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Abstract

Objective: To determine the current estimate for the Maternal Mortality Ratio in Eritrea.

Methods: The study used RAMOS (Reproductive Age Mortality Study), which is a methodology of identifying all deaths of women in reproductive age as a source for identifying maternal deaths. All female deaths with in reproductive age were first identified in a nationally representative sample of 42 communities, which was followed by identifying maternal deaths among the female deaths, through verbal autopsy.

Findings: In the 42 selected communities, a total of 46,684 households were visited and a total of 248 female deaths within the reproductive age group (15-49 years) were identified. Among the 248 female deaths 41 were found to be maternal deaths. For calculating the maternal mortality ratio, the number of deaths was directly used as the numerator while the denominator was obtained using the fertility rates from a recent Demographic and Health Survey. This gave a maternal mortality ratio estimate of 752 per 100,000 live births and a lifetime risk for maternal mortality of 1 in 28, for the country.

Conclusion: The level of maternal mortality in Eritrea is still very high. RAMOS can be effectively and efficiently used to determine Maternal Mortality Ratio and the other measures for the level of maternal mortality.
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Introduction

A maternal death is the death of a woman while pregnant or within 42 days of termination of pregnancy, irrespective of the duration and the site of the pregnancy, from any cause related to or aggravated by the pregnancy or its management but not from accidental causes ¹.

Maternal mortality risks are conventionally defined in three distinct measures, namely: maternal mortality ratio, maternal mortality rate and lifetime risk of maternal mortality ²,³,⁴,⁵. The Maternal Mortality Ratio, which is defined as the ratio of the number of maternal deaths to the number of pregnancies, is an indicator of the risk of dying that a woman faces for each pregnancy she undergoes. Although conceptually the denominator should include all pregnancies, operationally, because of the difficulty of counting miscarriages and induced abortions, the denominator used is live births ³,⁴,⁵. The Maternal Mortality Rate, which is defined as the number of maternal deaths divided by the number of women of reproductive age, is a composite measure that is the product of maternal mortality ratio (deaths/births) and the birth rate in the reproductive age group ³,⁴,⁵. Lifetime risk of maternal death takes into account both the probability of becoming pregnant and the probability of dying as a result of the pregnancy cumulated across a woman’s reproductive years. It is again a composite measure that takes into account not only the maternal mortality risk per pregnancy but also factors in the cumulative exposure to pregnancy that an individual women experiences ³,⁷.

World wide at least 529,000 women die each year due to maternal causes of which 99 percent take place in low- and middle-income (developing) countries ⁸. In 2,000, the United Nations General Assembly acknowledged that despite progress in some countries, rates of maternal morbality and morbidity remain unacceptably high ⁹. Every minute of every day, somewhere in the world, a woman dies as a result of complications arising during pregnancy and childbirth, the majority of which are avoidable. For every woman who dies, approximately 20 more women suffer injuries, infection and disabilities during pregnancy or childbirth ².

About 75 to 80 percent of maternal deaths in the low and middle-income countries result from, in approximate order of importance, hemorrhage, sepsis, hypertensive disorders of pregnancy (eclampsia), complications of unsafe abortion and obstructed or prolonged labor ¹⁰.

The vast majority of the maternal deaths can be attributed to three causes: hemorrhage, sepsis and eclampsia. Attribution of causes of death is complicated by the fact that in most cases unsafe abortion and obstructed or prolonged labor eventually cause death due to hemorrhage or sepsis ⁴. The remaining 20-25% of maternal deaths can be attributed to illnesses aggravated by pregnancy ¹¹.

The Millennium Development Goals have placed maternal and newborn health firmly on the international agenda. But there remains the need to develop firm evidence to convince policy-makers and donors that interventions to improve maternal and newborn health are a worthwhile investment that will actually reduce poverty. Target 6 of the MDGs states “Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio.

The 1995 Eritrean Demographic and Health Survey (EDHS) revealed an extremely high level of maternal mortality ratio of 998 per 100,000 live births ¹². Understandably, there are caveats (wide confidence
Materials and Methods

The sampling of maternal deaths was conducted in the following two steps, based on RAMOS methodology.

1. Identify all female deaths with in reproductive age:

The Government of Eritrea has structured all villages (or areas of towns) in the country into 704 administrative units, called village administration (or administration areas), which were the sampling units for this study. The list of all administrative areas was obtained from the Ministry of Local Government. The Zones were taken as clusters and 7 administrative areas were randomly selected from the list of the administrative units, called village administration (or areas of towns) in the country into 704

A total of 42 communities (7 randomly selected communities from each of the 6 Zobas), were included in the study. Two people from each selected community after appropriate training undertook census house-to-house visit, marked (ticked with a chalk) all households visited, tallied the number of households visited and listed the names of females with in the reproductive age groups (15-49) who died within one year prior to the study.

Procedurally the work of the two local people is described as follows: visit every house and ask if there is female death in the past year and a half (Since 1st January of 2002). If there are no female deaths since January 1st 2002, they just tick the house and tally it and pass to the next house. If they encounter a house with female death since 1st January 2002, they verify whether it is with in one year (From June 1st 2002 to 31st May 2003) and the age whether the age is with in 15-49, if one of these the date or the age is not with in the range, they again mark the house, tally it and pass, until they find a house with female death with in the reproductive age in the time range, which they then have to write the names of the deceased person and the head of the household and the location of the house, besides marking (ticking) the house and tallying it.

2. Identify Maternal Deaths among the female deaths:

Once all deaths of female within the reproductive age (15-49) were identified in step 1, the trained interviewers identified the maternal deaths among all female deaths within the reproductive age, through verbal autopsy.

The principal investigator trained the data collectors. The importance of not missing maternal deaths was emphasized during the training. Hence, the interviewers visited every female death within the reproductive age in the community, even when it seemed unlikely to be a maternal death.

A checklist was prepared to assist the interviewers, to identify maternal deaths among all female deaths with in the reproductive age group, during the verbal autopsy. The interviewers were trained on use and interpretation of the checklist, which was field-tested and accordingly amended during the training. The checklist is presented in annex1. The number of births in a year for each Zone and for the selected communities was calculated from the total population and the Crude Birth Rates. The total population of each Zone was an estimate by the Ministry of Local Government for 2002, while the Crude Birth Rate for each Zone was estimated by the 2002 Eritrean Demographic and Health Survey.

Results

As depicted in table 1, a total of 46,684 households were visited in the 42 selected communities, from which 248 female deaths within the reproductive age group (15-49 years) were identified. Forty-one maternal deaths were then identified among the 248 female deaths within reproductive age. This gives a 16.5 percent proportionate mortality ratio for maternal death among women within the reproductive age group. The maternal deaths occurred during pregnancy in 16 percent of the cases, during delivery in 48 percent of the cases and in 36 percent of the cases with in 45 days after termination of pregnancy.
Table 1: Number of households visited, number of women deaths 15-49 years and maternal deaths identified in the sampled communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone (Zoba)</th>
<th>No. of communities sampled</th>
<th>No. of Households Visited</th>
<th>No. of population</th>
<th>No. of female deaths (15-49)</th>
<th>No. of maternal deaths identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maakel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18,580</td>
<td>79,760</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debub</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>16,910</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anseba</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>26,380</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Barka</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,770</td>
<td>31,110</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,874</td>
<td>32,470</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,610</td>
<td>16,330</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46,684</td>
<td>202,960</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number of estimated births and identified maternal deaths in the selected communities by Zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone (Zoba)</th>
<th>Total Population Of the Zone</th>
<th>Crude Birth Rate per 1,000 population</th>
<th>Number of births per year in the Zone</th>
<th>Population of the selected communities</th>
<th>Number of births per year in the selected communities</th>
<th>No of maternal deaths in the selected communities</th>
<th>MMR Per 100,000 Live births in the selected communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maakel</td>
<td>552,540</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14,919</td>
<td>79,760</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debub</td>
<td>779,060</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26,488</td>
<td>16,910</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anseba</td>
<td>448,910</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15,712</td>
<td>26,380</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Barka</td>
<td>578,900</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19,683</td>
<td>31,110</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRS</td>
<td>479,600</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15,827</td>
<td>32,470</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS</td>
<td>68,300</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>16,330</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,139,160</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100,453</td>
<td>202,960</td>
<td>6,495</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>631*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>3,139,160</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100,453</td>
<td>202,960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>752**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*631 is the maternal mortality ratio per 100,000 live birth for the 42 communities studied.
** 752 is the maternal mortality ratio per 100,000 live births, estimated for the whole country adjusted for the Zonal variations in number of births.

Table 2 presents the total population of each Zone as estimated by the Ministry of Local Government for 2002, Crude Birth Rate for each Zone as estimated by the 2002 Eritrean Demographic and Health Survey (12) (less than a year prior to this study), and the number of maternal deaths identified in this study. The number of births in a year for each Zone and for the selected communities was calculated from the total population and the Crude Birth Rates.

Using the information on table 2, an estimation of maternal mortality ratio is directly calculated using the following formula:

\[
\text{Maternal Mortality Ratio} = \frac{\text{All maternal deaths Occurring in one year} \times 100,000}{\text{Number of live births occurring in the same year}}
\]

As revealed in table 2, the maternal mortality ratio for the whole country, adjusted for Zonal variation in number of birth is 752 per 100,000 live births. The 95 percent confidence interval for the estimate of the 752 per 100,000 live birth is ± 210 per 100,000 (i.e 542 per 100,000 to 962 per 100,000).

Although it needs to be interpreted with caution due to the above-mentioned wide confidence intervals, as revealed in table 2 and figure 1, this study revealed wide Zonal variation in maternal mortality ratio, ranging from 46 per 100,000 in Zoba Maakel to 1,261 per 100,000 live births in Zoba Southern Red Sea. Three of the six Zones in Eritrea (Anseba, Gash Barka and Southern Red Sea) were found to have a maternal mortality ratio of around or over 1,000 per 100,000 live births.

Fig. 1: Maternal Morality Ratio Per 100,000 Livebirths by Zoba

N.B. This map is not an official map for international boundaries.
Taking the General Fertility Rate (GFR) or the birth rate of 153 per 1,000 women as revealed by the 2002 EDHS, and a Maternal Mortality Ratio of 752 per 100,000 livebirths revealed from this study, the Maternal Mortality Rate is calculated as 115 maternal deaths/100,000 women.

With the current maternal mortality ratio and fertility rate, the Lifetime Risk for Maternal Mortality in Eritrea is calculated at 0.036, which is equivalent to 1 in 28.

Discussion

All maternal deaths that occurred within one year prior to the study were identified using RAMOS, which first identifies all deaths of women of reproductive age as a source of identifying maternal deaths, as described below.

RAMOS approaches can, when competently handled, provide valuable insights into the circumstances leading to maternal deaths. They did not usually provide good data on levels of maternal mortality, because of the difficulties encountered in matching the numerator with an appropriate denominator. In this study, however, we succeeded in determining maternal mortality ratio because of being able to obtain estimates of the denominator, due to a well structured Local Government Administration with a fairly reliable population size for each village administration and the availability of Crude Birth Rates for each zone from a recent Demographic and Health Survey, which was conducted only 9 months prior to this study.

As precise estimation of maternal mortality from either sisterhood or household surveys require large sample sizes, the 95 percent confidence interval of maternal mortality estimation are usually very wide. For example analysis of Demographic and health surveys, which use sisterhood method, have shown 95 percent confidence intervals around maternal mortality rates to be plus or minus 31 percent, on average. The issue of wide sampling error also pertains to direct techniques of determining maternal mortality ratio, not just the sisterhood method. The Addis Ababa household survey interviewed 32,300 households and identified 45 deaths and produced an estimated maternal mortality ratio of 480 per 100,000 live births for the population of Addis Ababa. At the 95 percent level of significance this gave a sampling error of about 30 percent, i.e. the ratio could be anywhere between 370 and 660.

The calculated 95 percent confidence interval for the 752 per 100,000 maternal mortality estimates in our study was also equally wide with plus or minus 28 percent. Hence, the actual figure could be as low as 542 or as high as 962 per 100,000 live births.

The current estimate (752 per 100,000) is 25 percent less than the 1995 EDHS estimate for maternal mortality ratio (998 per 100,000). However, although that may be the case, it is difficult to conclude whether there actually was a 25 percent reduction in maternal mortality ratio or not because as depicted by the heavy line in fig. 2 the 95 percent confidence intervals for the current estimate of 752 overlap between 689 and 962. Hence, there may as well be no difference between the current and the 1995 EDHS estimates of maternal mortality ratio for the country. Chance cannot be excluded as a likely explanation for the difference due to the wide 95 percent confidence interval.

Discussion

All maternal deaths that occurred within one year prior to the study were identified using RAMOS, which first identifies all deaths of women of reproductive age as a source of identifying maternal deaths, as described below.

RAMOS approaches can, when competently handled, provide valuable insights into the circumstances leading to maternal deaths. They did not usually provide good data on levels of maternal mortality, because of the difficulties encountered in matching the numerator with an appropriate denominator. In this study, however, we succeeded in determining maternal mortality ratio because of being able to obtain estimates of the denominator, due to a well structured Local Government Administration with a fairly reliable population size for each village administration and the availability of Crude Birth Rates for each zone from a recent Demographic and Health Survey, which was conducted only 9 months prior to this study.

As precise estimation of maternal mortality from either sisterhood or household surveys require large sample sizes, the 95 percent confidence interval of maternal mortality estimation are usually very wide. For example analysis of Demographic and health surveys, which use sisterhood method, have shown 95 percent confidence intervals around maternal mortality rates to be plus or minus 31 percent, on average. The issue of wide sampling error also pertains to direct techniques of determining maternal mortality ratio, not just the sisterhood method. The Addis Ababa household survey interviewed 32,300 households and identified 45 deaths and produced an estimated maternal mortality ratio of 480 per 100,000 live births for the population of Addis Ababa. At the 95 percent level of significance this gave a sampling error of about 30 percent, i.e. the ratio could be anywhere between 370 and 660.

The calculated 95 percent confidence interval for the 752 per 100,000 maternal mortality estimates in our study was also equally wide with plus or minus 28 percent. Hence, the actual figure could be as low as 542 or as high as 962 per 100,000 live births.

The current estimate (752 per 100,000) is 25 percent less than the 1995 EDHS estimate for maternal mortality ratio (998 per 100,000). However, although that may be the case, it is difficult to conclude whether there actually was a 25 percent reduction in maternal mortality ratio or not because as depicted by the heavy line in fig. 2 the 95 percent confidence intervals for the current estimate of 752 overlap between 689 and 962. Hence, there may as well be no difference between the current and the 1995 EDHS estimates of maternal mortality ratio for the country. Chance cannot be excluded as a likely explanation for the difference due to the wide 95 percent confidence interval.

The 752 estimation of maternal mortality ratio in Eritrea, although lower than the average for Sub-Saharan Africa, estimated at 980 per 100,000, is still very high. The maternal mortality ratio in Eritrea is 1.5 times the average for the low-and middle-income countries, which is estimated at 480 per 100,000 live births and is 28 times the average for industrialized countries, which is estimated at 27 maternal deaths per 100,000 live births. The lifetime risk for a woman in Eritrea of dying due to maternal causes calculated from the estimation of maternal mortality ratio in this study is 0.036, which is about 1 in 28, which is half of the 1995 EDHS estimate of 1 in 14.

Cost had always been raised as a major impediment for conducting household surveys to directly determine maternal mortality ratio. Hence, a very important methodological lesson learned from this study is that the task at the initial level can be made simple to be undertaken by local people and the cost of under taking a household survey, could be minimized drastically. The salary paid to the local personnel was 50 ERN (Equivalent to 3.3 USD) as opposed to 250 ERN (16.5 USD) per day for the trained health workers. Additionally the trained personnel would have required transportation, which would have cost an additional 1,100 ERN per day (60 USD). The local personnel did not need any transportation. The trained health workers may need translators and local guides, while the local people do not.

Hence, the identification of deaths of all female with in reproductive age cost around 15 percent of the estimated cost if we were to use qualified health workers. As the identification of all female deaths with in reproductive age constitute the major portion of the whole expense of a household survey for maternal mortality, over all the cost can be reduced by as much as two third.
The following are the conclusions of the study:

- With the current estimation of maternal mortality ratio at 752 per 100,000 live births, maternal mortality in Eritrea is very high and accordingly should be seen and treated as a priority among priorities.
- RAMOS can be effectively and efficiently used to determine the levels of maternal mortality.
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Annex 1:
Checklist for the Verbal Autopsy To identify Maternal Deaths

1. Name of deceased woman______
2. Date of death of (Name) __________
3. How old was (Name) when she died?______ years
4. Was (Name) pregnant when she died?
   a. [ ] Yes  b. [ ] No  [ ] I don’t know
5. Did (Name) die during childbirth?
   a. [ ] Yes  b. [ ] No
6. Did (Name) die within 6 weeks (42 days) after the end of a pregnancy or childbirth?
   a. [ ] Yes  b. [ ] No
7. Was her death due to complications of pregnancy or childbirth?
   a. [ ] Yes  b. [ ] No

If No, specify the cause________________________

Use your (the interviewers) professional judgment and knowledge about direct and indirect causes of maternal death and non maternal causes e.g. Accidents and cancer) to judge whether the cause could be classified as maternal or non maternal.

8. Your (the interviewers) judgment: -
   a. [ ] Maternal (direct or indirect)
   b. [ ] Non maternal

Conclusion
If the answer of both questions 4, 5 and 6 is No: Conclude the death is not maternal death.
If the answer to question number 7 is No and in your judgment (question number 8) the cause is Non maternal: Conclude the death is not maternal death.
If the answer to any one or more of the questions 4, 5 or 6 is Yes and in your judgment (question number 8) you judged it is maternal: Conclude the cause is maternal.
If the answer to question number 4 is I don’t know
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proceed with questions 9 to 13 as follows:–

First ask the interviewee/s if they could imagine of any person that may possibly know, whether the woman was pregnant or not (e.g. if she was not married try to find if she had a boy friend, or somebody she might have consulted for help or advice (e.g. a mother, a close friend, a health provider, an abortionist etc..., or somebody else the interviewers may come up with).

9. Was any person who might possibly know whether the woman was pregnant identified?
   [ ] Yes          [ ] No

10. If somebody was identified what is his/her relation with (Name)?_____

11. Was the identified person found?
    [ ] Yes          [ ] No

If the identified person was found ask him/her the following three questions:–

12. Was (Name) pregnant when she died?
    [ ] Yes          [ ] No          [ ] I don’t know

13. Was her death due to complications of pregnancy or childbirth?
    [ ] Yes          [ ] No
    If No, specify_________________

14. Your (the interviewers) judgment: -
    [ ] Maternal (direct or indirect)
    [ ] Non maternal

Conclusion: If the answer to questions 12 is yes and in your judgment (question 14) the cause is Maternal: Conclude it is maternal death.