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Abstract

Objective: The study was aimed at examining the magnitude, trends, and determinants of grand multiparity in the Sidama regional state of Ethiopia.

Design: We retrieved cross-sectional data from the Ethiopian demographic health survey 2016.

Setting: Community-based demographic health survey was conducted in Ethiopia.

Participants: The study population was women (aged 15 to 49 years) who had delivered children with available DHS data set.

Outcomes: Multilevel multivariate logistic regression analyses assessed the relationship between grand multiparity and its determinants.

Results: The magnitude of grand multiparity was 70.8% (95% CI: 68.5-72.9). The multilevel multivariable logistic regression model showed illiteracy [AOR=2; 95%CI:1.25-3.75], non-use of any contraceptive [AOR=3.8; 95% CI:1.2-12.2], early marriage [AOR=4.5; 95% CI: 2.6-7.9], polygamous marriage [AOR=4.2; 95% CI:2.0-9.3], short interbirth intervals [AOR=2.3; 95% CI:1.4-3.5] and husband low education status [AOR=5.8; 95%CI:2.1-16.1] were significantly associated with grand multiparity.

Conclusions: This study revealed that seven of ten women were grand multipara, and the magnitude did not show significant change over the last sixteen years. Early marriage and early age of first birth, low literacy level, low family planning utilization, polygamy, short interbirth interval, and unmet need of family planning were determinants of grand multiparity. We recommended to the stakeholders to design new strategies to address the root cause of high fertility factors in communities.
Keywords: High parity, High fertility, Grand multiparity, Multilevel analysis, Sidama, Ethiopia.

Strengths and Limitations of this study

- The strength of this study was that we used the recent Ethiopia demographic and health survey for Sidama national regional state.
- Also, we applied multilevel modeling to handle the hierarchical nature of the EDHS data. Despite the above strengths, the study might have recall bias since the participants were asked about the events that took place 5 years or more preceding the survey.
- Meanwhile, the data were cross-sectional studies, it could not display causal inferences concerning individual- and community-level factors with grand multiparity.
- Another limitation is that the management of missing data was also overlooked.

Background

Grand multiparity, a situation when a woman has at least five deliveries at gestational age greater than or equal to 20 weeks, is a major public health concern in developing countries particularly in sub-Saharan Africa [1-3]. Its obstetric performance is considered as high risk which is defined as the one in which the woman, fetus, and/or newborn are at increased risk of morbidity or mortality prenatal, intra-partum or postpartum [4]. In this regard, there is a high disparity in the fertility rates between the developed and developing countries [5]. The factors responsible for the huge disparity are usually neglected in existing family planning and reproductive health programs which causes the grand multi-parity to be a serious public health problem worldwide, particularly for developing countries including Ethiopia [6, 7].
While the global fertility rate declined from 3.2 live births per woman in 1990 to 2.5 in 2019, the magnitude increased to 4.6 in 2019 in sub-Saharan Africa including Ethiopia which indicates a high fertility rate [8-10].

Various factors have been identified to be associated with the grand multi-parity and these include early age at first marriage, low socio-economic status, polygamous marriage [11], husband's preference, culture, religion, and residence in a rural area. Others are low literacy level, poor mass media exposure, low level of awareness on health, and lack of access to modern contraceptives especially in most sub-Saharan Africa [1, 12, 13].

Even to date, the gap between previous studies is missing some variables, limited data on the factors, and a lack of adequate literature special from the study area. Furthermore, numerous numbers of previous studies were conducted at a health facility level which is less generalizable to the larger community. Also, there were inadequate studies carried out on the trend, magnitude, and associated factors of grand multiparity by using national representative demographic health survey data (DHS). Therefore, we addressed the above-mentioned gaps by using largely nationally representative data which were conducted at the community level and used large sample sizes.

**Methods and materials**

**Study area and period**

Sidama national regional state is one of the 10 national regional states in Ethiopia. The region is divided into 36 Districts (6 urban districts and 30 rural districts). Hawassa city is the capital of the region and it is situated in the Southern part, about 273 Kilometers away from Addis Ababa, Ethiopia’s capital. The Sidama people number 8.8 million (4.01% of the national population) and are the fifth most populous ethnic group in Ethiopia. Sidama national region state has 123 health
centers and 17 hospitals[10, 14-17]. For this study, we used secondary data from the 2016 Ethiopia demographic health and survey (DHS). The DHS data had been collected from January 18, 2016, to June 27, 2016, by the Ethiopian Central Statistical Agency (ECSA)[10].

**Study design, data source, and sampling techniques**

A cross-sectional survey data was obtained from 2016 (EDHS). The data were retrieved from the (DHS) program official database website (http://dhsprogram.com). It is a nationally representative household survey that collects information about population, health, and other important indicators. The sample of the EDHS study was designed to collect up-to-date information from each of the ten regions and the two administrative cities. Each region was stratified into urban and rural areas 21 sampling strata were obtained. Samples of enumeration areas (EAs) were selected independently in each stratum in two stages. In the first stage, a total EAs was selected with proportional sampling technique and with independent selection in each sampling stratum. The selection of households was the second stage. A fixed number of households per cluster were selected with an equal probability proportional allocation to sample size was done [10].

This study used the birth record dataset and the study population was women (aged 15 to 49 years) who had delivered children with available DHS data set. From the birth record dataset, the total number of multiparous (para 2 to 4) and grand multiparous (para 5 to 9) women was extracted for Sidama national region state from 2016 EDHS. The total sample was extracted for women who gave birth (parity 2 to 9) from the birth record dataset. The total number of women whose parity (2 to 9) in the study region of Ethiopia was included in 1,654 weighted samples. For trend analysis, grand multipara in all the four DHS data from 2000 to 2016 were extracted by using the quantitative method [10, 18-20].
Study variables

Dependent variable: The outcome variable of this study was grand multiparity which was categorized into “Yes = 1/ No = 0” form. These include all women who have five to nine deliveries as grand multi-parity categories [1, 2, 21].

\[ Y_i = \begin{cases} 0; & \text{Multiparity, for the women had given birth 2 to 4 times.} \\ 1; & \text{Grand multiparity, for the women who had given birth 5 to 9 times.} \end{cases} \]

\[ Y_i \] represent the parity of the \( i \)th ever born children.

Independent variables: The independent variables for this study were identified based on previous studies conducted on the factors affecting grand multiparity at the different places that were reviewed from the literature as associated factors of grand multiparity [11, 22-33]. The independent variables selected for analysis from the available dataset were the place of residence, maternal age, educational status of women, wealth index, current marital status, polygamy marriage, women currently working, religion, husband education level husband occupation status, women supported by husband, community media exposure, age of women at first birth, age at first sex, number of living children, preceding birth interval (months), the contraceptive method used, unmet need of contraceptive, the desire for more children, the child being alive, place of delivery, and husband’s desire for more children. In this analysis, independent variables were categorized into individual-level variables and community-level variables. Individual-level variables were the age of women, women education status, wealth index, women age of first birth, number of living children, current marital status, polygamy marriage, women age at first sex, desire for more children, contraceptive method, unmet need of contraceptive, women currently working, the child is alive, preceding birth interval (months), place of delivery, women supported by husband, husband education status, husband occupation status, husband desire for more
children. Community-level variables were religion, place of residence, and community media exposure.

**Data Analysis**

For analysis, the weighted samples data were used to ensure the survey results were representative of the regions. Based on each weighted variable, the descriptive statistics were reported with summary indices, frequency, and proportion. The trend analysis of grand multiparity was assessed using the Extended Mantel-Haenszel Chi-square test for linear trend using the OpenEpi (version 3.01)-Response program[34]. A P-value of less than 0.05 was used to declare a 95% significant probability of the existence of a trend. The degree of crude association for individual and community variables was checked by employing a $\chi^2$ test.

For the nested structure of the EDHS data, multilevel multivariable logistic regression analysis was used. Also, the mixed effect (fixed effect for both the individual and community level factors and a random effect for the between cluster-variation), a two-level mixed-effect logistic regression analysis was used. The final findings were measured using an adjusted odds ratio (AOR). Within the multilevel multivariable logistical regression analysis, four models were fitted for the result variable. The primary model (null or empty model) was fitted without explanatory variables. The second model (individual model), third model (community model), and fourth model (final model) variables were fitted for individual level, community-level, and each individual- and community-level variable respectively. The final model was used to check for the independent effect of the individual and community level variables on grand multiparity.

The model fitness was assessed using Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), the Bayesian information criterion (BIC), and the Likelihood Ratio (LR) test. The values for each model of AIC and BIC were compared, the lowest one assumed to be a better explanatory model[35].
Multicollinearity between the individual- and community-level variables was checked using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The mean value of VIF < 10 was the cut-off point[36]. In the present study, the mean VIF value was estimated to be 2.44 showing the absence of multicollinearity in the models. The data were analyzed using the STATA statistical software system package version 14.0 (StataCorp., College Station, TX, USA). It was considered statistically significant if the P-values were less than 0.05 with the 95% confidence intervals.

**Patient and Public Involvement**

No patient was involved in this study.

**Results**

**Socio-demographic characteristics of study participants**

In this study, a total weighted sample of 1,654 women was included in the analysis from the latest EDHS data (2016). The mean age (±SD) of the women was 35±6.7 years with the majority of women aged between 40-49 years. Almost all (99%) of women lived in a rural setting, and close to two-thirds (67%) of women were illiterate. Slightly more than half (55%) of the women were under a low level of socio-economic status. Almost all of them were married (93%) and follow the protestant religion (92%). More than three-fourths (77%) of the women were not supported by their husbands to do day-to-day chores. In addition, the majority of husbands had attended formal education and had different types of occupations. The summarized information of socio-demographic background is displayed below (table 1).
### Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of study participants in the Sidama national region state, data from 2016 Ethiopia demographic health and survey.

| Individual and community Variables | Categories                      | Weighted (No.) | Weight (%) |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Place of residence                | Urban                            | 13             | 0.75       |
|                                   | Rural                            | 1641           | 99.25      |
| Age in years                      | 20-29                            | 329            | 19.87      |
|                                   | 30-34                            | 441            | 26.66      |
|                                   | 35-39                            | 413            | 25.00      |
|                                   | 40-49                            | 471            | 28.47      |
| Mean ±SD                          | 35±6.7                           |                |            |
| Educational status                | Have formal education            | 532            | 32.16      |
|                                   | No formal education              | 1122           | 67.84      |
| Wealth index                      | Low                              | 912            | 55.14      |
|                                   | Middle                           | 357            | 21.58      |
|                                   | Higher                           | 385            | 23.28      |
| Current marital status            | Other marital statuses           | 110            | 6.66       |
|                                   | Married                          | 1544           | 93.34      |
| Polygamy                          | No                               | 1205           | 77.09      |
|                                   | Yes                              | 357            | 22.91      |
| Women currently working           | No                               | 942            | 56.94      |
|                                   | Yes                              | 712            | 43.04      |
| Religion                          | Orthodox                         | 16             | 0.97       |
|                                   | Catholic                         | 27             | 1.63       |
|                                   | Protestant                       | 1535           | 92.80      |
|                                   | Muslim                           | 76             | 4.59       |
| Husband education level           | Lack of formal education         | 504            | 32.28      |
|                                   | Primary education                | 944            | 60.41      |
|                                   | Secondary education and above    | 114            | 7.31       |
| Husband occupation status         | Professionals                    | 187            | 11.96      |
|                                   | Merchant                         | 262            | 16.74      |
|                                   | Agriculture/Farmer               | 1,114          | 71.30      |
| Women supported by husband        | No                               | 1216           | 77.82      |
|                                   | Yes                              | 347            | 22.18      |
| Community media exposure          | No                               | 1122           | 67.82      |
|                                   | Yes                              | 532            | 32.18      |

### Sexual and reproductive health characteristics of study participants

The mean age (±standard deviation) of women at first delivery was 17.69 ± 2.75 years and at first coital exposure was 16±2.6 years. The women’s mean number of living children was 4.9 with a
±1.8 standard deviation. About two-thirds (64.8%) of women had short birth intervals within or less than 36 months. Among participants, a considerable proportion of women (45.81%) did not utilize modern contraceptives. Nearly, one-out of ten women (10.9%) had experienced child death in the survey. Slightly more than three-fourths (80%) of women gave birth at home (table 2).

**Table 2:** Fertility, sexual and reproductive health characteristics of study participants in Sidama regional state, data from 2016 Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey.

| Individual-level variables | Categories                                      | Frequency | Percent (%) |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Age of women at first birth| Less than 18 years                              | 1,077     | 65.11       |
|                            | Greater than or equal 18 years                  | 577       | 34.89       |
|                            | Mean ±SD                                        | 17.69±2.75|             |
| Age at first sex           | Less than or equal to 18 years                  | 1,356     | 81.98       |
|                            | Greater than 18 years                           | 298       | 18.02       |
|                            | Mean ±SD                                        | 16±2.6    |             |
| Number of living children  | Mean ±SD                                        | 4.9±1.8   |             |
| Preceding birth interval (months) | Less than or equal to 36 months | 844     | 64.8       |
|                            | Greater than 36 months                          | 459       | 35.2        |
|                            | Mean ±SD                                        | 34.47±18.6|             |
| Contraceptive method used  | Not using any methods                           | 758       | 45.81       |
|                            | Short-acting family planning                    | 680       | 41.13       |
|                            | Long-acting family planning                     | 216       | 13.06       |
| Unmet need of contraceptive| Unmet of contraceptive                          | 219       | 13.25       |
|                            | Met of contraceptive                            | 1,313     | 68.51       |
|                            | Infecund/Menopausal                              | 302       | 18.24       |
| The desire for more children| Wants no more children                          | 1,106     | 66.84       |
|                            | Wants more children                             | 548       | 33.16       |
| Husband desire more child  | Husband wants fewer                             | 357       | 23.02       |
|                            | Husband wants more                              | 583       | 37.56       |
|                            | Both want more                                  | 611       | 39.42       |
| Child is alive             | No                                              | 181       | 10.95       |
|                            | Yes                                             | 1473      | 89.05       |
| Place of delivery          | Home                                            | 251       | 80.0        |
|                            | Health facilities                               | 62        | 20.0        |

The magnitude of grand multi-parous women

The prevalence of grand multiparity with the weighted sample was 70.8 % (95 % CI, 68.5 - 72.9), in the 5 years preceding the survey in the Sidama region. Evidence from 2016 EHDS (Figure 1).
The trend of grand multiparous women

The magnitudes of the grand multi-parity were 70.93 % in 2000 EDHS, 68.58 % in 2005 EDHS, 74.23 % in 2011 EDHS, and 70.82 % in 2016 DHS in the Sidama national region state. Over 16 years, the trend of grand multiparous women from four surveys showed no significant change (Extended Mantel-Haenszel chi-square for leaner trend= 1.13 and P-values= 0.29). Likewise, no percentage change was observed between 2000 and 2016 EDHS in the Sidama region (Figure 2).

Bivariate variables association with grand multi-para women

With regards to education status, the lack of formal education (75.8%) was significantly higher in grand multiparous women than in multipara (48.6%), (P<0.001). An enormous number of women in both groups were of poorest and poorer statuses on the wealth index. The unmet need for contraceptives and underutilization of long-acting family planning utilization was significantly higher in grand multipara than multipara (p<0.001). Among grand multipara, women in polygamous marriage were significantly higher compared with multipara women, (p<0.001). Likewise, the age of women at first birth, short birth intervals, husband education level, number of living children, and place of residence showed significant associations in both study groups, (p<0.001).

However, no significant differences were observed between grand multipara and multiparous regarding women currently working, place of delivery, the child is alive, current marital status, husband occupation status, and community media exposure, (P> 0.05), (table 3).
Table 3: Bivariate variables association of individual and community level variable with grand multipara and multiparous women in Sidama national region state, Ethiopia, data from EDHS 2016.

| Individual and community variables | Categories                          | Multiparous No_ (%) | Grand Multipara No_ (%) | P-value |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Age in year                       | Mean ± SD                           | 29.4 ± 0.3          | 37.7 ± 0.2              | p<0.001 |
| Educational level                 | Lack of formal education            | 234(20.9)           | 888(79.1)               | p<0.001 |
|                                   | Have formal education               | 248(46.7)           | 283(53.3)               |         |
| Wealth Index                      | Poorest                             | 134(28.9)           | 329(71.1)               |         |
|                                   | Poorer                              | 146(32.5)           | 303(67.5)               |         |
|                                   | Middle                              | 89(24.8)            | 269(75.2)               |         |
|                                   | Richer                              | 54(25.2)            | 159(74.8)               |         |
|                                   | Richest                             | 61(35.2)            | 112(64.8)               |         |
|                                   |                                     |                     |                         | p=0.049 |
| Age of women at first birth       | Mean ± SD                           | 18.8±2.9            | 17.5± 2.6               | p<0.001 |
| Number of living children         | Mean ± SD                           | 2.8± 0.8            | 5.8 ±1.4                | p<0.001 |
| Current marital status            | Other marital statues               | 30(26.8)            | 80(73.2)                | P=0.74  |
|                                   | Married                             | 453(93.9)           | 1,091(93.1)             |         |
| Polygamy marriage                 | No                                  | 426(35.3)           | 780(64.7)               | p<0.001 |
|                                   | Yes                                 | 34(9.6)             | 322(90.4)               |         |
| Age at first sex                  | Mean ± SD                           | 16.56±2.77          | 16.13±2.52              | P=0.022 |
| The desire for more children      | Not want more children              | 178(16.1)           | 927(83.9)               | p<0.001 |
|                                   | Want more children                  | 305(55.5)           | 244(44.5)               |         |
| Unmet need of contraceptive       | Unmet                               | 36(16.6)            | 183(83.4)               | p<0.001 |
|                                   | Met                                 | 414(36.5)           | 719(63.5)               |         |
|                                   | Infecund/Menopausal                 | 33(10.7)            | 269(89.3)               |         |
| Women currently working           | No                                  | 270(28.6)           | 672(71.4)               | P= 0.594|
|                                   | Yes                                 | 213(29.9)           | 499(70.1)               |         |
| Child is alive                    | No                                  | 34(19.0)            | 147(81.0)               | P=0.098 |
|                                   | Yes                                 | 448(30.4)           | 1,025(69.6)             |         |
| Preceding birth interval (months) | Mean ± SD                           | 40±21.9             | 32.6±16.9               | p<0.001 |
| Place of delivery                 | Home                                | 138(54.8)           | 114(45.2)               | p=0.262 |
|                                   | Health facilities                   | 34(12.5)            | 22(38.5)                |         |
| Religion                          | Orthodox                            | 21(47.3)            | 23(52.7)                | P=0.025 |
|                                   | Protestant                          | 42(28.0)            | 1,106(72.0)             |         |
|                                   | Muslim                              | 33(43.8)            | 43(56.2)                |         |
| Women supported by husband        | No                                  | 326(26.8)           | 890(73.2)               | P=0.007 |
|                                   | Yes                                 | 132(38.6)           | 213(61.4)               |         |
| Husband education level           | Lack of formal education            | 115(22.7)           | 390(77.3)               | p<0.001 |
|                                   | Primary education                   | 281(29.8)           | 663(70.2)               |         |
|                                   | Secondary education and above       | 65(56.7)            | 50(43.3)                |         |
| Husband occupation status         | Professionals                       | 39(21.0)            | 148(79.0)               | P = 0.064|
|                                   | Merchant                            | 90(34.5)            | 171(65.5)               |         |
### Determinants of grand multiparity

We applied a two-level mixed effect multivariable logistic regression using the extracted data from 2016 DHS for the Sidama national regional state that is aimed at identifying individual and community-level determinants of grand multiparity or women having high parity. Those four models were developed to analyze factors accordingly. The result was reported based on Model IV (combined individual and community level factors were fitted simultaneously) (Table 4).

The odds of grand multiparity compared to multiparity was 2 times \([AOR=2; 95 \% CI: 1.25-3.75]\) higher among women who were uneducated compared with women who were educated. The odds of grand multiparity compared to those multiparous women not using any contraceptive method was 3.85 times higher compared to those women using long-acting family planning \([AOR=3.8; 95\% CI: 1.2-12.2]\).

The odd of grand multiparity was 4.5 times higher among women who had their first births before 18 years old compared to those after 18 years old \([AOR=4.5; 95\% CI: 2.6–7.9]\). The odd of grand multiparity was 4.2 times higher for those who were in polygamous marriage compared to those in monogamy \([AOR=4.2; 95\% CI: 2.0–9.3]\). In addition, the likelihood of grand multiparity was 80% less likely to have met of contraceptive compared to those women who have met.
contraceptive) [AOR=0.2; 95% CI: 0.09-0.83]. The odd of grand multiparity was 2.3 times higher among women who had short birth intervals compared to those women with normal birth intervals [AOR=2.3; 95% CI: 1.4-3.5]. The odd of grand multiparity was 5.8 times higher among women whose husbands had primary education compared to those who attended secondary schools and above [AOR=5.8; 95% CI: 2.1-16.1]. Also, the odd of grand multiparity was 3.4 times higher among women whose husbands lack formal education compared to those women husbands had secondary level of education and above [AOR=3.4; 95% CI: 1.2-9.9].

According to random-effect analysis; Model-I had no individual- and community-level variables and it observed only the random and intercept variables. About model I, the ICC value was 20%. This indicates that the variation on the grand multiparity occurred at the community level (between-cluster variability) and is contributable to the community-level factors. The ICC in the null model greater than zero indicates that it guided the researcher to use multilevel modeling than the standard single-level regression model. Also, results in subsequent models, between cluster variability found to be 14.4% in Model II (individual-level factors), 18.6% in Model III (communities level factors), and 14.5% in Model IV (combined individual and community level factors). In another way, the proportional change in variance (PCV) results indicated that the predictor variables to the null model better explained the factors associated with grand multiparity. The PCV finding for Model-II was (33.7%), in Model-III was (9.6%) and for Model-IV was (33.7%). The final Model (combined individual and community level factors) indicated 33.7% of the community-level variation on grand multiparity was explained by the combined factors at both the individual and community levels (table 4).
Table 4: Multilevel logistic regression model of individual and community-level factors associated with grand multiparous women in Sidama national region state, Ethiopia using data from the 2016 EDHS.

| Individual- and community-level variables | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
|------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Empty (Null)model                        |         |         |         |         |
| Individual-level variables               |         |         |         |         |
| Educational level                        |         |         |         |         |
| Have formal education                    | Ref.    | 2 (1.24-3.74)** | Ref.    | 2.2(1.3 -3.4)** |
| Lack of formal education                 |         |         |         |         |
| Sex of household head                    |         |         |         |         |
| Female                                   | Ref.    | 0.3(0.1 - 0.8) ** | Ref.    | 0.3(0.1-0.8) * |
| Male                                     |         |         |         |         |
| Wealth index combined                    |         |         |         |         |
| Low                                      | 0.5(0.24 – 0.99) * | 1.4 (0.66 – 2.96) | 0.5(0.2-1) | 1.4 (0.7-3.0) |
| Middle                                   |         |         |         |         |
| High                                     | Ref.    |         |         |         |
| Age of women at first birth              |         |         |         |         |
| Greater than or equal 18 years           | Ref.    | 4.5 (2.6 – 7.9) *** | Ref.    | 4.5(2.6 –7.9) *** |
| Less than 18 years                       |         |         |         |         |
| Contraceptive methods used               |         |         |         |         |
| Not using any methods                    | 3.8(1.2 -12.2) * | 2.2(1.1- 4.5) * | 3.8 (1.2- 12.2) * | 2.2(1.1 -4.4) * |
| Short-acting family planning             |         |         |         |         |
| Long-acting family planning              |         |         |         |         |
| Husband occupation status                |         |         |         |         |
| Professionals                            | 2.2(1.0 -4.7) |         | 2.2(1.03 -4.8) * |         |
| Merchant                                 | 0.5(0.3 – 0.9) * |         | 0.5(0.3-0.9) * |         |
| Agriculture/Farmer                       | Ref.    |         |         |         |
| Husband desire more child                |         |         |         |         |
| Husband wants fewer                      | Ref.    |         |         |         |
| Husband wants more                       | 1.4(0.7 - 2.6) |         | 1.3(0.7-2.6) |         |
| Both want more                           | 1.3(0.7- 2.4) |         | 1.3(0.7-2.4) |         |
| Variable                                      | Reference | Value                     | Value                     |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| **Polygamy/ number of other wives**           | Ref.      | 4.2 (1.9 -9.3) ***        | Ref.                     |
| No                                            |           |                           | 4.2 (2.0 – 9.3) *        |
| Yes                                           |           |                           |                           |
| **Age at first sex**                          | Ref.      | 3.8(1.9 - 7.9) ***        |                           |
| Less than or equal to 18 years                |           |                           |                           |
| Greater than 18 years                         |           |                           |                           |
| **Unmet need of contraceptive**               | Ref.      | 0.2 (0.07 - 0.5) ***      |                           |
| Unmet                                         |           |                           | 0.2(0.1 -0.5) ***        |
| Met                                           |           | 1.1 (0.3 -3.3)            | 1.1(0.34-3.26)           |
| **Preceding birth interval (months)**         | Ref.      | 2.3(1.4 -3.5) ***         |                           |
| Greater than 36 months                        |           |                           |                           |
| Less than or equal to 36 months               |           |                           |                           |
| **Husband education level**                   |           |                           |                           |
| Lack of formal education                      |           | 3.4 (1.2- 10.0) *         | 3.4(1.2-9.9) *           |
| Primary education                             |           | 5.9(2.2 – 16.2) ***       | 5.8(2.1 – 16.1) ***      |
| Secondary education and above                 |           |                           |                           |
| **Religion**                                  | Ref.      |                           |                           |
| Orthodox                                      |           |                           | 4.9(1.8 -13.4) **        |
| Protestant                                    |           |                           | 2.6 (0.8 - 8.4)          |
| Muslim                                        |           |                           |                           |
| **Type of place of residence**                | Ref.      |                           |                           |
| Urban                                         |           |                           | 6.6(1.29 -33.8) *        |
| Rural                                         |           |                           | 1.2(0.2- 10.7)           |
| **Random effect**                             |           |                           |                           |
| Community-level variance (SE)                 | 0.83***   | (0.4)                     | 0.55*** (0.3)            |
| ICC (%)                                       | 20%       | 14.4%                     | 18.6%                    |
| MOR                                           | 2.4       | 2.0                       | 2.3                      |
| PCV                                           | Reference | 33.7%                     | 9.6%                     |
| Random effect                                 | 0.75***   | (0.4)                     | 0.56 *** (0.3)           |
| Model fit statistics     | Log-likelihood | AIC    | BIC    | AIC    | BIC    |
|--------------------------|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                          | -523           | 1050   | 1059   | -513   | 1059   |
|                          | -281           | 602    | 692    | 1036   | 698    |
|                          | -281           | 604    | 698    |        |        |

Note: *significant at *P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; AOR = Adjusted Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval, AIC = Akaike information criterion, BIC = Bayesian information criterion, Model 1 - Empty (null) model; Model 2 - Only individual-level explanatory variables included in the model; Model 3 - Only community-level explanatory variables included in the model; Model 4 - Combined model; PCV = Proportional Change in Variance, MOR = Median Odds Ratio and Ref. = reference.
Discussion

Seven out of ten reproductive-age women had experienced grand multi-parity. Age at marriage, literacy status of women, age of women at first birth, modern contraceptive method utilization, polygamy, husband education level, preceding birth interval and unmet need of contraceptive were significantly associated with women having high parity.

During the analysis, the ICC value was found to be 14.5% in the combined Model. This indicates that 14.5% of the chances of grand multiparous women were explained through cluster differences. The ICC in the null model greater than zero indicates that it guided the researcher to use multilevel modeling than the standard single-level regression model [35, 37, 38]. Similarly, the study indicates that the proportion change in variance of the final model was accountable for about 33.7% in the log odds of high parity in the communities. In addition to that, the results of median odds ratio, a measure of unexplained cluster heterogeneity, is 2.48, 3.51, 2.43, and 3.34 in models 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Hence, the results of the median odds ratio showed that there is unexplained variation between the clusters of the community.

In the present study, the magnitude of grand multiparity was 70.8 %. This is similar to a study conducted community-based in Gedeo Zone 69.1 % and Tigray region, Ethiopia 51 % [22, 26]. This figure was quite higher than the prevalence reported by other investigators ranging from 9.4 % to 27% in Gambian, Cameroon, Nigeria, Tanzania, and India [2, 30, 31, 39, 40]. The fact that later studies were all carried out in health facilities and urban catchment areas could explain these low prevalence rates. The educational backgrounds, socioeconomic, sociodemographic, and cultural settings of these studies are different from the current findings[28]. Similarly, there are many contributing factors for high fertility, among which are early marriage, the perceived ideal number of children, and mass media exposure by women [22, 33]. While the prevalence of grand
multiparity in developed countries has significantly declined ranging from 3 to 4 % [41], it has
increased in the current study and this could be explained by lack of formal education (75.8%) and
a high number of early marriages. As individual health implications, the women are given more
subsequent births while they get more maternal and child health risks and many socioeconomic
challenges in their lifetime in low resource setting areas [21, 32, 42, 43].

The trends of grand multiparity over study periods showed no significant change. This finding was
consistent with a previous study done in rural Cameroon[28]. However; in Tanzania, the previous
study's findings showed a significant change of trend on grand multiparity [23]. This decline could
have been explained by the availability of higher education to women and increased community
awareness on the health risks of giving birth at an advanced maternal age and benefits of family
planning and empowerment of women on reproductive health decision making[23].

This study revealed that grand multiparity was higher among women who had their first births
before 18 years old compared to those women who started after 18 years. We realized that in the
study community where women start birth before 18 years, the period of fertility is longer, and
they have many ever-born children. As a result of these, the women have high parity. Similarly,
the women not using modern family planning appropriately and timely for spacing and limiting
the number of births have high fertility. This is similar to the previous study done in Gedeo Zone,
Ethiopia [22], Nigeria[44], Nepal [33], and Pakistan [25]. Nevertheless, the problem of early age
at first delivery is significantly alarming in the present study area than the previous findings.

The odds of grand multiparity compared to that of multiparity were higher among women who
were illiterate compared with literate women. This finding is in line with previous studies
conducted in Nigeria[44], Kenya[24], Nepal[33], and the Tigray region in Ethiopia[26]. In this
study, almost all of the women were rural dwellers (99%). Women who are rural inhabitants are
less likely to spend much time in school and would rather get married early. A possible explanation is that women residing in the urban area stay longer in school, thereby postponing the time for marital engagement[22]. On the other hand, researchers found that education is an important factor for high parity with several causal relationships from a theoretical perspective[45]. To sum up, education generally results in an improvement in the status of individuals in society in the form of a better understanding of health issues, and employment status [46]. The low social class found among the grand multiparous women are usually associated with illiteracy and low socioeconomic status which may be an encouraging factor to produce more children[11].

The grand multiparity was higher among women with short birth intervals (less than or equal to 36 months). This finding is also consistent with a study conducted in Wonago District, Gedeo Zone, Ethiopia [22]. The possible explanation might be due to women utilizing modern contraceptives that lead the women to get more children in a short period of time.

In our study, it was found that grand multiparity is significantly associated with polygamous marriage compared with monogamous marriage. This finding is similar to other studies conducted in Nigeria[1]. The variation could be due to competition amongst wives to have many children and to build large family sizes.

The grand multiparity among women not using any contraceptive and using short-acting contraceptive methods was higher compared to those women using long-acting contraceptives. Similar findings were reported in Nigeria [44], Cambodia[47], Pakistani [25], and Wonago District, Gedeo Zone[22]. Most factors in this study are directly or indirectly associated with the low utilization of contraceptives which indicated that it is the root cause for high fertility in the study setting. In addition, in one study, the women were not using contraceptives because their husbands did not allow them to make contraceptive decisions[47].
Conclusions

This study revealed that seven of ten women had experienced grand multiparity and the magnitude did not show significant change over the last sixteen years. Early marriage and early age of first birth, low literacy level, low family planning utilization, polygamy marital status, short birth interval, and unmet need of family planning were determinants of grand multiparity. We recommended to the stakeholders to design new strategies to address the root cause of high fertility factors in communities. Health ministry should focus on health education and create awareness about maternal health risks related to grand multiparity in the community. Furthermore, special attention should be given to improving the utilization of contraceptives in the community to reduce the prevalence of grand multiparity.
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Fig 1: The magnitude of grand multiparity in Sidama region, data from EDHS 2016.
Fig 2: Trend of grand multiparous women in Sidama national regional state, Ethiopia, DHS data from years 2,000 to 2016.
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Abstract

Objective: The study was aimed at examining the magnitude, trends, and determinants of grand multiparity in the Sidama regional state of Ethiopia.

Design: We retrieved cross-sectional data from the Ethiopian demographic health survey from 2000 to 2016.

Setting: Community-based demographic health survey was conducted in Ethiopia.

Participants: The study population was women (aged 15 to 49 years) who had delivered children with the available DHS data set.

Outcomes: Multilevel multivariate logistic regression analyses assessed the relationship between grand multiparity and its determinants.

Results: The magnitude of grand multiparity was 70.8% (95% CI: 68.5-72.9). The multilevel multivariable logistic regression model showed illiteracy [AOR=2; 95%CI:1.25-3.75], non-use of any contraceptive [AOR=3.8; 95% CI:1.2-12.2], early marriage [AOR=4.5; 95% CI: 2.6-7.9], polygamous marriage [AOR=4.2; 95% CI:2.0-9.3], short interbirth intervals [AOR=2.3; 95% CI:1.4-3.5] and husband low education status [AOR=5.8; 95%CI:2.1-16.1] were significantly associated with grand multiparity.

Conclusions: This study revealed that seven of ten women were grand multipara, and the magnitude did not show significant change over the last sixteen years. Early marriage and early age of first birth, low literacy level, low family planning utilization, polygamy, short inter-birth interval, and unmet need for family planning were determinants of grand multiparity. We
recommended to the stakeholders design new strategies to address the root cause of high fertility factors in communities.

**Keywords:** High parity, High fertility, Grand multiparity, Multilevel analysis, Sidama, Ethiopia.

**Strengths and Limitations of this study**

- The strength of this study included analyzing the most recent nationally representative data sets aided in providing a broad comparative picture of grand multiparity in the study setting, as well as significant predictors of children ever born among ever-married women.
- To avoid misleading inferences and thus valid interpretation of the results, clustering effects were considered using a mixed modeling approach.
- Despite the above strengths, the study may have had recall bias because participants were asked about events that occurred 5 years or more before the survey.
- Also, we used secondary datasets, we were limited in our ability to select exposure variables for statistical analysis.

**Background**

Grand multiparity, a situation when a woman has at least five deliveries at gestational age greater than or equal to 20 weeks, is a major public health concern in developing countries particularly in sub-Saharan Africa [1-3]. Its obstetric performance is considered as high risk which is defined as the one in which the woman, fetus, and/or newborn are at increased risk of morbidity or mortality prenatal, intra-partum or postpartum [4]. In this regard, there is a high disparity in the fertility rates between the developed and developing countries [5]. The factors responsible for the huge disparity are usually neglected in existing family planning and reproductive health programs which causes
the grand multi-parity to be a serious public health problem worldwide, particularly in developing
countries including Ethiopia [6, 7].

While the global fertility rate declined from 3.2 live births per woman in 1990 to 2.5 in 2019, the
magnitude increased to 4.6 in 2019 in sub-Saharan Africa including Ethiopia which indicates a
high fertility rate [8-10].

Various factors have been identified to be associated with the grand multi-parity and these include
early age at first marriage, low socio-economic status, polygamous marriage [11], husband's
preference, culture, religion, and residence in a rural area. Others are low literacy level, poor mass
media exposure, low level of awareness of health, and lack of access to modern contraceptives
especially in most sub-Saharan Africa [1, 12, 13].

According to studies conducted in some developing countries, grand multipara women have a
higher number of children than women in developed countries. Indeed, many factors contribute to
grand multiparity, but some published literature identified the factors for grand multiparity in low
and lower-middle-income countries [1, 14-16]. Still, grand multiparity has not been well-addressed
as there is a dearth of evidence on a larger scale. Also, there were inadequate studies carried out
on the trend, magnitude, and associated factors of grand multiparity by using national
representative demographic health survey data (DHS). Therefore, this study was carried out to
assess the trend and associated factors of grand multiparity using demographic and health survey
data for the Sidama region from 2000 to 2016. The findings will assist program managers and
policymakers in developing appropriate intervention strategies to effectively address the
challenges and problems of grand multipara women in order to prevent high parity in the
community in terms of reproductive health services at all levels.
Methods and materials

Study area and period

Sidama national regional state is one of the 10 national regional states in Ethiopia. The region is divided into 36 Districts (6 urban districts and 30 rural districts). Hawassa city is the capital of the region, and it is situated in the Southern part, about 273 Kilometers away from Addis Ababa, Ethiopia’s capital. The Sidama people number 8.8 million (4.01% of the national population) and are the fifth most populous ethnic group in Ethiopia. Sidama national region state has 123 health centers and 17 hospitals[10, 17-20]. For this study, we used secondary data from the 2000 to 2016 Ethiopia demographic health and survey (DHS). The DHS data had been collected from January 18, 2016, to June 27, 2016, by the Ethiopian Central Statistical Agency (ECSA)[10].

Study design, data source, and sampling techniques

A cross-sectional survey data was obtained from 2000 to 2016 (EDHS). The data were retrieved from the (DHS) program’s official database website (http://dhsprogram.com). It is a nationally representative household survey that collects information about population, health, and other important indicators. The sample of the EDHS study was designed to collect up-to-date information from each of the ten regions and the two administrative cities. Each region was stratified into urban and rural areas 21 sampling strata were obtained. Samples of enumeration areas (EAs) were selected independently in each stratum in two stages. In the first stage, a total of EAs was selected with a proportional sampling technique and with independent selection in each sampling stratum. The selection of households was the second stage. A fixed number of households per cluster were selected with an equal probability proportional allocation to sample size was done [10].
This study used the birth record dataset, and the study population was women (aged 15 to 49 years) who had delivered children with the available DHS data set. From the birth record dataset, the total number of multiparous (para 2 to 4) and grand multiparous (para 5 to 9) women was extracted for Sidama national region state from 2016 EDHS. The total sample was extracted for women who gave birth (parity 2 to 9) from the birth record dataset. The total number of women whose parity (2 to 9) in the study region of Ethiopia was included in 1,654 weighted samples. For trend analysis, grand multipara in all the four DHS data from 2000 to 2016 were extracted by using the quantitative method [10, 21-23].

**Study variables**

**Dependent variable:** The outcome variable of this study was grand multiparity which was categorized into “Yes = 1/ No = 0” form. These include all women who have five to nine deliveries as grand multi-parity categories [1, 2, 24].

\[ Y_i = \begin{cases} 
0; \text{Multiparity, for the women had given birth 2 to 4 times.} \\
1; \text{Grand multiparity, for the women who had given birth 5 to 9 times.} 
\end{cases} \]

\( Y_i \) represent the parity of the \( i \)-th ever born children.

**Independent variables:** The independent variables for this study were identified based on previous studies conducted on the factors affecting grand multiparity at the different places that were reviewed from the literature as associated factors of grand multiparity [11, 14, 25-35]. The independent variables selected for analysis from the available dataset were the place of residence, maternal age, educational status of women, wealth index, current marital status, polygamy marriage, women currently working, religion, husband education level husband occupation status, women supported by husband, community media exposure, age of women at first birth, age at first sex, number of living children, preceding birth interval (months), the contraceptive method...
used, unmet need of contraceptive, the desire for more children, the child being alive, place of
delivery, and husband’s desire for more children. In this analysis, independent variables were
categorized into individual-level variables and community-level variables. Individual-level
variables were the age of women, women's education status, wealth index, women's age of first
birth, number of living children, current marital status, polygamy marriage, women's age at first
sex, desire for more children, contraceptive method, unmet need of contraceptive, women
currently working, the child is alive, preceding birth interval (months), place of delivery, women
supported by husband, husband education status, husband occupation status, husband desire for
more children. Community-level variables were religion, place of residence (rural or urban), and
community media exposure.

Data Analysis

For analysis, the weighted sample data were used to ensure the survey results were representative
of the regions. Based on each weighted variable, the descriptive statistics were reported with
summary indices, frequency, and proportion. The trend analysis of grand multiparity was assessed
using the Extended Mantel-Haenszel Chi-square test for linear trend using the OpenEpi (version
3.01)-Response program[36]. A P-value of less than 0.05 was used to declare a 95% significant
probability of the existence of a trend. The degree of crude association for individual and
community variables was checked by employing a $\chi^2$ test.

For the nested structure of the EDHS data, multilevel multivariable logistic regression analysis
was used. Also, for the mixed effect (fixed effect for both the individual and community level
factors and a random effect for the between cluster-variation), a two-level mixed-effect logistic
regression analysis was used. The final findings were measured using an adjusted odds ratio
(AOR). Within the multilevel multivariable logistical regression analysis, four models were fitted
for the result variable. The primary model (null or empty model) was fitted without explanatory
variables. The second model (individual model), third model (community model), and fourth
model (final model) variables were fitted for individual level, community-level, and each
individual- and community-level variable respectively. The final model was used to check for the
independent effect of the individual and community level variables on grand multiparity. To show
cluster correlation within a model, the Intra-Cluster Correlation (ICC) was calculated. The
Proportional Change in Variance (PCV) was also calculated to determine the predictive power of
the variables included in each model. To identify the factors associated with grand multiparity, the
model with the highest PCV value was used.

The model fitness was assessed using Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), the Bayesian
information criterion (BIC), and the Likelihood Ratio (LR) test. The values for each model of AIC
and BIC were compared, the lowest one assumed to be a better explanatory model[37].
Multicollinearity between the individual- and community-level variables was checked using the
Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The mean value of VIF < 10 was the cut-off point[38]. In the
present study, the mean VIF value was estimated to be 2.44 showing the absence of
multicollinearity in the models. The data were analyzed using the STATA statistical software
system package version 14.0 (StataCorp., College Station, TX, USA). It was considered
statistically significant if the P-values were less than 0.05 with the 95% confidence intervals.

**Patient and Public Involvement**

No patient was involved in this study.
Results

Socio-demographic characteristics of study participants

In this study, a total weighted sample of 1,654 women was included in the analysis from the latest EDHS data (2016). The mean age (±SD) of the women was 35±6.7 years with the majority of women aged between 40-49 years. Almost all (99%) of women lived in a rural setting, and close to two-thirds (67%) of women were illiterate. Slightly more than half (55%) of the women were under a low level of socio-economic status. Almost all of them were married (93%) and follow the protestant religion (92%). More than three-fourths (77%) of the women were not supported by their husbands to do day-to-day chores. In addition, the majority of husbands had attended formal education and had different types of occupations. The summarized information on socio-demographic background is displayed below (table 1).

Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of study participants in the Sidama national region state, data from 2016 Ethiopia demographic health and survey.

| Individual and community Variables | Categories             | Weighted (No_) | Weight (%) |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Place of residence                | Urban                  | 13             | 0.75       |
|                                   | Rural                  | 1641           | 99.25      |
| Age in years                      | 20-29                  | 329            | 19.87      |
|                                   | 30-34                  | 441            | 26.66      |
|                                   | 35-39                  | 413            | 25.00      |
|                                   | 40-49                  | 471            | 28.47      |
|                                   | Mean ±SD               | 35±6.7         |            |
| Educational status                | Have formal education  | 532            | 32.16      |
|                                   | No formal education    | 1122           | 67.84      |
| Wealth index                      | Low                    | 912            | 55.14      |
|                                   | Middle                 | 357            | 21.58      |
|                                   | Higher                 | 385            | 23.28      |
| Current marital status            | Other marital statues  | 110            | 6.66       |
|                                   | Married                | 1544           | 93.34      |
| Polygamy                          | No                     | 1205           | 77.09      |
|                                   | Yes                    | 357            | 22.91      |
| Women currently working           | No                     | 942            | 56.94      |
|                                   | Yes                    | 712            | 43.04      |
### Sexual and reproductive health characteristics of study participants

The mean age (±standard deviation) of women at first delivery was 17.69 ± 2.75 years and at first coital exposure was 16±2.6 years. The women’s mean number of living children was 4.9 with a ±1.8 standard deviation. About two-thirds (64.8%) of women had short birth intervals within or less than 36 months. Among participants, a considerable proportion of women (45.81%) did not utilize modern contraceptives. Nearly, one-out of ten women (10.9%) had experienced child death in the survey. Slightly more than three-fourths (80%) of women gave birth at home (table 2).

#### Table 2: Fertility, sexual and reproductive health characteristics of study participants in Sidama regional state, data from 2016 Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey.

| Individual-level variables                               | Categories                        | Frequency | Percent (%) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Age of women at first birth                               | Less than 18 years                | 1,077     | 65.11       |
| Age of women at first birth                               | Greater than or equal to 18 years | 577       | 34.89       |
| Age of women at first birth                               | **Mean ±SD**                      | 17.69 ± 2.75 |             |
| Age at first sex                                          | Less than or equal to 18 years    | 1,356     | 81.98       |
| Age at first sex                                          | Greater than 18 years             | 298       | 18.02       |
| Age at first sex                                          | **Mean ±SD**                      | 16 ± 2.6  |             |
| Number of living children                                 | Mean ±SD                          | 4.9 ± 1.8 |             |
| Preceding birth interval (months)                         | Less than or equal to 36 months   | 844       | 64.8        |
| Preceding birth interval (months)                         | Greater than 36 months            | 459       | 35.2        |
| Preceding birth interval (months)                         | **Mean ±SD**                      | 34.47 ± 18.6 |           |
| Contraceptive method used                                 | Not using any methods             | 758       | 45.81       |
|                                | Short-acting family planning | Long-acting family planning | 680 | 216 | 41.13 | 13.06 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----|-----|-------|-------|
| Unmet need of contraceptive    | Unmet of contraceptive     | Met of contraceptive       | 219 | 1,313 | 13.25 | 68.51 |
|                                |                             | Infecond/Menopausal         | 302 |     | 18.24 |       |
| The desire for more children   | Wants no more children     | Wants more children        | 1,106 | 548 | 66.84 | 33.16 |
| Husband desire more child      | Husband wants fewer        | Husband wants more         | 357 | 583 | 23.02 | 37.56 |
|                                | Both want more             |                             | 611 |     | 39.42 |       |
| Child is alive                 | No                          | Yes                         | 181 | 1473 | 10.95 | 89.05 |
| Place of delivery              | Home                        | Health facilities          | 251 | 62  | 80.0  | 20.0  |

**The magnitude of grand multi-parous women**

The prevalence of grand multiparity with the weighted sample was 70.8 % (95 % CI, 68.5 - 72.9), in the 5 years preceding the survey in the Sidama region. Evidence from 2016 EHDS (Figure 1).

**The trend of grand multiparous women**

The magnitudes of the grand multi-parity were 70.93 % in 2000 EDHS, 68.58 % in 2005 EDHS, 74.23 % in 2011 EDHS, and 70.82 % in 2016 DHS in the Sidama national region state. Over 16 years, the trend of grand multiparous women from four surveys showed no significant change (Extended Mantel-Haenszel chi-square for leaner trend= 1.13 and P-values= 0.29). Likewise, no percentage change was observed between 2000 and 2016 EDHS in the Sidama region (Figure 2).

**Bivariate variables association with grand multi-para women**

With regards to education status, the lack of formal education (75.8%) was significantly higher in grand multiparous women than in multipara (48.6%), (P<0.001). An enormous number of women in both groups were of the poorest and poorer statuses on the wealth index. The unmet need for contraceptives and underutilization of long-acting family planning utilization was significantly
higher in grand multipara than multipara (p<0.001). Among grand multipara, women in polygamous marriages were significantly higher compared with multipara women, (p<0.001). Likewise, the age of women at first birth, short birth intervals, husband education level, number of living children, and place of residence showed significant associations in both study groups, (p<0.001).

However, no significant differences were observed between grand multipara and multiparous regarding women currently working, place of delivery, the child is alive, current marital status, husband occupation status, and community media exposure, (P> 0.05), (table 3).

Table 3: Bivariate variables association of individual and community level variable with grand multipara and multiparous women in Sidama national region state, Ethiopia, data from EDHS 2016.

| Individual and community Variables | Categories | Multiparous No_ (%) | Grand Multipara No_ (%) | P-value |
|-----------------------------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| Age in year Mean ± SD             |            | 29.4 ± 0.3          | 37.7 ± 0.2              | p<0.001 |
| Educational level                 |            |                     |                         |         |
| Lack of formal education          |            | 234(20.9)           | 888(79.1)               | p<0.001 |
| Have formal education             |            | 248(46.7)           | 283(53.3)               |         |
| Wealth Index                      |            |                     |                         | p=0.049 |
| Poorest                           |            | 134(28.9)           | 329(71.1)               |         |
| Poorer                            |            | 146(32.5)           | 303(67.5)               |         |
| Middle                            |            | 89(24.8)            | 269(75.2)               |         |
| Richer                            |            | 54(25.2)            | 159(74.8)               |         |
| Richest                           |            | 61(35.2)            | 112(64.8)               |         |
| Age of women at first birth       | Mean ± SD  | 18.8±2.9            | 17.5±2.6                | p<0.001 |
| Number of living children         | Mean ± SD  | 2.8± 0.8            | 5.8 ±1.4                | p<0.001 |
| Current marital status            |            |                     |                         | P=0.74  |
| Other marital statues             |            | 30(26.8)            | 80(73.2)                |         |
| Married                           |            | 453(93.9)           | 1,091(93.1)             |         |
| Polygamy marriage                 |            |                     |                         | p<0.001 |
| No                                |            | 426(35.3)           | 780(64.7)               |         |
| Yes                               |            | 34(9.6)             | 322(90.4)               |         |
| Age at first sex                  | Mean ± SD  | 16.56±2.77          | 16.13±2.52              | P=0.022 |
| The desire for more children      |            |                     |                         | p<0.001 |
| Not want more children            |            | 178(16.1)           | 927(83.9)               |         |
| Want more children                |            | 305(55.5)           | 244(44.5)               |         |
| Unmet need of contraceptive       |            |                     |                         | p<0.001 |
| Unmet                             |            | 36(16.6)            | 183(83.4)               |         |
| Met                               |            | 414(36.5)           | 719(63.5)               |         |
| Infecund/Menopausal               |            | 33(10.7)            | 269(89.3)               |         |
| Determinants of grand multiparity |
|----------------------------------|
| We applied a two-level mixed effect multivariable logistic regression using the extracted data from 2016 DHS for the Sidama national regional state that is aimed at identifying individual and community-level determinants of grand multiparity or women having high parity. Those four models were developed to analyze factors accordingly. According to random-effect analysis; Model-I had no individual- and community-level variables and it observed only the random and intercept variables. In model I, the ICC value was 20%. This indicates that the variation on the grand multiparity occurred at the community level (between-cluster variability) and is... |
contributable to the community-level factors. The ICC in the null model greater than zero indicates that it guided the researcher to use multilevel modeling than the standard single-level regression model. Also, results in subsequent models, between cluster variability were found to be 14.4% in Model II (individual-level factors), 18.6% in Model III (communities level factors), and 14.5% in Model IV (combined individual and community level factors). In another way, the proportional change in variance (PCV) results indicated that the predictor variables to the null model better explained the factors associated with grand multiparity. The PCV finding for Model-II was (33.7%), for Model-III was (9.6%) and for Model-IV was (33.7%). The final Model (combined individual and community level factors) indicated 34% of the community-level variation on grand multiparity was explained by the combined factors at both the individual and community levels. The result was reported based on Model IV (combined individual and community level factors were fitted simultaneously). As a result, variables such as educational level, age of women at first birth, contraceptive methods used, husband occupation status, polygamy, age of first sex, unmet need for contraception, preceding birth interval, and husband education level was significantly associated with grand multiparous women, according to Model IV findings.

The odds of grand multiparity compared to multiparity were 2 times [AOR=2; 95% CI:1.25-3.75] higher among women who were uneducated compared with women who were educated. The odds of grand multiparity compared to those multiparous women not using any contraceptive method were 3.85 times higher compared to those women using long-acting family planning [AOR=3.8; 95% CI:1.2-12.2].

The odd of grand multiparity was 4.5 times higher among women who had their first births before 18 years old compared to those after 18 years old [AOR=4.5; 95% CI: 2.6–7.9]. The odd of grand multiparity was 4.2 times higher for those who were in polygamous marriages compared to those
in monogamy [AOR=4.2; 95% CI: 2.0–9.3]. In addition, the likelihood of grand multiparity was 80% less likely to have met contraceptive compared to those women who have met contraceptive) [AOR=0.2; 95% CI: 0.09 -0.83]. The odd of grand multiparity was 2.3 times higher among women who had short birth intervals compared to those women with normal birth intervals [AOR=2.3; 95% CI: 1.4-3.5]. The odd of grand multiparity was 5.8 times higher among women whose husbands had primary education compared to those who attended secondary schools and above [AOR=5.8; 95%CI: 2.1–16.1]. Also, the odd of grand multiparity was 3.4 times higher among women whose husbands lack formal education compared to those women husbands who had a secondary level of education and above [ AOR=3.4; 95%CI: 1.2-9.9]. (table 4).
Table 4: Multilevel logistic regression model of individual and community-level factors associated with grand multiparous women in Sidama national region state, Ethiopia using data from the 2016 EDHS.

| Individual- and community-level variables | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
|------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                           | Empty (Null)model | Individual-level variables AOR (95% CI) | Community-level variables AOR (95% CI) | Individual- and community-level variables AOR (95% CI) |
| **Educational level**                    |         |         |         |         |
| Have formal education                    | Ref.    |         |         | Ref.    |
| Lack of formal education                 | 2 (1.24-3.74) ** |         |         | 2.2(1.3 -3.4) ** |
| **Sex of household head**                |         |         |         |         |
| Female                                   | Ref.    |         |         | Ref.    |
| Male                                     | 0.3(0.1 - 0.8) ** |         |         | 0.3(0.1-0.8) * |
| **Wealth index combined**                |         |         |         |         |
| Low                                      | 0.5(0.24 – 0.99) * |         |         | 0.5(0.2-1) |
| Middle                                   | 1.4 (0.66 – 2.96) |         |         | 1.4 (0.7-3.0) |
| High                                     | Ref.    |         |         | Ref.    |
| **Age of women at first birth**          |         |         |         |         |
| Greater than or equal to 18 years        | Ref.    |         |         | Ref.    |
| Less than 18 years                       | 4.5 (2.6 – 7.9) *** |         |         | 4.5(2.6-7.9) *** |
| **Contraceptive methods used**           |         |         |         |         |
| Not using any methods                    | 3.8(1.2 -12.2) * |         |         | 3.8 (1.2- 12.2) * |
| Short-acting family planning             | 2.2(1.1 – 4.5) * |         |         | 2.2(1.1 -4.4) * |
| Long-acting family planning              | Ref.    |         |         | Ref.    |
| **Husband occupation status**            |         |         |         |         |
| Professionals                            | 2.2(1.0 -4.7) |         |         | 2.2(1.03 -4.8) * |
| Merchant                                 | 0.5(0.3 – 0.9) * |         |         | 0.5(0.3-0.9) * |
| Agriculture/Farmer                       | Ref.    |         |         | Ref.    |
| **Husband desire more child**            |         |         |         |         |
| Husband wants fewer                      | Ref.    |         |         | Ref.    |
| Husband wants more                       | 1.4(0.7- 2.6) |         |         | 1.3(0.7-2.6) |
| Both want more                           | 1.3(0.7 - 2.4) |         |         | 1.3(0.7-2.4) |
|                           | Ref.             | Ref.             |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| **Polygamy/ number of other wives** |                  |                  |
| No                        | 4.2 (1.9 - 9.3) *** |                  |
| Yes                       |                  | 4.2 (2.0 – 9.3) *  |
| **Age at first sex**      |                  |                  |
| Less than or equal to 18 years | 3.8 (1.9 - 7.9) *** |                  |
| Greater than 18 years     |                  | 3.9 (1.9 - 8.1) *** |
| **Unmet need for contraceptive** |                  |                  |
| Unmet                     | 0.2 (0.07 - 0.5) *** | 0.2 (0.1 - 0.5) *** |
| Met                       | 1.1 (0.3 - 3.3)    | 1.1 (0.34 - 3.26) |
| **Preceding birth interval (months)** |                  |                  |
| Greater than 36 months    | 2.3 (1.4 - 3.5) *** | 2.3 (1.4 - 3.5) *** |
| Less than or equal to 36 months |                  |                  |
| **Husband education level** |                  |                  |
| Lack of formal education  | 3.4 (1.2 - 10.0) * | 3.4 (1.2 - 9.9) * |
| Primary education         | 5.9 (2.2 - 16.2) *** | 5.8 (2.1 - 16.1) *** |
| Secondary education and above |                  |                  |
| **Religion**              |                  |                  |
| Orthodox                  |                  | 4.9 (1.8 - 13.4) ** |
| Protestant                | 2.6 (0.8 - 8.4)   |                  |
| Muslim                    |                  |                  |
| **Type of place of residence** |                  |                  |
| Urban                     | 6.6 (1.29 - 33.8) * |                  |
| Rural                     |                  | 1.2 (0.2 - 10.7)  |
| **Random effect**         |                  |                  |
| Community-level variance (SE) | 0.83*** (0.4)    | 0.55*** (0.3)    |
| ICC (%)                   | 20%              | 14.4%            |
| MOR                       | 2.4              | 2.0              |
| PCV                       | Reference        | 33.7%            | 9.6%          | 33.7%  |
| Model fit statistics | Log-likelihood | AIC   | BIC   | Log-likelihood | AIC   | BIC   |
|----------------------|----------------|-------|-------|----------------|-------|-------|
|                      | -523           | 1050  | 1059  | -281           | 602   | 692   |
|                      | -513           | 1036  | 1059  | -513           | 1036  | 1059  |
|                      | -281           | 604   | 698   | -281           | 604   | 698   |

Note: *significant at *P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; AOR = Adjusted Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval, AIC = Akaike information criterion, BIC = Bayesian information criterion, Model 1- Empty (null) model; Model 2- Only individual-level explanatory variables included in the model; Model 3- Only community-level explanatory variables included in the model; Model 4- Combined model; PCV = Proportional Change in Variance, MOR = Median Odds Ratio and Ref. = reference.
Discussion

Seven out of ten reproductive-age women had experienced grand multi-parity. Age at marriage, literacy status of women, age of women at first birth, modern contraceptive method utilization, polygamy, husband education level, preceding birth interval, and unmet need for contraceptives were significantly associated with women having high parity.

During the analysis, the ICC value was found to be 14.5% in the combined Model. This indicates that 14.5% of the chances of grand multiparous women were explained through cluster differences. The ICC in the null model greater than zero indicates that it guided the researcher to use multilevel modeling than the standard single-level regression model [37, 39, 40]. Similarly, the study indicates that the proportion change in variance of the final model was accountable for about 33.7% of the log odds of high parity in the communities. In addition to that, the results of the median odds ratio, a measure of unexplained cluster heterogeneity, are 2.48, 3.51, 2.43, and 3.34 in models 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Hence, the results of the median odds ratio showed that there is unexplained variation between the clusters of the community.

In the present study, the magnitude of grand multiparity was 70.8%. This is similar to a study conducted community-based in Gedeo Zone 69.1% and Tigray region, Ethiopia 51% [25, 29]. This figure was quite higher than the prevalence reported by other investigators ranging from 9.4% to 27% in Gambian, Cameroon, Nigeria, Tanzania, and India [2, 33, 34, 41, 42]. The fact that later studies were all carried out in health facilities and urban catchment areas could explain these low prevalence rates. The educational backgrounds, socioeconomic, sociodemographic, and cultural settings of these studies are different from the current findings[31]. Similarly, there are many contributing factors to high fertility, among which are early marriage, the perceived ideal number of children, and mass media exposure by women [14, 25]. While the prevalence of grand
309 multiparity in developed countries has significantly declined ranging from 3 to 4 % [43], it has increased in the current study and this could be explained by lack of formal education (75.8%) and a high number of early marriages. As individual health implications, the women are given more subsequent births while they get more maternal and child health risks and many socioeconomic challenges in their lifetime in low resource setting areas [24, 35, 44, 45].

314 The trends of grand multiparity over study periods showed no significant change. This finding was consistent with a previous study done in rural Cameroon[31]. However; in Tanzania, the previous study's findings showed a significant change in the trend of grand multiparity [26]. This decline could have been explained by the availability of higher education to women and increased community awareness of the health risks of giving birth at an advanced maternal age and the benefits of family planning and empowerment of women in reproductive health decision-making [26].

321 This study revealed that grand multiparity was higher among women who had their first births before 18 years old compared to those women who started after 18 years. We realized that in the study community where women start birth before 18 years, the period of fertility is longer, and they have many ever-born children. As a result of these, women have high parity. Similarly, the women not using modern family planning appropriately and timely for spacing and limiting the number of births have high fertility. This is similar to the previous study done in Gedeo Zone, Ethiopia [25], Nigeria[46], Nepal [14], and Pakistan [28]. Nevertheless, the problem of early age at first delivery is significantly more alarming in the present study area than in the previous findings.

330 The odds of grand multiparity compared to that of multiparity were higher among women who were illiterate compared with literate women. This finding is in line with previous studies
conducted in Nigeria[46], Kenya[27], Nepal[14], and the Tigray region in Ethiopia[29]. In this study, almost all of the women were rural dwellers (99%). Women who are rural inhabitants are less likely to spend much time in school and would rather get married early. A possible explanation is that women residing in the urban area stay longer in school, thereby postponing the time for marital engagement[25]. On the other hand, researchers found that education is an important factor for high parity with several causal relationships from a theoretical perspective[47]. To sum up, education generally results in an improvement in the status of individuals in society in the form of a better understanding of health issues, and employment status [48]. The low social class found among the grand multiparous women is usually associated with illiteracy and low socioeconomic status which may be an encouraging factor to produce more children[11]

The grand multiparity was higher among women with short birth intervals (less than or equal to 36 months). This finding is also consistent with a study conducted in Wonago District, Gedeo Zone, Ethiopia [25]. The possible explanation might be due to women utilizing modern contraceptives that lead the women to get more children in a short period of time.

In our study, it was found that grand multiparity is significantly associated with polygamous marriage compared with monogamous marriage. This finding is similar to other studies conducted in Nigeria[1]. The variation could be due to competition amongst wives to have many children and to build large family sizes.

The grand multiparity among women not using any contraceptive and using short-acting contraceptive methods was higher compared to those women using long-acting contraceptives. Similar findings were reported in Nigeria [46], Cambodia[49], Pakistani [28], and Wonago District, Gedeo Zone[25]. Most factors in this study are directly or indirectly associated with the low utilization of contraceptives which indicated that it is the root cause of high fertility in the
study setting. In addition, in one study, the women were not using contraceptives because their husbands did not allow them to make contraceptive decisions[49].

Conclusions

This study revealed that seven of ten women had experienced grand multiparity and the magnitude did not show significant change over the last sixteen years. Early marriage and early age of first birth, low literacy level, low family planning utilization, polygamy marital status, short birth interval, and unmet need for family planning were determinants of grand multiparity. We recommended to the stakeholder's design new strategies to address the root cause of high fertility factors in communities. Ministry of health should focus on health education and create awareness about maternal health risks related to grand multiparity in the community. Furthermore, special attention should be given to improving the utilization of contraceptives in the community to reduce the prevalence of grand multiparity.
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**Fig 1:** The magnitude of grand multiparity in Sidama region, data from EDHS 2016.

**Fig 2:** Trend of grand multiparous women in Sidama national regional state, Ethiopia, DHS data from years 2,000 to 2016.
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Abstract

Objective: The study was aimed at examining the magnitude, trends, and determinants of grand multiparity in the Sidama regional state of Ethiopia.

Design: We retrieved cross-sectional data from the Ethiopian demographic health survey from 2000 to 2016.

Setting: Community-based demographic health survey was conducted in Ethiopia.

Participants: The study population was women (aged 15 to 49 years) who had delivered children with the available DHS data set.

Outcomes: Multilevel multivariate logistic regression analyses assessed the relationship between grand multiparity and its determinants.

Results: The magnitude of grand multiparity was 70.8% (95% CI: 68.5-72.9). The multilevel multivariable logistic regression model showed illiteracy [AOR=2; 95% CI:1.25-3.75], non-use of any contraceptive [AOR=3.8; 95% CI:1.2-12.2], early marriage [AOR=4.5; 95% CI: 2.6-7.9], polygamous marriage [AOR=4.2; 95% CI:2.0-9.3], short birth intervals [AOR=2.3; 95% CI:1.4-3.5] and husband low education status [AOR=5.8; 95% CI:2.1-16.1] were significantly associated with grand multiparity.

Conclusions: This study revealed that seven of ten women were grand multipara, and the magnitude did not show significant change over the last sixteen years. Early marriage and early age of first birth, low literacy level, low family planning utilization, polygamy, short inter-birth interval, and unmet need for family planning were determinants of grand multiparity. We
recommended to the stakeholders to design new strategies to address the root cause of high fertility factors in communities.

**Keywords:** High parity, High fertility, Grand multiparity, Multilevel analysis, Sidama, Ethiopia.

**Strengths and Limitations of this study**

- The strength of this study included analyzing the most recent nationally representative data sets aided in providing a broad comparative picture of grand multiparity in the study setting, as well as significant predictors of children ever born among ever-married women.

- To avoid misleading inferences and thus valid interpretation of the results, clustering effects were considered using a mixed modeling approach.

- Despite the above strengths, the study may have had recall bias because participants were asked about events that occurred 5 years or more before the survey.

- Also, we used secondary datasets, we were limited in our ability to select exposure variables for statistical analysis.

**Background**

Grand multiparity, a situation when a woman has at least five deliveries at gestational age greater than or equal to 20 weeks, is a major public health concern in developing countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa [1-3]. Its obstetric performance is considered as high risk which is defined as the one in which the woman, fetus, and/or newborn are at increased risk of morbidity or mortality prenatal, intrapartum or postpartum [4]. In this regard, there is a high disparity in the fertility rates between the developed and developing countries [5]. The factors responsible for the huge disparity are usually neglected in existing family planning and reproductive health programs, which causes
the grand multi-parity to be a serious public health problem worldwide, particularly in developing
countries including Ethiopia [6, 7].

While the global fertility rate declined from 3.2 live births per woman in 1990 to 2.5 in 2019, the
magnitude increased to 4.6 in 2019 in sub-Saharan Africa including Ethiopia, which indicates a
high fertility rate [8-10].

Various factors have been identified to be associated with the grand multi-parity and these include
early age at first marriage, low socioeconomic status, polygamous marriage [11], husband's
preference, culture, religion, and residence in a rural area. Others are low literacy level, poor mass
media exposure, low level of awareness of health, and lack of access to modern contraceptives
especially in most sub-Saharan Africa [1, 12, 13].

According to studies conducted in some developing countries, grand multipara women have a
higher number of children than women in developed countries. Indeed, many factors contribute to
grand multiparity, but some published literature identified the factors for grand multiparity in low
and lower-middle-income countries [1, 14-16]. Still, grand multiparity has not been well-addressed, as there is a dearth of evidence on a larger scale. Also, there were inadequate studies
carried out on the trend, magnitude, and associated factors of grand multiparity by using national
representative demographic health survey data (DHS). Therefore, this study was carried out to
assess the trend and associated factors of grand multiparity using demographic and health survey
data for the Sidama region from 2000 to 2016. The findings will assist program managers and
policymakers in developing appropriate intervention strategies to effectively address the
challenges and problems of grand multipara women in order to prevent high parity in the
community in terms of reproductive health services at all levels.
Methods and materials

Study area and period

Sidama national regional state is one of the 10 national regional states in Ethiopia. The region is divided into 36 Districts (6 urban districts and 30 rural districts). Hawassa city is the capital of the region, and it is situated in the Southern part, about 273 Kilometers away from Addis Ababa, Ethiopia’s capital. The Sidama people number 8.8 million (4.01% of the national population) and are the fifth most populous ethnic group in Ethiopia. Sidama national region state has 123 health centers and 17 hospitals[10, 17-20]. For this study, we used secondary data from the 2000 to 2016 Ethiopia demographic health and survey (DHS). The DHS data had been collected from January 18, 2016, to June 27, 2016, by the Ethiopian Central Statistical Agency (ECSA)[10].

Study design, data source, and sampling techniques

A cross-sectional survey data were obtained from 2000 to 2016 (EDHS). The data were retrieved from the (DHS) program's official database website (http://dhsprogram.com). It is a nationally representative household survey that collects information about population, health, and other important indicators. The sample of the EDHS study was designed to collect up-to-date information from each of the ten regions and the two administrative cities. Each region was stratified into urban and rural areas, 21 sampling strata were obtained. Samples of enumeration areas (EAs) were selected independently in each stratum in two stages. In the first stage, a total of EAs was selected with a proportional sampling technique and with independent selection in each sampling stratum. The selection of households was the second stage. A fixed number of households per cluster were selected with an equal probability proportional allocation to sample size was done [10].
This study used the birth record dataset, and the study population was women (aged 15 to 49 years) who had delivered children with the available DHS data set. From the birth record dataset, the total number of multiparous (para 2 to 4) and grand multiparous (para 5 to 9) women was extracted for Sidama national region state from 2016 EDHS. The total sample was extracted for women who gave birth (parity 2 to 9) from the birth record dataset. The total number of women whose parity (2 to 9) in the study region of Ethiopia was included in 1,654 weighted samples. For trend analysis, grand multipara in all the four DHS data from 2000 to 2016 were extracted by using the quantitative method [10, 21-23].

**Study variables**

**Dependent variable:** The outcome variable of this study was grand multiparity which was categorized in to "Yes = 1/ No = 0" form. These include all women who have five to nine deliveries as grand multi-parity categories [1, 2, 24].

\[ Y_i = \begin{cases} 
0; & \text{Multiparity, for the women had given birth 2 to 4 times.} \\
1; & \text{Grand multiparity, for the women who had given birth 5 to 9 times.} 
\end{cases} \]

\[ Y_i \] represent the parity of the \(i\)th ever born children.

**Independent variables:** The independent variables for this study were identified based on previous studies conducted on the factors affecting grand multiparity at the different places that were reviewed from the literature as associated factors of grand multiparity [11, 14, 25-35]. The independent variables selected for analysis from the available dataset were the place of residence, maternal age, educational status of women, wealth index, current marital status, polygamy marriage, women currently working, religion, husband education level husband occupation status, women supported by husband, community media exposure, age of women at first birth, age at first sex, number of living children, preceding birth interval (months), the contraceptive method
used, unmet need of contraceptive, the desire for more children, the child being alive, place of
delivery, and husband’s desire for more children. In this analysis, independent variables were
categorized into individual-level variables and community-level variables. Individual-level
variables were the age of women, women's education status, wealth index, women's age of first
birth, number of living children, current marital status, polygamy marriage, women's age at first
sex, desire for more children, contraceptive method, unmet need of contraceptive, women
currently working, the child is alive, preceding birth interval (months), place of delivery, women
supported by husband, husband education status, husband occupation status, husband desire for
more children. Community-level variables were religion, place of residence (rural or urban), and
community media exposure.

Data Analysis

For analysis, the weighted sample data were used to ensure the survey results were representative
of the regions. Based on each weighted variable, the descriptive statistics were reported with
summary indices, frequency, and proportion. The trend analysis of grand multiparity was assessed
using the Extended Mantel-Haenszel Chi-square test for linear trend using the OpenEpi (version
3.01)- Response program[36]. A P-value of less than 0.05 was used to declare a 95% significant
probability of the existence of a trend. The degree of crude association for individual and
community variables was checked by employing a χ² test.

For the nested structure of the EDHS data, multilevel multivariable logistic regression analysis
was used. Also, for the mixed effect (fixed effect for both the individual and community level
factors and a random effect for the between cluster-variation), a two-level mixed-effect logistic
regression analysis was used. The final findings were measured using an adjusted odds ratio
(AOR). Within the multilevel multivariable logistical regression analysis, four models were fitted
for the result variable. The primary model (null or empty model) was fitted without explanatory
variables. The second model (individual model), third model (community model), and fourth
model (final model) variables were fitted for individual level, community-level, and each
individual- and community-level variable respectively. The final model was used to check for the
independent effect of the individual and community level variables on grand multiparity. To show
cluster correlation within a model, the Intra-Cluster Correlation (ICC) was calculated. The
Proportional Change in Variance (PCV) was also calculated to determine the predictive power of
the variables included in each model. To identify the factors associated with grand multiparity, the
model with the highest PCV value was used.

The model fitness was assessed using Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), the Bayesian
information criterion (BIC), and the Likelihood Ratio (LR) test. The values for each model of AIC
and BIC were compared, the lowest one assumed to be a better explanatory model[37].

Multicollinearity between the individual- and community-level variables was checked using the
Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The mean value of VIF < 10 was the cut-off point[38]. In the
present study, the mean VIF value was estimated to be 2.44 showing the absence of
multicollinearity in the models. The data were analyzed using the STATA statistical software
system package version 14.0 (StataCorp., College Station, TX, USA). It was considered
statistically significant if the P-values were less than 0.05 with the 95% confidence intervals.

**Patient and Public Involvement**

No patient was involved in this study.
Results

Sociodemographic characteristics of study participants

In this study, a total weighted sample of 1,654 women was included in the analysis from the latest EDHS data (2016). The mean age (±SD) of the women was 35±6.7 years, with the majority of women aged between 40-49 years. Almost all (99%) of women lived in a rural setting, and close to two-thirds (67%) of women were illiterate. Slightly more than half (55%) of the women were under a low level of socio-economic status. Almost all of them were married (93%) and follow the protestant religion (92%). More than three-fourths (77%) of the women were not supported by their husbands to do day-to-day chores. In addition, the majority of husbands had attended formal education and had different types of occupations. The summarized information on the sociodemographic background is displayed below (table 1).

Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of study participants in the Sidama national region state, data from 2016 Ethiopia demographic health and survey.

| Individual and community Variables | Categories       | Weighted (No_) | Weight (%) |
|------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|------------|
| Place of residence                 | Urban            | 13             | 0.75       |
|                                    | Rural            | 1641           | 99.25      |
| Age in years                       | 20-29            | 329            | 19.87      |
|                                    | 30-34            | 441            | 26.66      |
|                                    | 35-39            | 413            | 25.00      |
|                                    | 40-49            | 471            | 28.47      |
|                                    | Mean ±SD         | 35±6.7         |            |
| Educational status                 | Have formal education | 532       | 32.16      |
|                                    | No formal education | 1122    | 67.84      |
| Wealth index                       | Low              | 912            | 55.14      |
|                                    | Middle           | 357            | 21.58      |
|                                    | Higher           | 385            | 23.28      |
| Current marital status             | Other marital statues | 110       | 6.66       |
|                                    | Married          | 1544           | 93.34      |
| Polygamy                           | No               | 1205           | 77.09      |
|                                    | Yes              | 357            | 22.91      |
| Women currently working            | No               | 942            | 56.94      |
|                                    | Yes              | 712            | 43.04      |
Sexual and reproductive health characteristics of study participants

The mean age (±standard deviation) of women at first delivery was 17.69 ± 2.75 years and at first coital exposure was 16±2.6 years. The women’s mean number of living children was 4.9 with a ±1.8 standard deviation. About two-thirds (64.8%) of women had short birth intervals within or less than 36 months. Among participants, a considerable proportion of women (45.81%) did not utilize modern contraceptives. Nearly, one-out of ten women (10.9%) had experienced child death in the survey. Slightly more than three-fourths (80%) of women gave birth at home (table 2).

Table 2: Fertility, sexual and reproductive health characteristics of study participants in Sidama regional state, data from 2016 Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey.

| Individual-level variables | Categories | Frequency | Percent (%) |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| Age of women at first birth| Less than 18 years | 1,077 | 65.11 |
|                          | Greater than or equal to 18 years | 577 | 34.89 |
|                          | Mean ±SD | 17.69±2.75 | |
| Age at first sex          | Less than or equal to 18 years | 1,356 | 81.98 |
|                          | Greater than 18 years | 298 | 18.02 |
|                          | Mean ±SD | 16±2.6 | |
| Number of living children | Mean ±SD | 4.9 ±1.8 | |
| Preceding birth interval (months) | Less than or equal to 36 months | 844 | 64.8 |
|                          | Greater than 36 months | 459 | 35.2 |
|                          | Mean ±SD | 34.47 ± 18.6 | |
| Contraceptive method used | Not using any methods | 758 | 45.81 |
The magnitude of grand multiparous women

The prevalence of grand multiparity with the weighted sample was 70.8 % (95 % CI, 68.5 - 72.9), in the 5 years preceding the survey in the Sidama region. Evidence from 2016 EHDS (Figure 1).

The trend of grand multiparous women

The magnitudes of the grand multi-parity were 70.93 % in 2000 EDHS, 68.58 % in 2005 EDHS, 74.23 % in 2011 EDHS, and 70.82 % in 2016 DHS in the Sidama national region state. Over 16 years, the trend of grand multiparous women from four surveys showed no significant change (Extended Mantel-Haenszel chi-square for leaner trend= 1.13 and P-values= 0.29). Likewise, no percentage change was observed between 2000 and 2016 EDHS in the Sidama region (Figure 2).

Bivariate variables’ association with grand multi-para women

Regarding education status, the lack of formal education (75.8%) was significantly higher in grand multiparous women than in multipara (48.6%), (P<0.001). An enormous number of women in both groups were of the poorest and poorer statuses on the wealth index. The unmet need for contraceptives and underutilization of long-acting family planning utilization was significantly
higher in grand multipara than multipara (p<0.001). Among grand multipara, women in polygamous marriages were significantly higher compared with multipara women, (p<0.001).

Likewise, the age of women at first birth, short birth intervals, husband education level, number of living children, and place of residence showed significant associations in both study groups, (p<0.001).

However, no significant differences were observed between grand multipara and multiparous regarding women currently working, place of delivery, the child is alive, current marital status, husband occupation status, and community media exposure, (P> 0.05), (table 3).

Table 3: Bivariate variables association of individual and community level variables with grand multipara and multiparous women in Sidama national region state, Ethiopia, data from EDHS 2016.

| Individual and community Variables | Categories | Multiparous No_ (%) | Grand Multipara No_ (%) | P-value |
|-----------------------------------|------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------|
| Age in year                        | Mean ± SD  | 29.4 ± 0.3          | 37.7 ± 0.2              | p<0.001|
| Educational level                  | Lack of formal education | 234(20.9) | 888(79.1) | p<0.001 |
|                                   | Have formal education    | 248(46.7) | 283(53.3) | |
| Wealth Index                       | Poorest       | 134(28.9) | 329(71.1) | p=0.049 |
|                                   | Poorer        | 146(32.5) | 303(67.5) | |
|                                   | Middle        | 89(24.8)  | 269(75.2) | |
|                                   | Richer        | 54(25.2)  | 159(74.8) | |
|                                   | Richest       | 61(35.2)  | 112(64.8) | |
| Age of women at first birth        | Mean ± SD    | 18.8±2.9     | 17.5±2.6               | p<0.001|
| Number of living children          | Mean ± SD    | 2.8±0.8      | 5.8±1.4                | p<0.001|
| Current marital status             | Other marital statues | 30(26.8) | 80(73.2) | P=0.74 |
|                                   | Married       | 453(93.9)  | 1,091(93.1) | |
| Polygamy marriage                  | No           | 426(35.3) | 780(64.7) | p<0.001 |
|                                   | Yes          | 34(9.6)    | 322(90.4) | |
| Age at first sex                   | Mean ± SD    | 16.56±2.77  | 16.13±2.52            | P=0.022|
| The desire for more children       | Not want more children | 178(16.1) | 927(83.9) | p<0.001 |
|                                   | Want more children    | 305(55.5) | 244(44.5) | |
| Unmet need of contraceptive        | Unmet        | 36(16.6)   | 183(83.4)            | p<0.001|
|                                   | Met          | 414(36.5)  | 719(63.5)            | |
Determinants of grand multiparity

We applied a two-level mixed effect multivariable logistic regression using the extracted data from 2016 DHS for the Sidama national regional state that is aimed at identifying individual and community-level determinants of grand multiparity or women having high parity. Those four models were developed to analyze factors accordingly. According to random-effect analysis; Model-I had no individual- and community-level variables, and it observed only the random and intercept variables. In the model I, the ICC value was 20%. This indicates that the variation on the grand multiparity occurred at the community level (between-cluster variability) and is
contribute to the community-level factors. The ICC in the null model greater than zero indicates
that it guided the researcher to use multilevel modeling than the standard single-level regression
model. Also, results in subsequent models, between cluster variability were found to be 14.4% in
Model II (individual-level factors), 18.6% in Model III (communities level factors), and 14.5% in
Model IV (combined individual and community level factors). In another way, the proportional
change in variance (PCV) results indicated that the predictor variables to the null model better
explained the factors associated with grand multiparity. The PCV finding for Model-II was
(33.7%), for Model-III was (9.6%) and Model-IV was (33.7%). The final Model (combined
individual and community level factors) indicated that 34% of the community-level variation on
grand multiparity was explained by the combined factors at both the individual and community
levels. The result was reported based on Model IV (combined individual and community level
factors were fitted simultaneously). As a result, variables such as educational level, age of women
at first birth, contraceptive methods used, husband occupation status, polygamy, age of first sex,
unmet need for contraception, preceding birth interval, and husband education level were
significantly associated with grand multiparous women, according to Model IV findings.

The odds of grand multiparity compared to multiparity were 2 times [AOR=2; 95% CI:1.25-3.75]
higher among women who were uneducated compared with women who were educated. The odds
of grand multiparity compared to those multiparous women not using any contraceptive method
were 3.85 times higher compared to those women using long-acting family planning [AOR=3.8;
95% CI:1.2-12.2].

The odd of grand multiparity was 4.5 times higher among women who had their first births before
18 years old compared to those after 18 years old [AOR=4.5; 95% CI: 2.6–7.9]. The odd of grand
multiparity was 4.2 times higher for those who were in polygamous marriages compared to those
in monogamy [AOR=4.2; 95% CI: 2.0–9.3]. In addition, the likelihood of grand multiparity was
80% less likely to have met contraceptive compared to those women who have met contraceptive)
[AOR=0.2; 95% CI: 0.09 -0.83]. The odd of grand multiparity was 2.3 times higher among women
who had short birth intervals compared to those women with normal birth intervals [AOR=2.3;
95% CI: 1.4-3.5]. The odd of grand multiparity was 5.8 times higher among women whose
husbands had primary education compared to those who attended secondary schools and above
[AOR=5.8; 95%CI: 2.1–16.1]. Also, the odd of grand multiparity was 3.4 times higher among
women whose husbands lack formal education compared to those women husbands who had a
secondary level of education and above [AOR=3.4; 95%CI: 1.2-9.9].
(table 4).
Table 4: Multilevel logistic regression model of individual and community-level factors associated with grand multiparous women in Sidama national region state, Ethiopia, using data from the 2016 EDHS.

| Individual- and community-level variables | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
|-------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                            | Empty (Null) model | Individual-level variables AOR (95% CI) | Community-level variables AOR (95% CI) | Individual- and community-variables AOR (95% CI) |
| Educational level                         |         |         |         |         |
| Have formal education                     |         |         |         |         |
| Lack of formal education                  |         |         |         |         |
| Sex of household head                     |         |         |         |         |
| Female                                    | Ref.    |         |         |         |
| Male                                      |         | 0.3 (0.1 - 0.8) ** |         |         |
| Wealth index combined                     |         |         |         |         |
| Low                                       |         | 0.5 (0.24 – 0.99) * |         | 0.5 (0.2 -1) |
| Middle                                    |         | 1.4 (0.66 – 2.96) |         | 1.4 (0.7-3.0) |
| High                                      |         | Ref.    |         | Ref.    |
| Age of women at first birth               |         |         |         |         |
| Greater than or equal to 18 years         |         |         |         |         |
| Less than 18 years                        |         |         |         |         |
| Contraceptive methods used                |         |         |         |         |
| Not using any methods                     |         | 3.8 (1.2 -12.2) * |         | 3.8 (1.2- 12.2) * |
| Short-acting family planning              |         | 2.2 (1.1 – 4.5) * |         | 2.2(1.1 -4.4) * |
| Long-acting family planning               |         | Ref.    |         | Ref.    |
| Husband occupation status                 |         |         |         |         |
| Professionals                             |         | 2.2(1.0 -4.7)    |         | 2.2(1.03 -4.8) * |
| Merchant                                  |         | 0.5(0.3 – 0.9) * |         | 0.5(0.3-0.9) * |
| Agriculture/Farmer                        |         | Ref.    |         | Ref.    |
| Husband desire more child                 |         |         |         |         |
| Husband wants fewer                       |         |         |         |         |
| Husband wants more                        |         |         |         |         |
| Both want more                            |         |         |         |         |
| Category                              | Yes                  | No                  | Reference  |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Polygamy/ number of other wives       |                      |                     |            |
| No                                    | 4.2 (1.9 - 9.3) ***   | Ref.                |            |
| Yes                                   |                      |                     |            |
| Age at first sex                      |                      |                     |            |
| Less than or equal to 18 years        | Ref. 3.8(1.9 - 7.9) *** |                   |            |
| Greater than 18 years                 |                      |                     |            |
| Unmet need for contraceptive         |                      |                     |            |
| Unmet                                | 0.2 (0.07 - 0.5) ***  | Ref.                |            |
| Met                                   | 1.1 (0.3 - 3.3)       |                     |            |
| In fecund/Menopausal                  |                      |                     |            |
| Preceding birth interval (months)     |                      |                     |            |
| Greater than 36 months               | Ref. 2.3(1.4 - 3.5) *** |                   |            |
| Less than or equal to 36 months       |                      |                     |            |
| Husband education level               |                      |                     |            |
| Lack of formal education              | 3.4 (1.2 - 10.0) *    | Ref.                |            |
| Primary education                     | 5.9(2.2 - 16.2) ***  |                     |            |
| Secondary education and above         |                      |                     |            |
| Religion                              |                      |                     |            |
| Orthodox                              | Ref. 4.9(1.8 - 13.4) ** |                   |            |
| Protestant                            | 2.6 (0.8 - 8.4)       |                     |            |
| Muslim                                |                      |                     |            |
| Type of place of residence            |                      |                     |            |
| Urban                                 | Ref. 6.6(1.29 -33.8) * |                   |            |
| Rural                                 |                      |                     |            |
| Random effect                         |                      |                     |            |
| Community-level variance (SE)         | 0.83*** (0.4)         | 0.55*** (0.3)       | 0.75*** (0.4) | 0.56 *** (0.3) |
| ICC (%)                               | 20%                  | 14.4%               | 18.6%      | 14.5%        |
| MOR                                   | 2.4                  | 2.0                 | 2.3        | 2.0          |
| PCV                                   | Reference             | 33.7%               | 9.6%       | 33.7%        |
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| Model fit statistics | Log-likelihood | AIC  | BIC  |
|----------------------|----------------|------|------|
| Empty (null) model   | -523           | 1050 | 1059 |
| Model 2              | -281           | 602  | 692  |
| Model 3              | -513           | 1036 | 1059 |
| Model 4              | -281           | 604  | 698  |

Note: *significant at *P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; AOR = Adjusted Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence Interval, AIC = Akaike information criterion, BIC = Bayesian information criterion, Model 1- Empty (null) model; Model 2- Only individual-level explanatory variables included in the model; Model 3- Only community-level explanatory variables included in the model; Model 4- Combined model; PCV = Proportional Change in Variance, MOR = Median Odds Ratio and Ref. = reference.
Discussion

Seven out of ten reproductive-age women had experienced grand multi-parity. Age at marriage, literacy status of women, age of women at first birth, modern contraceptive method utilization, polygamy, husband education level, preceding birth interval, and unmet need for contraceptives were significantly associated with women having high parity.

During the analysis, the ICC value was found to be 14.5% in the combined Model. This indicates that 14.5% of the chances of grand multiparous women were explained through cluster differences. The ICC in the null model greater than zero indicates that it guided the researcher to use multilevel modeling than the standard single-level regression model [37, 39, 40]. Similarly, the study indicates that the proportion change in variance of the final model was accountable for about 33.7% of the log odds of high parity in the communities. In addition to that, the results of the median odds ratio, a measure of unexplained cluster heterogeneity, are 2.48, 3.51, 2.43, and 3.34 in models 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Hence, the results of the median odds ratio showed that there is unexplained variation between the clusters of the community.

In the present study, the magnitude of grand multiparity was 70.8%. This is similar to a study conducted community-based in Gedeo Zone 69.1% and Tigray region, Ethiopia 51% [25, 29]. This figure was quite higher than the prevalence reported by other investigators ranging from 9.4% to 27% in Gambian, Cameroon, Nigeria, Tanzania, and India [2, 33, 34, 41, 42]. The fact that later studies were all carried out in health facilities and urban catchment areas could explain these low prevalence rates. The educational backgrounds, socioeconomic, sociodemographic, and cultural settings of these studies are different from the current findings [31]. Similarly, there are many contributing factors to high fertility, among which are early marriage, the perceived ideal number of children, and mass media exposure by women [14, 25]. While the prevalence of grand
multiparity in developed countries has significantly declined ranging from 3 to 4 % [43], it has increased in the current study and this could be explained by lack of formal education (75.8%) and a high number of early marriages. As individual health implications, the women are given more subsequent births while they get more maternal and child health risks and many socioeconomic challenges in their lifetime in low resource setting areas [24, 35, 44, 45].

The trends of grand multiparity over study periods showed no significant change. This finding was consistent with a previous study done in rural Cameroon[31]. However, in Tanzania, the previous study's findings showed a significant change in the trend of grand multiparity [26]. This decline could have been explained by the availability of higher education to women and increased community awareness of the health risks of giving birth at an advanced maternal age and the benefits of family planning and empowerment of women in reproductive health decision-making [26].

This study revealed that grand multiparity was higher among women who had their first births before 18 years old compared to those women who started after 18 years. We realized that in the study community where women start birth before 18 years, the period of fertility is longer, and they have many ever-born children. As a result of these, women have high parity. Similarly, the women not using modern family planning appropriately and timely for spacing and limiting the number of births have high fertility. This is similar to the previous study done in Gedeo Zone, Ethiopia [25], Nigeria[46], Nepal [14], and Pakistan [28]. Nevertheless, the problem of early age at first delivery is significantly more alarming in the present study area than in the previous findings.

The odds of grand multiparity compared to that of multiparity were higher among women who were illiterate compared with literate women. This finding is in line with previous studies.
conducted in Nigeria[46], Kenya[27], Nepal[14], and the Tigray region in Ethiopia[29]. In this study, almost all the women were rural dwellers (99%). Women who are rural inhabitants are less likely to spend much time in school and would rather get married early. A possible explanation is that women residing in the urban area stay longer in school, thereby postponing the time for marital engagement[25]. On the other hand, researchers found that education is an important factor for high parity, with several causal relationships from a theoretical perspective[47]. To sum up, education generally results in an improvement in the status of individuals in society in the form of a better understanding of health issues, and employment status [48]. The low social class found among the grand multiparous women is usually associated with illiteracy and low socioeconomic status, which may be an encouraging factor to produce more children[11]

The grand multiparity was higher among women with short birth intervals (less than or equal to 36 months). This finding is also consistent with a study conducted in Wonago District, Gedeo Zone, Ethiopia [25]. The possible explanation might be due to women not utilizing modern contraceptives that lead the women to get more children in a short period.

In our study, it was found that grand multiparity is significantly associated with polygamous marriage compared with monogamous marriage. This finding is similar to other studies conducted in Nigeria[1]. The variation could be due to competition amongst wives to have many children and to build large family sizes.

The grand multiparity among women not using any contraceptive and using short-acting contraceptive methods was higher compared to those women using long-acting contraceptives. Similar findings were reported in Nigeria [46], Cambodia[49], Pakistani [28], and Wonago District, Gedeo Zone[25]. Most factors in this study are directly or indirectly associated with the low utilization of contraceptives, which indicated that it is the root cause of high fertility in the
study setting. In addition, in one study, the women were not using contraceptives because their husbands did not allow them to make contraceptive decisions [49].

**Strengths and Limitations of this study**

The strength of this study included analyzing the most recent nationally representative data sets aided in providing a broad comparative picture of grand multiparity in the study setting, as well as significant predictors of children ever born among ever-married women. In addition, to avoid misleading inferences and thus valid interpretation of the results, clustering effects were considered using a mixed modeling approach. Despite the above strengths, the study may have had recall bias because participants were asked about events that occurred 5 years or more before the survey. Also, we used secondary datasets, we were limited in our ability to select exposure variables for statistical analysis.

**Conclusions**

This study revealed that seven of ten women had experienced grand multiparity and the magnitude did not show significant change over the last sixteen years. Early marriage and early age of first birth, low literacy level, low family planning utilization, polygamy marital status, short birth interval, and unmet need for family planning were determinants of grand multiparity. We recommended to the stakeholders design new strategies to address the root cause of high fertility factors in communities. The Ministry of health should focus on health education and create awareness about maternal health risks related to grand multiparity in the community. Furthermore, special attention should be given to improving the utilization of contraceptives in the community to reduce the prevalence of grand multiparity.
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Fig 1: The magnitude of grand multiparity in Sidama region, data from EDHS 2016.

Fig 2: Trend of grand multiparous women in Sidama national regional state, Ethiopia, DHS data from years 2,000 to 2016.
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- Proportion of multiparity: 70.82%
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Legend:
- Blue: Multiparity
- Orange: Grand multiparity
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**Year of survey conducted**

- **EDHS 2000**
- **EDHS 2005**
- **EDHS 2011**
- **EDHS 2016**

**Percentage of grand multiparous women**

- 70.83
- 68.58
- 74.23
- 70.82
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