It is made available under a	a <mark>'CC-B</mark> `	Y 4.0 International license .
------------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------------

Title:	Barriers to accessing mother, new-born and child health services in urban
	Gambia during COVID-19: An interview-based qualitative study.

Authors: Abdourahman Bah<sup>1</sup>, Giuliano Russo<sup>1</sup>

Affiliations: <sup>1</sup> The Wolfson Institute of Population Health, Queen Mary University of London

### ABSTRACT

Introduction: Evidence is being consolidated that shows that the utilisation of mother, newborn, and child health (MNCH) services has declined in low-income countries (LICs) during the COVID-19 pandemic. Very little is known about the effects of the pandemic on MNCH service utilisation in the Gambia. We set out to explore the COVID-19-related factors affecting the utilisation of antenatal and immunisation services in the Gambia.

Methods: A qualitative methodology was used to explore patients' and providers' experiences of MNCH services during the pandemic in two Local Government Areas (LGAs) in the Gambia. Thirty-one study participants were recruited from four health facilities, applying a theory-driven sampling framework, including health workers as well as female patients. Qualitative evidence was collected through theory-driven semi-structured interviews, and was recorded, translated into English, transcribed, and analysed thematically, applying a social-ecological framework.

Results: In our interviews, we identified five main themes, ranging from individual factors to interpersonal, community, institutional and policy factors. Individual factors revolved around patients' fear of being infected in the facilities, and of being quarantined, and their anxiety about passing on infections to family members. Interpersonal factors involved the reluctance of partners and family members, as well as perceived negligence and disrespect by health workers. Community factors included misinformation within the community and mistrust of vaccines. Institutional factors included the shortage of health workers, closures of health facilities, and the lack of personal protective equipment (PPEs) and essential medicines. Finally, policy factors revolved around the consequences of COVID-19 prevention measures, particularly the shortage of transport options and mandatory wearing of face masks.

Conclusions: Our findings suggest that patients' fears of contagion, perceptions of poor treatment in the health system, and a general anxiety around the imposing of prevention measures, undermined the uptake of MNCH services. In future emergencies, the government in the Gambia, and governments in other LICs, will need to consider the unintended consequences of epidemic control measures on the uptake of MNCH services.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

### 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

With the recent COVID-19 pandemic, the achievements made globally in improving mother, new-born and child health (MNCH) have been threatened. During the early phase of the pandemic there was a concern about the potential direct impact of COVID-19 on vulnerable populations, particularly women and children [1], since the health of women and children is usually disproportionally affected during pandemics and conflicts. The direct impacts that were of particular concern included potential increased maternal mortality, prematurity, stillbirths and congenital birth defects due to transmission from mothers to new-borns [2-4]. Evidence gathered thus far on the direct impacts of COVID-19 on MNCH indicates a substantial increase in maternal, new-born and child mortality, particularly in LICs [5].

Given the introduction of strict COVID-19 prevention measures, such as lockdowns and other movement restrictions, it became clear that there would be some indirect effects resulting from these measures, particularly in LICs [6,7]. In fact, studies conducted thus far have reported disruptions in the usage and provision of MNCH services during the pandemic resulting from COVID-19 prevention measures [8-12]. For example, a study conducted across 18 LICs estimated an average 2.6% to 4.6% decline in MNCH service utilisation during the pandemic [13].

Evidence on the COVID-19 factors associated with the disruptions suggests that a combination of demand-side factors (i.e., factors related to MNCH service users) and supplyside factors (i.e., those related to the health system) are responsible for the disruptions. The demands-side factors include movement restrictions, economic hardship and fear of getting infected [14-17]. The supply-side factors, on the other hand, include health workforce difficulties, unavailability of services, shortage of supplies and suspension of services [18-20]. These findings are in line with the findings of other studies conducted in Liberia, Sierre Leone and Guinea during the 2013–2016 Ebola outbreak that showed that fear of infection, transport difficulties, closure of essential health services and the attitudes of care providers were the main deterrents to MNCH service utilisation during the Ebola outbreak [21-25]

In the Gambia, the uptake of MNCH services has improved significantly over the last decade. For example, the proportion of women that delivered in health facilities increased from 63% in 2013 to 84% in 2019; the percentage of women that received a postnatal check-up within two days of delivery increased from 76% in 2013 to 88% in 2019; and about 79% of women made at least four antenatal care visits and about 98% of women received antenatal care from a skilled health professional (doctor, nurse or midwife) in 2019 [26,27]. In addition, the country has recorded improvements in vaccination coverage for children between 12 and 23 months of age. For example, the basic vaccination coverage increased from 76% in 2013 to 85% in 2019 [26,27]. However, despite these achievements in increased MNCH uptake, when compared to international rates, the maternal, new-born and child mortality rates in the Gambia remain very high. The country has an under-five mortality rate of 56 per 1,000 live births, an infant mortality rate of 42 per 1,000 live births and a neonatal mortality rate of 29 per 1,000 live births [26]. Concerning maternal deaths, the maternal mortality rate is 289 per 100,000 live births [26]. These high mortality rates are attributable to the following factors: inadequate financial and logistical support; a shortage of medical supplies and equipment; worsening physical infrastructure; inadequate numbers of health workers; high attrition rates; and an inadequate referral system (among other factors) [28].

Maternal health	Percentage
Births delivered in a health facility (%)	84
Birth assisted by a skilled provider (%)	84
Postnatal care for mothers within two days of delivery (%)	88

Table 1: Key maternal and child health indicators in the Gambia

Antenatal care – four or more visits	79
	15
Maternal mortality (deaths per 100,000 live births)	289
Child health	
Children who have received all basic vaccinations (%)	85
Children who have received all age-appropriate vaccinations (%)	77
Infant mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births)	42
Under-five mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births)	56
Neonatal mortality rate (deaths per 1,000 live births)	26

Source: Gambia Bureau of Statistic (GBoS) and ICF International [26,27]

The recent COVID-19 pandemic threatens to reverse the progress made so far in improving the uptake of MNCH services in the Gambia. The COVID-19 pandemic, which was declared a public health emergency in January 2020, reached the Gambia on 17 March 2020 [29,30]. However, by June 2020, only 48 new cases had been detected [31]. Nevertheless, from July to September 2020, the country experienced a short and intense first wave of infections, during which it recorded 3,530 new cases and 110 deaths [32]. This peak period was followed by a period of low infections till December 2020, after which a second wave commenced in January 2021 and ended in March 2021, with a total of 5,459 confirmed cases and 165 deaths [33,34]. This period was followed by a slow period until June 2021 [35] and a third wave then began in July 2021 and continued until the end of September 2021. The country recorded a total of 3.856 new cases during this period [36].

Months	New cases	Total number of cases	New deaths	Total number of deaths
March 2020	4	4	1	1
April to June 2020	45	49	1	2
July to September 2020	3530	3579	110	112
October to December 2020	218	3797	12	124
January to March 2021	1662	5459	41	165
April to June 2021	620	6079	16	181
July to September 2021	3856	9935	157	338

### Table 2: COVID-19 timeline in the Gambia

Source: Ministry of Health [31-36]

Shortly after the first COVID-19 case was detected in the Gambia on 17 March 2020, the government imposed a national lockdown and closed its international land, sea and air borders [37]. On 27 March, the country declared a state of emergency, which included the closing of schools, non-essential shops, and places of worship, the prohibition of social gatherings of more than 10 people, and the limiting of the number of passengers on public transport [38]. Between April and July 2020, the government introduced contact tracing and guarantine measures for suspected and confirmed cases, who were obliged to remain in hotels for 14 days. As the pandemic progressed, self-isolation for suspected and confirmed cases was introduced and the guarantine period was reduced to 10 days [37]. From July 2020, the government made the wearing of face masks compulsory in public, and introduced curfews and social distancing measures in public, including in health facilities and on public transport [39].

The COVID-19 pandemic and its prevention measures may have affected the utilisation of MNCH services in the Gambia. In fact, evidence collected thus far suggests that the uptake of medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.10.06.22280770; this version posted October 7, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

antenatal and immunisation services declined considerably during the first wave of the pandemic [6,12]. However, the factors responsible for this decline have so far been unexplored. To fill this gap, this study therefore investigated the COVID-19-related factors associated with a decline in the uptake of antenatal and immunisation services in two LGAs in the Gambia.

## 2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 The methodological approach

The study utilised an exploratory qualitative approach to explore the COVID-19-related factors affecting the uptake of MNCH services. This methodology was chosen as it allows the exploration of participants' perceptions and experiences in-depth, leading to a more comprehensive understanding of the COVID-19-related factors influencing the uptake of MNCH services, which would not be possible with a quantitative approach [40]. The social-ecological framework was used to explore and understand the COVID-19-related factors influencing the uptake of antenatal and immunisation services. This framework was chosen because it provides a theory-based framework for understanding the dynamic interrelations between various factors that shape individual behaviour [41]. The framework illustrates five levels of influence on individual behaviour: individual, interpersonal, community, institutional and policy. The framework for data analysis. It was also useful in producing themes and sub-themes that take into account the wide range of factors, including demand-side and supply-side factors, that influenced the use of antenatal and immunisation services in the period being studied.

The 21-item checklist from the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR) was used to inform the qualitative approach of the research and to report on the interview findings [42]. Scientific and ethical approvals were obtained from the Medical Research Council Unit of the Gambia (MRCG) Scientific Coordinating Committee and the Gambia Government/MRCG Joint Ethics Committee, respectively. Official permission letters were also obtained from the Director of Health Services at the Ministry of Health and from the administrative offices of all four health facilities. After explaining the purpose of the study, written consent was obtained from all study participants. To ensure confidentiality and anonymity, the interview data was anonymised. This was done by assigning each study participant a unique identification code.

### 2.2 Data collection

The study was conducted from June 2021 to August 2021 in Brikama and Kanifing LGAs, the two most densely populated LGAs in the Gambia, home to about 37% and 20% of the Gambia's population, respectively [27]. Both areas are situated close to the Atlantic coast, and mostly comprise urban areas. These two areas were purposively selected based on Ministry of Health reports on the prevalence of COVID-19 cases. They were reported to have the highest prevalence of COVID-19 cases in the country [43]. Also, the decision to restrict the study to these two areas was determined by feasibility issues relating to the limited timeframe for the study and logistical challenges. Consequently, four health facilities were purposively selected from these two areas, to represent both public and private health facilities (see Table 3 below).

Seventeen mothers were purposively selected from the above-mentioned health facilities. A convenience sampling strategy was used to select mothers that regularly accessed antenatal and immunisation services during the pandemic and mothers that did not attend all the recommended immunisation and antenatal visits [44]. In addition to these inclusion criteria, only mothers who were able to provide informed consent, were at least 18 years of age, and who had a child not older than one-year-old were considered for inclusion in the study. The selected participants also had varying socioeconomic statuses, ages and education levels.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.10.06.22280770; this version posted October 7, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The mothers that met the inclusion criteria were identified with the help of the health workers using maternity registers and child vaccination cards. In addition to the mothers selected, 14 healthcare providers were purposively selected from the above-mentioned health facilities. They included nurses, midwives and allied health professionals who were directly involved in providing antenatal and immunisation services during the pandemic. The health providers were selected to explore their perspectives on the COVID-19 factors shaping access to antenatal and immunisation services.

Data was collected through semi-structured interviews. A total of 31 interviews were conducted among the two groups, comprising 14 health workers and 17 mothers. All interviews were conducted in the health facilities. The interviews were conducted using topic guides created based on the findings of the literature review (see S1 and S2). The topic guides were designed specifically for each group and each interview guide was divided into the following five areas of inquiry, which are based on the five levels of the social-ecological framework: individual, interpersonal, community, institutional and policy factors. The interview guides were piloted with two participants. All interviews were conducted in English, Mandinka and Fula. The interviews were audio-recorded and, where necessary, translated into English, and were transcribed verbatim and anonymised.

Type of interviewee	LGAs				Total
	Kanifing LGA	Kanifing LGA	Brikama LGA		-
	Public health facility	Public health facility	Public health facility	Private health facility	-
	Kanifing General Hospital (KGH)	Bundung Maternity and Child Health Hospital (BMCHH)	Brikama District Hospital (BDH)	Africmed International Hospital	
Midwife	3	3	-	-	6
Nurse	-	2	-	-	2
Allied health professional	-	3	2	1	6
Total	3	8	2	1	14
Mothers that regularly accessed MNCH services	-	5	2	1	8
Mothers that did not regularly access MNCH services	-	6	2	1	9
Total	-	11	4	2	17

Table 3: List of people interviewed by participant category, LGA and health facility

### 2.3 Data analysis

The data collected from the interviews was analysed using a thematic approach. The analysis was conducted in several stages. To obtain a first impression of the data, the researchers read through the transcripts to familiarise themselves with the content. Following this, the transcribed data was entered into NVivo 12, and a deductive approach was used to identify predetermined codes based on the topic guides and literature review. An inductive approach was then used to identify new codes that were different from the predetermined codes. Once all the data had been coded, similar codes from mothers and health workers were triangulated and combined into themes and sub-themes based on the social-ecological framework and the research objectives. Following this, to ensure the objectivity of the findings, the two researchers worked closely together in reviewing and defining themes. This procedure was repeated until no new codes emerged from the data. Finally, all of the coded data was

reviewed to ensure that all the codes fit their respective themes and the findings were then reported using individual quotes.

### 3 RESULTS

In this section, we lay out the main findings from our qualitative interviews, according to the conceptual framework of reference (Fig 1). First, we present the socio-demographic characteristics of the study participants, then we present the themes that emerged from the interviews.

### Fig 1: The five main themes and their respective sub-themes.

#### Socio-demographic characteristics 3.1

A total of 17 mothers participated in this study. The ages of the mothers ranged from 18 to 35. Sixteen of them were married, while only one was single. Six of them did not have any formal education while 11 claimed to have attended at least primary education. The majority of them belonged to the Mandinka (eight) and Fula (five) ethnic groups, while the rest belonged to the Jola (two), Wollof (one) and Manjago (one) ethnic groups. Regarding their religious beliefs, 14 of the mothers were Muslims, while three were Christians. In addition to the mothers interviewed, 14 healthcare workers were interviewed. Out of these 14, six were midwives, two were nurses and six were allied health professionals.

#### 3.2 Individual factors

This category of factors refers to the demand-side factors at the individual level that limit women's uptake of antenatal and immunisation services. They include anxiety arising from fear of getting infected with COVID-19, fear of being quarantined and fear of infecting family members.

Fear of getting infected: Both health workers and mothers mentioned that fear of getting infected was a contributing factor to the reduction in the uptake of antenatal and immunisation services. Mothers perceived health facilities as a source of infection, due to overcrowding in health facilities and the lack of proper ventilation, which increases the risk of infection. They also mentioned a lack of social distancing in health facilities due to the lack of sufficient space in health facilities, the lack of enough seats, and some facilities failing to observe COVID-19 precautionary measures, such as wearing face masks and ensuring hand hygiene. This led some mothers to feel it would be unsafe to come to health facilities for antenatal and immunisation services.

"During the peak of the pandemic, I was pregnant, but I was not coming for antenatal service until after six months of my pregnancy ... During the pandemic, I was not coming to the health facility that often. This was because of fear of getting infected." (Respondent 1, BMCHH)

"Looking at the little space available in many facilities, it was nearly impossible to practice social distancing. This contributed to people not going to health facilities since it is a gathering." (Health worker, Africmed)

"It was also not safe to come to the health facility because you can easily get infected at the health facility. I wasn't coming regularly because the health facility used to be overcrowded, which made the environment unsafe." (Respondent 2, BDH)

Fear of being guarantined: Other mothers mentioned that testing positive for COVID-19 and being quarantined was another barrier to accessing antenatal and immunisation services. They were worried that if they went to the health facilities and were screened for COVID-19 through temperature checks, they would be told that they had COVID-19 even if they were not actually infected, and this would mean being guarantined for two weeks. This was a huge worry for them as it would mean being away from their loved ones and potentially being stigmatised within their communities.

"I remember there was a time when you tell someone you should go to a health facility. ... they would tell you I will not because if I go to the health facility, they will tell me I have COVID-19 and I will be quarantined." (Health worker 1, BDH)

"I have seen many of them not going to the health facility during the pandemic. The reason they would give is that if they go the health facility, they would be told that they have COVID-19. So, for that reason, they are afraid of going to the health facility." (Respondent 2, BMCHH)

"In my community, people were not going to health facilities that much. They used to say that if they go to the health facility, they will be tested for COVID-19 and they would be told that they have COVID-19, especially if you are having a cold. They would say that if you go there coughing and sneezing, they will say that you have COVID-19." (Health worker 3, KGH)

*Fear of infecting family members*: Some mothers also reported being afraid of infecting family members. They were worried that if they went to the health facilities, they would get infected and would eventually infect their family members. This was particularly worrying for those living with vulnerable people, such as the elderly and those with compromised health status.

"There were several people in my community who stopped taking their children for immunisation during the pandemic. ... They would say that they would not take their children for immunisation to the health facility because the health facility is not safe, and they could easily get infected and bring it home to infect their families." (Respondent 4, BMCHH)

"We were always worried that we will get infected and take the disease to our families because some patients were not willing to follow the precautionary measures." (Health worker 8, BMCHH)

#### Interpersonal factors 3.3

This category of factors refers to a combination of demand- and supply-side factors related to the interrelationships between the participants, their partners, family members and health workers.

Husband's and family's attitude: Some mothers reported that their partners refused to give them permission to access immunisation and antenatal services during the pandemic. Therefore, to avoid potential conflict with their partners, some mothers decided against attending antenatal and immunisation services. Others also mentioned that their family members, including their parents and their partner's family, dissuaded them from coming for immunisation and antenatal services due to fear of infection and high transportation costs.

"There was a reduction in the inflow and then the majority of MCH users when we called, they were telling us that because of the pandemic our family members are not allowing us to move out or go to health facilities, where it was always crowded." (Health worker, Africmed)

"...there were some members of my family who were telling me not to go to the health facility because of the COVID-19 pandemic." (Respondent 3, BMCHH)

"Some of my family members were saying I should not come because of the high transport fares that I have to pay to get here. Some were also saying I shouldn't come because the health facility was not safe during the pandemic." (Respondent 2, BDH)

Relationship with health workers: Some mothers cited mistreatment and disrespect from health workers as being a deterrent to coming for immunisation and antenatal services during the pandemic. They mentioned that they stopped coming to health facilities because of the bad behaviour exhibited by some health workers, including being disrespectful and even insulting them. The reason that the mothers gave for this behaviour was the fact that the health workers were short-staffed during the pandemic and were always exhausted. It was reported that this resulted in frustration, and that this frustration was vented on patients. Some mothers also claimed they were neglected by the health workers. They mentioned that they did not receive services in a timely manner at health facilities during the pandemic as the health workers were demotivated and, as such, neglected their duties, including sitting around and

chatting with their colleagues instead of providing services. As such, some mothers mentioned that they had frequent clashes with the health workers. This was corroborated by several health workers. They confirmed that some health workers refused to provide antenatal and immunisation services because, even though they were sacrificing their lives, they felt they were not adequately supported by the government. For instance, they mentioned that they were not provided with incentives to motivate them. As a result, some of the health workers were demotivated and refused to provide MNCH services.

"It might be one of the reasons why some people were not bringing their children for immunisation because for me, personally, if you embarrass me in front of people, I will stop coming to the hospital. ... Sometimes, people even choose to go to the big pharmacies or private hospitals, where they will not be treated badly by the health workers." (Respondent 6, BMCHH)

"I always guarrel with them because you come from a far place. Instead of them attending to you, they will be sitting and chatting with their colleagues and neglecting you." (Respondent 2, BMCHH)

"The quality of service was very much affected, because, during those days, some of our staff were refusing to provide the service." (Health worker 1, BMCHH)

#### **Community factors** 3.4

This category of factors refers to those demand-side factors at the community level that reduced mothers' willingness to attend both antenatal and immunisation services. These factors include vaccine scepticism and narratives about COVID-19 within the community.

*Mistrust in vaccines:* The research participants described having a mistrust of vaccines since the COVID-19 outbreak, often citing pervasive rumours that health workers were injecting patients with the COVID-19 virus. Participants also mentioned that within the community childhood vaccines and the COVID-19 vaccine were sometimes confounded. As a result, some mothers refused to come for antenatal services and others refused to bring their children for immunisation because they believed that if they came to health facilities, they would be given the COVID-19 vaccine instead of maternal and child vaccines.

"They would not even trust the childhood vaccines we were giving them here. The perception they had was that we were giving them COVID-19. They believed that the COVID-19 virus was included in the childhood vaccines." (Health worker 2, BMCHH)

"Some mothers would not take their children for immunisation because they thought that if they bring their children for immunisation, they will be given the Covid-19 vaccine which is not safe." (Respondent 3, BMCHH)

"Some [mothers] also started to confuse the vaccines we give them with COVID-19 vaccines. Some husbands were telling their wives not to take our childhood vaccines. As a result, the number of patients coming here was very reduced." (Health worker 4, BMCHH)

*Misleading information:* Both health workers and mothers cited misleading information about vaccines arising from the media as another factor limiting mothers' willingness to access antenatal and immunisation services. They mentioned that people used social media and other forms of communication, particularly WhatsApp, to advise people not to visit health facilities and not to get their children immunised. Others mentioned that they did not come for antenatal and immunisation services because there were rumours within their community that it was not safe to visit health facilities. Some health workers described their encounters with women who did not come for antenatal and immunisation services: they reported that the mothers were erroneously told in their communities that health facilities had been closed and the provision of antenatal and immunisation services had been suspended.

"The rumours from the community and from the media also contributed to my unwillingness to go to the health facility because they were advising people in the media not to go to the health facility as it is not safe." (Respondent 1, BMCHH)

"Media issues are disturbing us and vaccine hesitancy. People tend to write information anyhow they feel. Some people believe the media more than the health workers. That was affecting us, especially the WhatsApp groups, where they keep telling people not to send their children to health facilities and not to get them immunised. Even here, some would bring their children, but the moment they know we are going to immunise them, they refuse." (Health worker 4, BMCHH)

"Others would even tell you that health clinics [antenatal and immunisation services] have stopped. We don't even know where they got that information. They would tell you that they have heard that the hospital has stopped offering immunisation services. So, for that reason, they were no longer taking their children for immunisation." (Health worker 2, BMCHH)

#### 3.5 Institutional factors

This category of factors refers to the main supply-side (i.e., health system) factors that contributed to the decline in the uptake of antenatal and immunisation services during the COVID-19 pandemic. These factors include shortages of health workers, a lack of essential materials, including personal protective equipment (PPE) and medicines, and the closure of some health facilities.

Inadequate personal protective equipment: Several mothers claimed that some health workers did not use PPE. For instance, they mentioned that some health workers did not wear face masks. As a result, some mothers were unwilling to come for antenatal and immunisation services as they felt it would be unsafe. For their part, the health workers blamed this on the lack of PPE. For example, they reported acute shortages of face masks and gloves.

"As some health workers do not follow the precautionary measures ... the government should do something about that. Because that was the main reason, I was not coming to the health facilities." (Respondent 1, BMCHH)

"The main barrier we had here is the lack of PPE, such as face masks and gloves." (Health worker 2, BDH)

Shortage of essential medicines: Some mothers reported a lack of essential medicines in the health facilities during the pandemic. They claimed that whenever they went to the health facility, they would only receive a few of the medicines they needed; the rest they had to buy them in the pharmacies, which was reported to be guite expensive. As a result, some of them stopped going to health facilities altogether.

"The pandemic made things very difficult because there were not even enough medicines at the health facilities. You would go to the health facility, and they would ask you to go and buy the medicines from the private pharmacies. ... Some mothers are not willing to take their children to the health facility because they know that they will not have the medicines they need." (Respondent 2, BMCHH)

"Sometimes even I.V fluid, Zinc syrup and vitamin C were scarce. ... The shortage of medical supplies could have a been reason why some people were not coming to health facilities because for example, if I leave my home and come here and don't have the medicines that I need. I will go home and not come back here in the short distant future." (Health worker 1. BMCHH)

Staff shortages: Some mothers complained about a shortage of health workers during the pandemic. They claimed that this shortage resulted in an increase in waiting times for both antenatal and immunisation services as the provision of these services was slower than usual. This deterred some mothers from going to health facilities, as they were worried that the longer they remained in the health facility the greater their chance of getting infected. This claim was corroborated by most health workers as they described an acute shortage of health workers during the pandemic. According to them, this shortage was a result of staff getting infected

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.10.06.22280770; this version posted October 7, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

## perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

### and the deployment of staff towards the prevention and control of COVID-19. Some claimed that this shortage led to an increased workload and to staff burnout.

"During the pandemic, there were not enough health workers at this health facility because many of them were not working at that time. If there used to be three health workers on duty before the pandemic, this was reduced to two health workers during the pandemic. So, this resulted in increased waiting time for us as the service was a bit slow because there were not enough health workers." (Respondent 4, BMCHH)

"Yes, during the pandemic, we had a shortage of manpower because some of our colleagues were sick, and others were diagnosed with COVID-19 and had to guarantine for two weeks, along with those who came in contact with them. This affected our service delivery. The workload also increased for those of us who remained because we had to cover for those who were absent. This made our work very difficult at that time." (Health worker 7, BMCHH)

Scaling down of MNCH service provision: Some mothers claimed that they stopped attending antenatal and immunisation services because of the closure of some health facilities. They claimed that they were sent home several times from health facilities. Others reported that some health facilities temporarily suspended the provision of immunisation and antenatal services during the pandemic. Some mothers also claimed that in order to reduce overcrowding, some health facilities introduced a limit on the number of people allowed to receive immunisation and antenatal services each day. Thus, to receive these services, mothers had to come to the health facility very early, which was not possible for most of them. As a result, some stopped attending antenatal and immunisation services altogether.

"I used to go to Hagan Hospital in Banjul, but when the COVID-19 pandemic started, they closed the health facility. I brought my child there for immunisation, but they said they have closed the hospital and they are not seeing patients. I went there several times, but they told me that it was closed. So, I went home and stopped taking my child for immunisation." (Respondent 2. BMCHH)

"I was not taking him for immunisation every month. ...At that time, you only take your child for immunisation when you have an appointment, which was about every two months. This was because they stopped weighing children during the pandemic. So, I used to bring him only when he was supposed to get vaccinated." (Respondent 11, BMCHH)

"They also introduced a limit on the number of people they would allow in the health facility a day, so if you don't come early, you will not receive the service. For this reason, many people stopped going to the health facility. Even myself, there was a time I stopped going to the health facility." (Respondent 3, BDH)

#### **Policy factors** 3.6

This category of factors refers to infection prevention measures introduced during the COVID-19 pandemic that affected the uptake of antenatal and immunisation services. These include transportation challenges arising from movement restrictions and face mask enforcement issues.

*Movement restrictions:* Some mothers claimed that the movement restrictions imposed by the government resulted in transportation challenges that affected their ability to access antenatal and immunisation services during the pandemic. They reported an acute shortage of vehicles as some of the drivers were reluctant to work because of the social distancing measures and movement restrictions, which made it particularly difficult to travel to health facilities. Several mothers also reported high transportation costs being a barrier to accessing antenatal and immunisation services during the pandemic. They claimed there was a substantial increase in transport fares and reported that this posed a significant challenge for most of them as they could not afford to pay the high transport costs due to the economic constraints caused by the pandemic.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.10.06.22280770; this version posted October 7, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

"Transport was a big problem for me during the pandemic because I live all the way in Lamin, which is quite far from here. There was a shortage of vehicles as many drivers were not working at that time due to social distancing measures introduced by the government." (Respondent 4, BMCHH)

"Of course, I had transport difficulties at that time because, at that time, I was staying in Bundung. I used to pay about 50 dalasis to get to Banjul. When coming back, I used to face the same problem. Transport at that time was very costly and there were not many vehicles. Their decision to stop us from going to the health facility was a huge favour to me because I used to spend a lot of money on transport." (Respondent 7, BMCHH)

"In my village, there were some people who were not coming for MNCH services during the pandemic. They were not coming to the health facility because of high transport fares." (Respondent 2, BDH)

*Face mask enforcement:* Some mothers complained about the fact that the wearing of face masks in health facilities and on public transport was mandatory. They reported that people without face masks were not allowed entry into the health facilities and were denied access to antenatal and immunisation services. Others complained about the discomfort associated with the mandatory wearing of face masks. This was particularly the case for those with breathing problems, such as asthma patients. Some also reported PPE costs being a barrier to accessing antenatal and immunisation services during the pandemic. They claimed that the cost of face masks was quite high, and most of them could not afford this.

"Others would sometimes be sent home because they don't have face masks and their children would not be immunised." (Respondent 4, BMCHH)

"...we did not allow people to access MCH services without being in a protective mask. you had to put on a face mask before you can access MCH services here. We went even to the extent that we sent people out if they don't put on a face mask" (Health worker 5, BMCHH)

"The mandatory wearing of a face mask was another reason why I was not willing to go to health facilities because I feel uncomfortable wearing it. ... When I put it on, I feel like suffocating." (Respondent 1, BMCHH)

"Sometimes, I used to see people not coming to the health facility because they don't have the money to buy a face mask." (Respondent 1, BMCHH)

### 4 **DISCUSSION**

This study seeks to contribute to the qualitative literature exploring COVID-19-related factors that affected the uptake of MNCH services in Africa during the pandemic. Based on the socialecological model, we identified several factors that were responsible for a reduction in uptake of antenatal and immunisation services in two LGAs in the Gambia during the pandemic: anxiety and fear of getting infected in health facilities, negative attitudes of healthcare workers, a mistrust of the health system and of vaccines, shortages of health workers, perceptions that there was inadequate equipment and there were inadequate essential medicines, and physical barriers imposed by travel restrictions and the mandating of wearing face masks. The factors identified in this study are not unique to the Gambia. Furthermore, our study used a socio-ecological framework to explore the demand-side and supply-side factors influencing the use of MNCH services during the pandemic in the Gambia: a similar approach might be employed to disentangle the multi-layered effects of the pandemic on health systems in other LICs. Because of the cultural, political and health systems similarities, we particularly hope that such an approach may be used to explore COVID-19 impacts in the African continent.

A few limitations need to be considered when interpreting our study findings. First, it was not possible to quantify the extent to which of the above socio-ecological factors influenced the utilisation of antenatal and immunisation services, as our focus was rather on identifying and framing these factors through applying a qualitative approach. Second, the distinction between

demand-side and supply-side factors was not always clear-cut in our interviews, as both sets of factors are known to interact in health markets [45]. Third, the study was conducted between June 2021 and August 2021 – a year after the first wave of COVID-19 in the Gambia and about six months after the second wave. Thus, given the fact that the study participants were required to recall events that occurred in the past six to 12 months, there may have been some recall bias. Finally, the study was conducted in only two LGAs in a small country in West Africa; as such, the external validity of our findings may be limited.

This is one of the first studies to document the reality of the COVID-19 pandemic in the comparatively less researched country of the Gambia. Some of our findings are consistent with similar work conducted in other countries in sub-Saharan Africa. Studies from Ethiopia and Nigeria, for example, reported that anxiety resulting from fear of testing positive for COVID-19, uncertainty and stress about the pandemic prevented mothers from accessing immunisation and antenatal services [15,18]. Similarly, a study conducted in India found that mothers were unwilling to seek antenatal and immunisation services at health facilities due to fear of contracting COVID-19 and transmitting it to their babies [9].

Our analysis of the importance of interpersonal factors for the uptake of health services is corroborated by the literature reporting negative attitudes of health workers and low motivation to provide MNCH services, possibly in connection with low pay and high workloads [46]. Temesgan and colleagues [14] found that mothers who were not required to obtain permission from their partners to access MNCH services during the pandemic had greater odds of accessing MNCH services than those who were required to seek permission.

The theme of vaccine hesitancy and misinformation has been addressed before: vaccine mistrust and misinformation emanating from the media and communities likewise prevented mothers from seeking immunisation and antenatal services during the Ebola outbreak in West Africa [21]. However, in comparison to the Ebola epidemic we found a larger role played by social media in sharing misinformation during the present pandemic, possibly because of the spread of mobile technology. COVID-19 also received comparatively greater media coverage in the Gambia, which may have given more visibility and spread to dubious sources and unofficial information in this small West African country.

Many of our interviewees reported a lack of protective equipment in the Gambia's health facilities. According to the health workers we talked to, this fuelled an unwillingness among many to provide services, for fear of getting infected, the closure of some facilities, and the suspension of routine MNCH services. Such findings are consistent with previous studies that have showed how the pandemic disrupted the provision of immunisation and antenatal services due to the deployment of health workers to COVID-19-related tasks and the disruption of global supply chains for medicines and PPEs [46,47].

In our view, these findings have policy implications for the government in the Gambia and for governments in other LICs, for the current pandemic as well as for future epidemics. The fear of contracting COVID-19 and the vaccine scepticism uncovered in our study need to be addressed. This could be achieved by providing health education to mothers to help counter unfounded narratives about unsafe childhood vaccines and health facilities [48]. The reported fears of mistreatment by health workers are also worrisome, as this erodes trust in health institutions and jeopardises the gains made in immunisation rates over the last two decades. There is no simple solution to this complex problem, but governments will need to balance the stick and carrot interventions at their disposal, by improving the financial and professional conditions of the workforce but also linking them to performance and patient satisfaction [49]. Ultimately, the uptake of newer and constantly evolving MNCH services will always depend on mothers' willingness to seek such services from health professionals that treat them with dignity and respect.

### 5 CONCLUSION

There are still gaps in our knowledge of the ways the COVID-19 pandemic is impacting the utilisation of lifesaving MNCH services in LICs, particularly for small countries like the Gambia. We aimed to fill these gaps by conducting theory-driven semi-structured interviews exploring the barriers to accessing health services in two LGAs in the Gambia with high COVID-19 prevalence.

We found that the prevention measures introduced during the pandemic negatively affected the utilisation of antenatal and immunisation services in urban Gambia, particularly due to challenges relating to the mandatory wearing of face masks and movement restrictions. Mothers' anxiety and fear about contracting COVID-19 in health facilities, and the health system's inability to sustain the provision of antenatal and immunisation services during the pandemic, also undermined the uptake of MNCH services.

Despite its limitations, this study has the merit of bringing a focus to the shortcomings of health services in the Gambia, and to the need for governments to pay attention to the demand-side factors affecting health interventions in LICs, as well as to the need to counter misinformation during health emergencies.

## REFERENCES

- 1. Gomes C. Report of the WHO–China joint mission on coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). Brazilian Journal of Implantology and Health Sciences. 2020;2(3).
- 2. Khan MS, Nabeka H, Akbar SM, Al Mahtab M, Shimokawa T, Islam F, Matsuda S. Risk of congenital birth defects during COVID-19 pandemic: draw attention to the physicians and policymakers. Journal of Global Health. 2020;10(2). doi: 10.7189/jogh.10.020378.
- 3. Khalil A, Kalafat E, Benlioglu C, O'Brien P, Morris E, Draycott T, Thangaratinam S, Le Doare K, Heath P, Ladhani S, von Dadelszen P. SARS-CoV-2 infection in pregnancy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical features and pregnancy outcomes. EClinicalMedicine. 2020; 25:100446. doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100446.
- 4. Busch-Hallen J, Walters D, Rowe S, Chowdhury A, Arabi M. Impact of COVID-19 on maternal and child health. The Lancet Global Health. 2020;8(10):e1257. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30327-2.
- 5. Chmielewska B, Barratt I, Townsend R, Kalafat E, van der Meulen J, Gurol-Urganci I, O'Brien P, Morris E, Draycott T, Thangaratinam S, Le Doare K. Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on maternal and perinatal outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. The Lancet Global Health. 2021;9(6):e759-772. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(21)00079-6.
- 6. Semaan A, Audet C, Huysmans E, Afolabi B, Assarag B, Banke-Thomas A, Blencowe H, Caluwaerts S, Campbell OM, Cavallaro FL, Chavane L. Voices from the frontline: findings from a thematic analysis of a rapid online global survey of maternal and newborn health professionals facing the COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ Global Health. 2020;5(6):e002967. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002967.
- 7. Kotlar B, Gerson E, Petrillo S, Langer A, Tiemeier H. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on maternal and perinatal health: a scoping review. Reproductive Health. 2021;18(1):1-39. doi: 10.1186/s12978-021-01070-6.
- 8. Haider N, Osman AY, Gadzekpo A, Akipede GO, Asogun D, Ansumana R, Lessells RJ, Khan P, Hamid MM, Yeboah-Manu D, Mboera L. Lockdown measures in response to COVID-19 in nine sub-Saharan African countries. BMJ Global Health. 2020;5(10):e003319. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003319.
- 9. Goyal M, Singh P, Singh K, Shekhar S, Agrawal N, Misra S. The effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on maternal health due to delay in seeking health care: experience from a tertiary center. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2021;152(2):231-5. doi: 10.1002/ijgo.13457.
- 10. Soma-Pillay P, Moodley J, Pattinson R, Fawcus S, Gebhardt S, Niit R. The effect of the first wave of Covid-19 on use of maternal and reproductive health services and maternal deaths in South Africa. Obstetrics and Gynaecology Forum. 2020;30(4): 38-46.
- 11. Ashish KC, Peterson SS, Gurung R, Skalkidou A, Gautam J, Malla H, Paudel P, Bhattarai K, Joshi N, Tinkari BS, Adhikari S. The perfect storm: disruptions to institutional delivery care arising from the COVID-19 pandemic in Nepal. Journal of Global Health. 2021; 11:05010. doi: 10.7189/jogh.11.05010.
- 12. World Health Organization. Pulse survey on continuity of essential health services during the COVID-19 pandemic: interim report. 2020 August 27 [cited 12 July 2022]. Available https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-EHS continuity-surveyfrom: 2020.1
- 13. Ahmed T, Roberton T, Vergeer P, Hansen PM, Peters MA, Ofosu AA, Mwansambo C, Nzelu C, Wesseh CS, Smart F, Alfred JP. Healthcare utilization and maternal and child

mortality during the COVID-19 pandemic in 18 low-and middle-income countries: an interrupted time-series analysis with mathematical modeling of administrative data. PLoS Medicine. 2022;19(8):e1004070. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1004070.

- 14. Temesgen K, Wakgari N, Debelo BT, Tafa B, Alemu G, Wondimu F, Gudisa T, Gishile T, Daba G, Bulto GA, Soboka B. Maternal health care services utilization amidst COVID-19 pandemic in West Shoa zone, central Ethiopia. PLoS One. 2021;16(3):e0249214. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0249214.
- 15. Tilton A, Bwala A, Katagum K, Badiora A, Ibrahim AY, Doherty P. The impact of COVID-19 on maternal and neonatal health in three states in Nigeria. Options. 2021.
- 16. Lusambili AM, Martini M, Abdirahman F, Asante A, Ochieng S, Guni JN, Maina R, Luchters S. "We have a lot of home deliveries": A qualitative study on the impact of COVID-19 on access to and utilization of reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health care among refugee women in urban Eastleigh, Kenya. Journal of Migration and Health. 2020; 1:100025. doi: 10.1016/j.jmh.2020.100025.
- 17. Ahmed SA, Ajisola M, Azeem K, Bakibinga P, Chen YF, Choudhury NN, Fayehun O, Griffiths F, Harris B, Kibe P, Lilford RJ. Impact of the societal response to COVID-19 on access to healthcare for non-COVID-19 health issues in slum communities of Bangladesh, Kenya, Nigeria and Pakistan: results of pre-COVID and COVID-19 lockdown stakeholder engagements. BMJ Global Health. 2020;5(8):e003042. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003042.
- 18. Hailemariam S, Agegnehu W, Derese M. Exploring COVID-19 related factors influencing antenatal care services uptake: a qualitative study among women in a rural community in Journal of Primary Care & Community Health. Southwest Ethiopia. 2021; 12:2150132721996892. doi: 10.1177/2150132721996892.
- 19. Banke-Thomas A, Semaan A, Amongin D, Babah O, Dioubate N, Kikula A, Nakubulwa S, Ogein O, Adroma M, Adiga WA, Diallo A. A mixed-methods study of maternal health care utilisation in six referral hospitals in four sub-Saharan African countries before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ Global Health. 2022;7(2):e008064. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2021-008064.
- 20. Semaan A, Banke-Thomas A, Amongin D, Babah O, Dioubate N, Kikula A, Nakubulwa S, Ogein O, Adroma M, Adiga WA, Diallo A. "We are not going to shut down, because we cannot postpone pregnancy": a mixed-methods study of the provision of maternal healthcare in six referral maternity wards in four sub-Saharan African countries during the COVID-19 pandemic. BMJ Global Health. 2022;7(2):e008063. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2021-008063.
- 21. UNFPA. Rapid assessment of Ebola impact on reproductive health services and service seeking behaviour in Sierra Leone. Freetown: UNFPA. 2015.
- 22. Gizelis TI, Karim S, Østby G, Urdal H. Maternal health care in the time of Ebola: a mixedmethod exploration of the impact of the epidemic on delivery services in Monrovia. World Development. 2017; 98:169-78. doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.04.027.
- 23. Camara BS, Delamou A, Diro E, Béavogui AH, El Ayadi AM, Sidibé S, Grovogui FM, Takarinda KC, Bouedouno P, Sandouno SD, Okumura J. Effect of the 2014/2015 Ebola outbreak on reproductive health services in a rural district of Guinea: an ecological study. Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2017;111(1):22-29. Doi: 10.1093/trstmh/trx009.
- 24. Yerger P, Jalloh M, Coltart CE, King C. Barriers to maternal health services during the Ebola outbreak in three West African countries: a literature review. BMJ Global Health. 2020;5(9):e002974. Doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-002974.

- 25. McQuilkin PA, Udhayashankar K, Niescierenko M, Maranda L. Health-care access during the Ebola virus epidemic in Liberia. The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2017;97(3):931. Doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.16-0702.
- 26. GBoS and ICF. The Gambia Demographic and Health Survey 2019–2020. 2021, 11 March [cited 16 May 2022]. Available from: https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-FR369-DHS-Final-Reports.cfm.
- 27. GBoS and ICF. The Gambia Demographic and Health Survey 2013. 2014, 4 September [cited 14 May 2022]. Available from: https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-fr289-dhs-final-reports.cfm.
- 28. UNICEF. Maternal and child health: we're working with partners to promote and provide equitable access to health care for mothers and children in the Gambia. 2018, 1 October [cited 2 May 2022]. In: Unicef Gambia [Internet]. Available from: https://www.unicef.org/gambia/maternal-and-child-health.
- 29. MRCG. Confirmed case of Covid-19 in the Gambia. 2020, 17 March [cited 16 February 2022]. In: MRC Unit the Gambia Posts [Internet]. Available from: https://www.mrc.gm/confirmed-case-of-covid-19-in-the-gambia/.
- 30. Darboe MK. Gambia confirms first coronavirus case. Anadolu Agency. 2020, 18 March [cited 10 March 2022]. Available from: https://www.aa.com.tr/en/africa/gambia-confirms-first-coronavirus-case/1769877.
- 31. Ministry of Health. The Gambia COVID-19 Sitrep. 2020, 30 June [cited 15 June 2022]. Available from: http://www.moh.gov.gm/wpcontent/uploads/2020/07/Gambia The COVID-19 Sitrep-30-06-2020-1.pdf
- 32. Ministry of Health. The Gambia COVID-19 Sitrep. 2020, 30 September [cited 15 June 2022]. Available from: http://www.moh.gov.gm/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/Gambia The COVID-19 Sitreps-30th-Sept-2020.pdf
- 33. Ministry of Health. The Gambia COVID-19 Sitrep. 2020, 28 December [cited 12 July 2022]. Available from: https://www.moh.gov.gm/wpcontent/uploads/2021/02/Gambia The COVID-19 Sitrep-28th-Dec-2020.pdf.
- 34. Ministry of Health. The Gambia COVID-19 Situational Report No 289. 2021, 30 March [cited 15 July 2022]. Available from: https://www.moh.gov.gm/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/GMB\_COVID-
  - 19\_Situational\_Report\_2021\_03\_30th\_No\_289.pdf
- Ministry of Health. The Gambia COVID-19 Situational Report No 335. 2021, 27 June [cited 20 July 2022]. Available from: https://www.moh.gov.gm/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/GMB\_COVID-

19\_Situational\_Report\_2021\_25th\_27th\_June\_No\_335-.pdf

- 36. Ministry of Health. The Gambia COVID-19 Situational Report No 382. 2021, 30 September [cited 30 July 2022]. Available from: https://www.moh.gov.gm/wpcontent/uploads/2021/10/GMB-COVID-19-Situational-Report-2021-30th\_September-No-382.pdf
- 37. Abatan B, Agboghoroma O, Akemoke F, Antonio M, Awokola B, Bittaye M, Bojang A, Bojang K, Brotherton H, Cerami C, Clarke E. Intense and mild first epidemic wave of coronavirus disease, the Gambia. Emerging Infectious Diseases. 2021;27(8):2064-2072. Doi: 10.3201/eid2708.204954.
- 38. Mbai P. Barrow declares a state of emergency, amid Corona infection cases in The Gambia. Freedom Newspaper. 2020, 27 March [cited May 2022]. Available from: https://www.freedomnewspaper.com/2020/03/27/barrow-declares-a-state-of-emergencyamid-corona-infection-cases-in-the-gambia/

- it is made available under a CC-DT 4.0 memational icense .
- 39. Lowe M, Ceesay FK, Musa SS, Amos A, Lucero-Prisno DE, Akpan EF. Fighting COVID-19 in the Gambia: efforts, challenges, and way forward. The Open Public Health Journal. 2021;14(1):492-493. doi: 10.2174/1874944502114010492.
- 40. Elliott R, Timulak L. Descriptive and interpretive approaches to qualitative research. A handbook of research methods for clinical and health psychology. 2005;1(7):147-59.
- 41. Cramer RJ, Kapusta ND. A social-ecological framework of theory, assessment, and prevention of suicide. Frontiers in Psychology. 2017:1756: 1-10. doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01756.
- 42. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Acad Med. 2014;89(9):1245-51. doi: 0.1097/ACM.00000000000388.
- Diallo BA, Usuf E, Ceesay O, D'Alessandro U, Roca A, Martinez-Alvarez M. Clinical research on COVID-19: perceptions and barriers to participation in the Gambia. BMJ Global Health. 2022;1;7(2):e007533. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2021-007533.
- 44. Etikan I, Musa SA, Alkassim RS. Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics. 2016;5(1):1-4.
- 45. Donahue JD, Nye JS, editors. Market-based governance: Supply side, demand side, upside, and downside. Brookings Institution Press; 2004.
- Temesgen K, Workie A, Dilnessa T. The impact of COVID-19 infection on maternal and reproductive health care services in governmental health institutions of Dessie town, North-East Ethiopia, 2020 GC. MedRxiv. 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.09.20.20198259.
- 47. Bliznashka L, Ahun MN, Velthausz D, Donco R, Karuskina-Drivdale S, Pinto J, Yousafzai AK, Jeong J. Effects of COVID-19 on child health services utilization and delivery in rural Mozambique: a qualitative study. Health Policy and Planning. 2022; 37(6):737-746. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czac009.
- 48. Lazić A, Žeželj I. A systematic review of narrative interventions: lessons for countering anti-vaccination conspiracy theories and misinformation. Public Understanding of Science. 2021;30(6):644-70. doi: 10.1177/09636625211011881.
- 49. Betron ML, McClair TL, Currie S, Banerjee J. Expanding the agenda for addressing mistreatment in maternity care: a mapping review and gender analysis. Reproductive Health. 2018;15(1):1-3. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-018-0584-6</u>.

### **SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

- S1: Interview guide for mothers
- S2: Interview guide for health workers



# Individual factors

- Fear of infection
- □ Fear of quarantine
- Fear of infecting family members

Family's and partner's attitude

- Relationship with health workers
  - Mistreatment from health workers
  - Disrespect from health workers
  - Neglect of health workers

Mistrust in vaccines

Misinformation

Figure