison group, girls in the intervention group sought ANC earlier by 0.53 months (95%CI [-0.82, -0.25]). The mean number of ANC visits during pregnancy was 1.11 times higher for girls in the intervention group vs. the comparison group (95%CI: [0.81, 1.40]). Both gestational age at first ANC visit and number of ANC visits were significantly associated with intervention exposure at $p<0.001$.

Nearly 95% of girls in the intervention group attended any ANC visit with a skilled provider compared to only 55% in the comparison group. The prevalence ratio for attending ANC was 1.75 (95%CI: [1.59, 1.92]) times greater for girls in the intervention group compared to the comparison group. Almost 90% of girls in the intervention group reported using a nutritional supplement throughout pregnancy compared to 60% of girls in the comparison group. The prevalence ratio for consistently using a nutritional supplement during pregnancy was 1.47 (95%CI: [1.35, 1.61]) times greater for girls exposed to the intervention compared to the comparison group. Almost 80% of girls exposed to the intervention reported facility-based birth compared to just under 30% in the comparison group. The prevalence ratio for a facility-based birth was 2.72 (95%CI: [2.29, 3.23]) times greater for girls exposed to the intervention compared to the comparison group. Slightly less than 60% of girls in the intervention group reported

355 receiving PNC within 48 hours of delivery compared to 47% of girls in the comparison group.
356 The prevalence ratio for receiving PNC was 1.26 (95%CI: [1.09, 1.45]) times greater among the
357 intervention group compared to the comparison group. Nearly half (48%) of girls in the
358 intervention group reported that they or their husband were doing something post-delivery to
359 prevent or space future pregnancies compared to just 20% of girls in the comparison group. The
360 prevalence ratio for PPFP was 2.38 (95%CI: [1.91, 2.97]) times greater for girls exposed to the
361 intervention compared to the comparison group. All outcomes were statistically significantly
362 associated with intervention exposure at p<0.001.

Table 2a. Bivariate linear regression for key pregnancy and postpartum variables by study group

	Mean (SD)	Beta	95% CI	p-value
Gestational age (months) at time of first ANC visit				
Comparison	5.27 (5.05-5.50)	Ref	Ref	Ref
Intervention	4.68 (4.54-4.82)	-0.53	-0.82, -0.25	p<0.001
# of ANC visits during pregnancy				
Comparison	3.90 (3.66-4.14)	Ref	Ref	Ref
Intervention	5.01 (4.84-5.18)	1.11	0.81, 1.40	p<0.001

Notes. SD= standard deviation; CI=confidence interval; Ref/ref=reference group; ANC=antenatal care.

363
364

Table 2b. Bivariate modified Poisson regression wit robust standard errors for key pregnancy and postpartum variables by study group

	n (%)	IRR	95% CI	p-value
Attended ANC during pregnancy (No=ref)				
Comparison	214 (54.6%)	Ref	Ref	Ref
Intervention	432 (95.4%)	1.75	1.59, 1.92	p<0.001
Used nutritional supplements during the whole pregnancy (No=ref)				
Comparison	236 (60.2%)	Ref	Ref	Ref

Intervention	398 (88.8%)	1.47	1.35, 1.61	p<0.001
Place of birth (Home=ref)				
Comparison	100 (28.99%)	Ref	Ref	Ref
Intervention	318 (78.91%)	2.72	2.29, 3.23	p<0.001
Attended PNC (No=ref)				
Comparison	151 (46.75%)	Ref	Ref	Ref
Intervention	227 (58.81%)	1.26	1.09, 1.45	p<0.001
Girl or husband doing something to avoid pregnancy or delay pregnancy following delivery (No=ref)				
Comparison	78 (19.95%)	Ref	Ref	Ref
Intervention	215 (47.57%)	2.38	1.91, 2.97	p<0.001
Notes. IRR=incident rate ratio; CI=confidence interval; Ref/ref=reference group; ANC=antenatal care; PNC=postnatal care.				

Tables 3a and b present adjusted linear and modified Poisson regression models with robust standard errors, controlling for education, age, parity, and the multidimensional poverty index. LGA was also included in the models as fixed effect to account for potential within group clustering. In adjusted models, the statistically significant associations detected in crude models remained statistically significant. Girls in the intervention group attended their first ANC visit at an earlier gestational age compared to girls in the comparison group (β: -0.57; 95%CI: [-0.89, -0.26]) and the number of ANC visits was higher by 1.44 (95%CI: [1.08, 1.79]).

The prevalence ratio for attending any ANC was 1.66 (95%CI: [1.50, 1.84]) times greater for girls exposed to the intervention compared to girls in the comparison group.

Compared to girls in the comparison group, the prevalence ratio was 1.45 (95%CI: [1.31, 1.59]) times greater for continuous nutritional supplementation during pregnancy for girls in the intervention group. Place of birth was also significantly associated with intervention exposure with a prevalence ratio of 2.36 (95%CI: [1.93, 2.89]) for facility-based birth. Girls in the intervention group had a substantially higher prevalence ratio for PPFP compared to girls in the

380 comparison group (IRR: 3.13; 95% CI: [2.45, 4.00]) and attending PNC was 1.52 (95%CI: [1.28,

381 1.80]) times greater for girls exposed to the intervention vs. girls in the comparison group.

382

383

384

Table 3a. Adjusted regression analysis for pregnancy variables by study group

	Gestational age at first ANC visit			Attended ANC			# ANC visits		
	Beta	95% CI	p-value	IRR	95% CI	p-value	Beta	95% CI	p-value
Intervention group (comparison=ref)	**-0.57**	**-0.89, -0.26**	**p<0.001**	**1.66**	**1.50, 1.84**	**p<0.001**	**1.44**	**1.08, 1.79**	**p<0.001**
Previous birth (no=ref)	0.12	-0.16, 0.41	p=0.387	0.93	0.86, 1.01	p=0.074	-0.24	-0.57, 0.09	p=0.154
Multi Poverty Index (no=ref)									
Yes	0.14	-0.47, 0.53	p=0.305	**0.90**	**0.83, 0.97**	**p=0.007**	-0.10	-0.41, 0.20	p=0.500
Education (none=ref)									
Primary	0.03	-0.47, 0.53	p=0.907	0.91	0.80, 1.03	p=0.131	-0.06	-0.58, 0.51	p=0.898
Secondary	-0.16	-0.59, -0.26	p=0.435	0.93	0.83, 1.04	p=0.223	0.12	-0.33, 0.58	p=0.589
Tertiary	**-0.87**	**-1.72, -0.03**	**p=0.042**	0.92	0.69, 1.21	p=0.554	1.45	0.31, 2.60	p=0.013
Islamic school	0.07	-0.41, 0.56	p=0.763	0.98	0.86, 1.12	p=0.774	0.13	-0.35, 0.62	p=0.594
Age (15 years=ref)									
16 years	0.44	-0.28, 1.15	p=0.022	1.03	0.81, 1.32	p=0.783	0.94	-0.81, 1.00	p=0.838
17 years	-0.01	-0.62, 0.60	p=0.982	1.02	0.83, 1.25	p=0.866	-0.09	-0.83, 0.63	p=0.790
18 years	0.35	-0.23, 0.92	p=0.238	1.07	0.88, 1.31	p=0.466	0.05	-0.65, 0.75	p=0.887
19 years	0.07	-0.51, 0.65	p=0.808	1.14	0.93, 1.39	p=0.205	0.46	-0.26, 1.18	p=0.212
LGA	0.02	-0.03, 0.08	p=0.428	**0.97**	**0.96, 0.99**	**p<0.001**	**0.13**	**0.06, 0.19**	**p<0.001**

Notes. IRR=incidence rate ratio; CI=confidence interval; ref=reference; ANC=antenatal care; LGA=local government area.

Table 3b. Adjusted regression analysis for pregnancy and postpartum variables by study group

	Nutritional supplement during pregnancy			Place of birth			PPFP		
	IRR	95% CI	p-value	IRR	95% CI	p-value	IRR	95% CI	p-value
Intervention group (comparison=ref)	**1.45**	**1.31, 1.59**	**p<0.001**	**2.36**	**1.93, 2.89**	**p<0.001**	**3.13**	**2.45, 4.00**	**p<0.001**
Previous birth (no=ref)	0.97	0.90, 1.05	p=0.505	1.01	0.88, 1.15	p=0.906	0.93	1.76, 1.12	p=0.435
Multi Poverty Index (no=ref)									
Yes	0.94	0.86, 1.02	p=0.151	0.97	0.85, 1.10	p=0.611	1.10	0.89, 1.37	p=0.363
Education (none=ref)									
Primary	**0.84**	**0.74, 0.96**	**p=0.008**	0.88	0.70, 1.10	p=0.269	0.79	0.56, 1.13	p=0.198
Secondary	0.87	0.78, 0.97	p=0.061	0.94	0.78, 1.16	P=0.570	0.89	0.65, 1.22	p=0.491
Tertiary	0.94	0.73, 1.21	p=0.616	1.30	0.91, 1.87	p=0.147	1.63	1.00, 2.64	p=0.049
Islamic school	0.92	0.81, 1.05	p=0.206	0.80	0.63, 1.03	p=0.090	0.68	0.47, 1.00	p=0.051
Age (15 years=ref)									
16 years	0.93	0.71, 1.22	p=0.610	1.31	0.89, 1.92	p=0.164	0.88	0.52, 1.50	p=0.637
17 years	0.98	0.80, 1.21	p=0.874	1.22	0.86, 1.73	p=0.267	0.88	0.58, 1.39	p=0.585
18 years	1.05	0.86, 1.28	p=0.610	1.16	0.83, 1.64	p=0.379	0.74	0.48, 1.15	p=0.191
19 years	1.11	0.92, 1.36	p=0.269	1.20	0.85, 1.70	p=0.299	0.68	0.44, 1.05	p=0.083
LGA	0.91	0.83, 1,00	p=0.047	**0.94**	**0.92, 0.97**	**p<0.001**	**1.10**	**1.06, 1.15**	**p<0.001**

Notes. IRR=incidence rate ratio; CI=confidence interval; ref=reference; PPFP=postpartum family planning; LGA=local government area.

Table 3b. Adjusted regression analysis for pregnancy and postpartum variables by study group (continued)			
	Attended PNC		
	IRR	95% CI	p-value
Intervention group (comparison=ref)	**1.52**	**1.28, 1.80**	**p<0.001**
Previous birth (no=ref)	0.86	0.73, 1.02	p=0.085
Multi-Poverty Index (no=ref)			
Yes	0.95	0.82, 1.11	p=0.526
Education (none=ref)			
Primary	0.89	0.66, 1.19	p=0.426
Secondary	0.91	0.71, 1.18	p=0.484
Tertiary	0.96	0.59, 1.56	p=0.874
Islamic school	1.05	0.80, 1.38	p=0.722
Age (15 years=ref)			
16 years	1.20	0.71, 2.04	p=0.493
17 years	1.08	0.66, 1.76	p=0.755
18 years	1.24	0.78, 1.98	p=0.354
19 years	1.19	0.75, 1.92	p=0.456
LGA	**1.06**	**1.03, 1.10**	**p<0.001**
Notes. IRR=incidence rate ratio; CI=confidence interval; ref=reference; PPFP=postpartum family planning; LGA=local government area.			

Discussion

This study presents results from an adolescent-friendly MNCH intervention nested within a larger SRH-focused intervention targeting married pregnant adolescent girls aged 15-19 in northern Nigeria where adolescent pregnancy rates are high and use of perinatal and postnatal services low. The MNCH component was co-designed with the target population and aimed to increase knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to preconception care and healthy behaviors during pregnancy and postpartum. It included educational sessions, co-facilitated by trained female community mentors and government ANC providers at local facilities that offer girls an opportunity to learn about the importance of ANC and PNC, the benefits of facility-based birth, and PPFP and to build trust with service providers. This was complimented by direct outreach to husbands about the value of ANC, training providers on how to engage adolescents, build trust, and provide adolescent-friendly care, and follow-up support from the female

community mentors during pregnancy. Results from the postpartum survey suggest that adolescent girls exposed to the MNCH component were statistically significantly more likely to attend their first ANC visit at an earlier gestational age and attend more ANC visits compared to girls in the comparison group who did not receive the MNCH component, net of the effects of age, education, parity, and poverty. In addition, girls exposed to the MNCH component consistently used nutritional supplements throughout pregnancy at higher rates than girls in the comparison group and were more likely to give birth in a facility, receive PNC, and use PPFP.

These results provide promising evidence about the ability to reach a high-need population of married adolescents by integrating an MNCH component within a larger SRH-focused intervention. As indicated in the systematic review by Sabet et al., there is a significant evidence gap on interventions that focus on increasing uptake and use of pregnancy-related health services among pregnant adolescents, making it challenging to compare our results to similar interventions among the same population (13). Nonetheless, our intervention approach adds to available evidence on how to create effective programs to improve maternal and reproductive health behaviors and outcomes for married adolescents and WRA more generally. Specifically, evidence of the effectiveness of using a co-design process to create an intervention that addresses the unique needs of the target population. Mhango et al. assessed the effectiveness of an adolescent co-designed intervention that focused on mental health for pregnant adolescent girls in Malawi (27). The intervention consisted of psychosocial educational sessions with CHWs, and results were overwhelmingly positive with significant improvements reported across all mental health outcomes. Both our MNCH intervention components and the intervention assessed by Mhango et al., are examples of programs that reinforced principles of respectful maternal care by responding to the voices of pregnant girls and recognizing them as valuable collaborators in program design, which likely contributed to the success of the interventions.

Our approach also makes use of other evidence-based strategies, including group-based approaches, engaging with husbands, and trust building with providers. According to Sabet et al., group-based approaches may be effective platforms to engage adolescents as they provide opportunities to share experiences and build a peer-group (13). The educational sessions, although limited in number, provided adolescent girls in similar stages of pregnancy a chance to learn together and be part of a group in which all members were concerned with having a healthy pregnancy. Although evidence on engaging husbands of adolescents in maternity care is scarce, a systematic review from Tokhi et al., suggests that interventions that engage husbands of pregnant women in general are associated with improved ANC attendance, facility-based birth, and PNC (28). Our study supports these findings specifically within the sub-group of pregnant adolescents.

It is important to acknowledge that the success of the MNCH component was likely due to the multilevel design that spanned the continuum of care. Drawing on lessons learned from the MMA program and other evidence-based programming, the MNCH component was designed to address barriers at different levels of the socio-ecological model. Not only did the intervention target individual care-seeking behaviors of pregnant girls, but also interpersonal determinants through fostering supportive relationships and communication between girls and their husbands, as well as girls and the female community mentors. At the facility-level, provider capacity to provide adolescent-friendly care and establish trust was strengthened. Our approach supports the evidence that multilevel interventions are more likely to lead to more substantial changes in behaviors than single-level interventions (29).

Our findings add to the growing body of evidence demonstrating the value of integrated approaches. While the comparison group received education and access to family planning services, the intervention group, received more comprehensive support across the maternal and reproductive health spectrum, which contributed to significantly higher PPFP uptake. This suggests a holistic model, which provides both immediate support (e.g., promoting healthy

behaviors during pregnancy and ensuring access to quality ANC) and anticipatory guidance (e.g., counseling on desired family size and access to modern contraception), better aligns with girls' evolving needs and preferences. Continuum of care models are well-suited for health system structures where complimentary services are provided by the same providers or within the same facility.

While this intervention showed significant improvements for the intervention group, more work is needed to scale effective approaches to reach all girls in need. Additionally, significant gaps still exist in understanding what approaches are most effective for behavior change, cost-effective, and sustainable for this population, Adolescent pregnant girls in Nigeria continue to face barriers to accessing and receiving high quality maternal care. The most prominent barriers include access-related barriers, social stigma and lack of decision-making power, provider bias, and health systems constraints. Pregnant adolescent girls especially in the conservative religious and cultural context of northern Nigeria remain a challenging group to identify, reach, and engage. While the MNCH intervention component was effective at improving knowledge and healthcare seeking behaviors for pregnant adolescent girls and tried to address more structural barriers including provider bias and gender power-imbalances, such systemic barriers that are rooted in underlying social and economic factors take longer to change and must be addressed on a larger scale to have a sustained impact on adolescent girls' health (30).

This study is not without limitations. The study is subject to response bias and recall bias due to self-reporting and interviewer-administered tools. We were unable to capture the existence of other SRH interventions that may have occurred at the same time as the intervention presented here which could confound the study results. The study was conducted in LGAs where the parent intervention, MMA, had been implemented, limiting our ability to compare results to the true counterfactual among girls in non-MMA areas. Because the MNCH component focused on addressing knowledge, attitudes and behaviors, it cannot be directly

linked to improved health outcomes. Although the intervention had multiple activities, we are unable to identify the effectiveness of each activity, which is also a limitation of the study design.

Conclusion

Complications from pregnancy during adolescence are a leading cause of death for adolescent girls in Nigeria. Using a co-design approach, we developed an adolescent-friendly MNCH intervention component to improve knowledge and pregnancy care-seeking behaviors for married pregnant adolescent girls and girls at risk for pregnancy in northern Nigeria. The component was associated with earlier ANC initiation, a greater number of ANC visits attended, use of nutritional supplements during pregnancy, facility-based birth, receipt of PNC, and PPFP uptake. The positive results demonstrate the potential impact that co-designed adolescent-friendly interventions can have on pregnancy-related health behaviors for a vulnerable and underserved population.

Contributions. The study design was conceptualized by EFK, AM, MC, and MP. Study implementation was supervised by AM. Data analysis was performed by EFK and a Nigerian consulting firm. The paper was drafted by EFK with all authors contributing and approving the final version. The MNCH intervention was designed by Population Services International, Society for Family Health Nigeria, Nigerian Ministry of Health, Emnet Teklu, and adolescent girls in target areas.

Acknowledgements. We would like to acknowledge the study participants, Viable Knowledge Masters, SFH Nigeria teams who implemented the project, government partners in Kaduna and Jigawa states, and the girls who consented to participate in the study.

Conflict of Interest. None.

Informed Consent and Ethical Approval. The study was approved by Population Services International Research Ethics Board and the Jigawa and Kaduna State Health Research and Ethics Committees in Nigeria. Informed consent was obtained from all study participants.

Funding. The study was funded by the Gates Foundation (INV-061331) and Children Investment Fund Foundation (R-1911-04245).

References

1. Shee A FN, Robertson C, McKenzie AM, Lodge J, et al.,. Accessing and engaging with antenatal care: an interview study of teenage women. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth.21(693).
2. Noori N PJ, Efevbera Y, Oron A. The Effect of Adolescent Pregnancy on Child Mortality in 46 Low- and Middle-Income Countries. BMJ Global Health. 2022;7(5):e007681.
3. Adolescent Pregnancy: World Health Organization; 2025 [Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescent-pregnancy.
4. Scipioni A VH, Tanner J, Salemi J, Duncan J. Adverse Obstetrical Outcomes are Increased in Adolescent Pregnancy. Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology. 2024;37(2):240.
5. Neal S MS, Bose K, Camacho A, Mathai M, et al. The causes of maternal mortality in adolescents in low and middle income countries: a systematic review of the literature. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2016;16(352).
6. Carroli G RC, Villar J. How effective is antenatal care in preventing maternal mortality and serious morbidity? An overview of the evidence. Paediatric and Perinatal Epidemiology. 2001;15(1).
7. Gross K AS, Glass T, Schellenberg J, Obrist B. Timing of antenatal care for adolescent and adult pregnant women in south-eastern Tanzania. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2012;12(16).
8. Do M HD. Relationships between antenatal and postnatal care and post-partum modern contraceptive use: evidence from population surveys in Kenya and Zambia. BMC Health Services Research. 2013;13(6).

9. Lee S AE, Kanyike A, Wani S, Kasibante S, et al. Compliance with the WHO recommended 8+ antenatal care contacts schedule among postpartum mothers in eastern Uganda: A cross-sectional study. PLoS One. 2024;19(12):e0314769.
10. New guidelines on antenatal care for a positive pregnancy experience: World Health Organization; 2016 [Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/07-11-2016-new-guidelines-on-antenatal-care-for-a-positive-pregnancy-experience.
11. Oladele R OE, Okoduwa G, Olajide O, Olufadewa I, et al. . Utilization of antenatal care by young mothers and adolescents in Nigeria. Discover PublicHealth. 2024;21(206).
12. Javadi D SE, Brizuela V, Finalyson K, Crossland N, et al. Factors that influence the uptake of postnatal care among adolescent girls: a qualitative evidence synthesis. BMJ Glob Health. 2023;8:e011560.
13. Sabet F PA, Rahmanian S, Qudah H, Cardoso M, et al. The forgotten girls: the state of the evidence for health interventions for pregnant adolescents and their newborns in low-income and middle-income countries. The Lancet. 2023;402(10412):1580–96.
14. Sosa-Rubi SG WD, Servan E, Bautista-Arrendondo S. Learning effect of a conditional cash transfer programme on poor rural women's selection of delivery in Mexico. Health Policy & Planning. 2011;26(6):496–507.
15. Lim SS DL, Hoisington JA, James SL, Hogan MC, et al. India's Janani Suraksha Yojana, a conditional cash transfer programme to increase births in health facilities: an impact evaluation. Lancet. 2010;375(9730):2009–23.
16. PMA2017/Nigeria Adolescents and Young Adults Health Brief | PMA2020. [March 27, 2025]. Available from: www.pma2020.org/reports/pma2017nigeria-adolescents-and-young-adults-health-bri.
17. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey 2018. Abuja, Nigeria, and Rockville, Maryland;; 2019.
18. Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey. Rockville, Maryland: NPC and ICF; 2024.
19. Tukur J LT, Adanikin A, Abdussalam M, Bankole K, et al. Quality and outcomes of maternal and perinatal care for 76,563 pregnancies reported in a nationwide network of Nigerian referral-level hospitals. EClinicalMedicine. 2022;47(101411).
20. Malakoff S CM, Coppola A. Aligning Contraception with Family and Life Goals of Married Adolescent Girls in Northern Nigeria: The Case of Matasa Matan Arewa (MMA). Washington, D.C.: Population Services International; 2021.
21. National and State Population Projections. Abuja, Nigeria: Population and Housing Census; 2022.
22. Sloan N SA, Fasawe O, Yakubu J, McCrystal K, et al. Advancing Survival in Nigeria: A Pre-post Evaluation of an Integrated Maternal and Neonatal Health Program. Matern Child Health J. 2018;22(7):986–97.
23. Sharma V BW, Kainuwa ALeight J, Bjorkman M. High maternal mortality in Jigawa State, Northern Nigeria estimated using the sisterhood method. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth. 2017;17(163).
24. 2024 Global Multidimensional Poverty Index: Poverty amid conflict. New York: United Nations Development Programme; 2024.
25. Zou. A Modified Poisson Regression Approach to Prospecitve Studies with Binary Data. American Journal of Epidemiology. 2004;159(7):702–6.

26. Barros A HV. Alternatives for logistic regression in cross-sectional studies: an empirical comparison of models that directly estimate the prevalence ratio. BMC Medical Research Methodology. 2003;3.
27. Mhango W MD, Gaysina D. Feasibility and acceptability of FOotpaths foR adolescent and MAternal mental HeAlth (FOR MAMA): A co-designed intervention for pregnant adolescents in Malawi. Glob Ment Health. 2024;11(e97).
28. Tokhi M C-TL, Davis J, Portela A, Cherisch M, et al. Involving men to improve maternal and newborn health: A systematic review of the effectiveness of interventions. PLoS One. 2018;13(1):e0191620.
29. Cleary P GC, Zaslavsky A, Taplin S. Multilevel Interventions: Study Design and Analysis Issues. JNCI Monographs. 2012;2012(44):49–55.
30. Viner R OE, Denny S, Marmot M, Resnick M, et al. Adolescene and the social determinants of health. The Lancet. 2012;379(9826):1641–52.