**Original Article** 

# Factors Associated with Teenage Pregnancy: A Hospital-Based Case-Control Study

Chet Kant Bhusal<sup>1\*</sup>, Sigma Bhattarai<sup>2</sup>, Salau Din Myia<sup>3</sup>, Kishor Adhikari<sup>4</sup>, Saneep Shrestha<sup>1</sup>, Gunjan Pokhrel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Community Medicine, <sup>2</sup>Department of Nursing, Universal College of Medical Science and Teaching Hospital affiliated to Tribhuvan University, Bhairahawa, Rupandehi, Nepal <sup>3</sup>Department of Public Health CiST College, Sangamchock, Newbaneshor, Kathmandu, Nepal <sup>4</sup>School of Public Health and Department of Community Medicine, Chitwan Medical College

Email: <a href="mailto:bhusalck3112@qmail.com">bhusalck3112@qmail.com</a>; ORCID iD: <a href="mailto:https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1012-3699">https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1012-3699</a>

## **ABSTRACT**

**Background**: Teenage pregnancy is a major public health problem and is considered to be high risk for maternal health, pregnancy outcomes, and long-term effects. This study aims to determine the factors associated with teenage pregnancy among pregnant teenagers and non-teenagers in a tertiary hospital of Nepal.

**Methods**: A hospital-based case-control study was conducted using 1:2 case-control ratio among 109 pregnant teenagers and 218 non-teenage pregnant women attending antenatal service at a tertiary hospital of Rupandehi, Nepal, from October 2020 to February 2021. Two controls were selected on the same day when a case was identified. Variables found significance (p < 0.05) in bivariate analysis were entered into multivariable logistic regression to identify final associated factors.

**Results**: The mean age of cases was  $17.81 \pm 1.01$  years, while controls were  $25.35 \pm 2.46$  years. Women from Dalit caste (AOR=3.04, CI=1.02-9.07), engaged in business work (AOR= 0.23, CI= 0.10-0.57), food sufficiency for more than 12 months per year (AOR =2.83, CI= 1.09-7.31), family planning (AOR=2.38, CI=1.33-4.25) and anemia (AOR= 2.58, CI: 1.56-4.27) were positively associated with teenage pregnancy. Conversely, primary (AOR= 0.18, CI= 0.06-0.57), secondary (AOR= 0.13, CI= 0.06-0.26) and SLC and above education (AOR= 0.36, CI= 0.15-0.85) were found to be negatively associated.

**Conclusions**: Ethnicity, education, occupation, food sufficiency, family planning use and hemoglobin were found to be independently associated factors of teenage pregnancy. Thus, policy makers and administrators should focus on informal educational intervention, intervention for utilization skills of family planning, and nutrition promotion during pregnancy especially for disadvantages people.

**Keywords**: Teenage pregnancy, Adolescent, Case control, Antenatal services

#### **Article Information**

Received: 30 April 2024 Accepted: 29 November 2024 Published online: 29 November 2024

**Copyright** © 2024 by the author(s), wherein the author(s) are the only owners of the copyright of the published content **Licensing**: This published content is distributed under the terms of the <u>Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0)</u> license, and is free to access on the Journal's website. The author(s) retain ownership of the copyrights and publishing rights without limitations for their content, and they grant others permission to copy, use, print, share, modify, and distribute the article's content even for commercial purposes.

**Disclaimer**: This publication's claims, opinions, and information are the sole creations of the specific author(s) and contributor(s). Errors in the contents and any repercussions resulting from the use of the information included within are not the responsibility of the publisher, editor, or reviewers. Regarding any jurisdictional assertions in any published articles, their contents, and the author's institutional affiliations, the Journal and its publisher maintain their objectivity.

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding Author: Chet Kant Bhusal; Tel +977-9849021337;

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Teenage pregnancy is defined as pregnancy at the age of 10–19 years [1]. It is estimated that in developing countries, approximately 21 million girls aged 15-19 years' experience pregnancy, with approximately 12 million of them eventually giving birth [2]. Approximately half of these pregnancies are unwanted, and more than half of them result in unsafe abortion [3]. In developing countries, a minimum of 777,000 births occur among teenagers younger than 15 years of age [2]. South Asia has the highest prevalence of child marriages compared to other regions, with nearly half of all child marriages worldwide occurring in this region [4]. In Nepal, teenage pregnancy accounts for 17%, with 13% of teenagers having already given birth and 4% currently being pregnant with their first child [5]. Teenage pregnancy and its consequences are a significant concern from both public health and human rights perspectives, especially in low and middleincome countries, including those in South Asia [6]. Adolescent pregnancies have many lifethreatening effects in terms of physical, mental, sexual, economic, social, as well as reproductive health [7]. Globally, complications during pregnancy and childbirth are the leading cause of death among teenagers aged 15-19-years [8]. Hence, teenage pregnancy should be a priority issues in every healthcare system [7].

Evidence suggests that younger pregnant adolescents face an elevated increased risk of maternal outcomes, including nutritional anemia, preterm delivery, postpartum hemorrhage, preeclampsia, unsafe puerperal abortion, endometritis, and systemic infections, compared to adult women aged 20-24 years [1, 9]. Similarly, babies had born to adolescent mothers face higher risks of having low birth weight, fetal growth retardation, severe neonatal conditions, and infant mortality [9]. The teenage pregnancy is associated with a higher risk of prolonged labor and an increased likelihood of requiring a cesarean delivery, as their pelvis is immature, which can contribute to difficulties in labor progression and descent of the fetus [10]. Pregnancy and delivery during the period of adolescence not only effect on maternal and pregnancy-related outcomes but are also connected to age-appropriate education [19], increased health care costs and an increased risk of poverty [11]. Several studies conducted in different parts of world found that factors such as education, family history of teenage pregnancy, peer group influence, family instability, early age of marriage, lack of knowledge of sexuality, lack of knowledge and/or ineffective use of contraceptives are the influencing factors of teenage pregnancy [12].

Despite Nepal's legislative efforts to prevent teenage marriage below the age of 20 years [13], teenage pregnancy remains prevalent in Nepal, particularly in Terai region [14]. Existing studies lack comprehensive investigation into the associated risk factors [15]. Hence, this study aims to determine different factors associated with teenage pregnancy among pregnant teen and pregnant non-teen in a tertiary hospital in Nepal. **METHODS** 

## **Study Design and Population**

hospital-based case-control study was conducted at Universal College of Medical Science and Teaching Hospital (UCMS-TH), Bhairahawa Rupandehi Nepal, from October 2020 to February 2021. The study focused on pregnant women aged ≤ 29 years attending antenatal services of UCMS-TH. Cases included pregnant teenagers (15-19 years) who attended UCMH-TH from 20th October 2020 to 19th February 2021, while controls comprised non-teenage pregnant women (20-29 years) as in the previous studies [16-18] from the same hospital and time frame. Cases and controls were matched based on pregnancy status (only primigravida) and place of Antenatal Care (ANC) visit.

**Inclusion and Exclusion criteria:** Pregnant women who met the criteria for both the cases and controls, and were experiencing their first pregnancy while visiting the same ANC outpatient department, were included. Pregnant

women in both the case and control groups who had previously given birth or had severe mental health issues were excluded from the study.

# **Sample Size and Sampling Techniques**

The sample size 327 was calculated by using Open Epi Version 3.01 statistical software for unmatched case control study. The basic parameters assumed for calculating sample size were 95% confidence level, power of study 80%, a control-to-case ratio of 2: 1, minimum detectable odds ratio of two and a proportion of control exposed at 30% [19]. The calculated sample size was 104 cases and 207 controls. An additional 5% of the sample was taken to account for non-response rate adjustment, resulting in a final sample size of 109 cases and 218 controls. Purposive sampling technique was used to select the cases. Two controls were selected on the same day when a case was identified, and controls were randomly chosen in case of more than two eligible controls found on the same day.

# **Data Collection Procedures and Validity**

A set of semi-structured questionnaire was prepared after reviewing similar studies. The questionnaire was initially formulated in English language and then translated into Nepali. The Nepali version of the questionnaire was then retranslated into English to ensure consistency of the questionnaire as per the previous study [20]. Pretesting questionnaire was conducted among 10% of sample in private clinics of Bhairahawa, Rupandehi, Nepal. The Cronbach's alpha was calculated, yielding a value of 0.764, which indicates good reliability of the instruments. A two days training was provided to bachelor in public health student from UCMS for data collection procedure. Selected pregnant women underwent face-to-face interviews, and certain obstetric information was collected by reviewing participants' hospital records.

## **Data Processing and Analysis**

The collected data were manually checked, compiled, edited and entered into Microsoft

Excel, and subsequently, SPSS software version 22 was used to analyze the data. Simple frequency tables, cross tabulation, mean and standard deviation were used to present data. The association between dependent and independent variables was assessed using chisquare test with significance noted at p<0.05. Binary logistic regression was used to compute the crude odds ratio (COR) and confidence interval. Significant variables with p<0.05 in binary logistic regression were entered into multivariable logistic regression model to find the adjusted odds ratio (AOR) and confidence interval for the final factors of teenage pregnancy. The adequacy of the multivariate logistic regression model's fit was assessed using Nagelkerke's R Square and the -2 likelihood ratio. Similarly, multicollinearity was examined using the variation inflation factor (VIF) like that of the previous studies [21,22]. The value of Nagelkerke R square was 0.317 and -2 likelihood ratio was 331.410, indicating an adequate goodness of fit. Similarly, VIF of all independent variables were less than 10, with the highest value being 1.363, indicating the absence of multicollinearity among independent variables. After checking all the confounders, AORs were assessed, and their corresponding value at a 95% confidence interval were calculated using the multivariate logistic regression model to determine the net effect of independent variables in cases and control.

# Ethical consideration and informed consent

This study obtained ethical approval from Institutional Review Committee of Universal College of Medical Science and Teaching Hospital Bhairahawa, Rupandehi, Nepal (UCMS/IRC/073/20). All the respondents involved in the study were fully informed about the objectives of study, privacy and confidentiality of the collected data. After explaining about the study, written informed consent with a signature was taken from the literate respondents and thumb print was taken for illiterate respondents. For the respondents having age lesser than 18

years, assent of respondents along with their husband's or parent's written informed consent was taken.

#### **RESULTS**

Cases had a mean age of  $17.81 \pm 1.01$  years, while controls were older with a mean age of  $25.35 \pm 2.46$  years. The average family size was  $7.06 \pm 3.29$ . Among participants, 32.7% of women were Madeshi, comprising 21.1% of cases and 38.5% of controls. Urban dwellers constituted 51.1%, with 59.6% as cases and 46.8% as controls. Hinduism was predominant among both cases (88.1%) and controls (85.3%). Arranged marriages were common among cases (74.3%) and controls (85.8%). Large families (>4 members) were prevalent in cases (75.2%) and controls (80.7%), with joint families more common in cases (65.1%) and controls (66.5%). Controls had higher education levels (17.4%) compared to cases

(14.7%). Housewife was the primary occupation for cases (26.6%) and controls (32.6%) while agriculture was another significant occupation among cases (22.0%) and controls (31.2%). Both cases (75.2%) and controls (83.0%) were categorized as cash earners. A significant portion of participants had a monthly income between 10,000 and 19,999 Nepalese Rupees (NRs), with 44.0% of cases and 30.7% of controls within this range. The median family income was NRs 17,395.83 in the case group, NRs 18,805.97 in the control group and NRs 18,217.39 in overall. The family monthly income ranged from a minimum of NRs 7,000 to a maximum of NRs 56,000. Most parents were married and cohabiting for both cases (93.6%) and controls (94.0%). The highest percentage of controls (36.2%) and cases (15.6%) reported having food sufficiency for more than 12 months (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Background related characteristics among cases and control

Characteristics	Cases	(n=109 )	Conti	rol (n=218)	Tota	Total (n=327)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Caste/Ethnicity							
Brahmin/Chhetri	35	32.1	46	21.1	81	24.8	
Madeshi	23	21.1	84	38.5	107	32.7	
Dalits	9	8.3	25	11.5	34	10.4	
Janjati	31	28.4	27	12.4	58	17.7	
Muslim	11	10.1	36	16.5	47	14.4	
Residential Status							
Urban	65	59.6	102	46.8	167	51.1	
Rural	44	40.4	116	53.2	160	48.9	
Religion							
Hindu	96	88.1	186	85.3	282	86.2	
Other than Hindu	13	11.9	32	14.7	45	13.8	
Types of Marriage							
Arranged	81	74.3	187	85.8	268	82.0	
Loved	28	25.7	31	14.2	59	18.0	
Size of Family							
≤ 4 members	27	24.8	42	19.3	69	21.1	
> 4 members	82	75.2	176	80.7	258	78.9	
Mean family size ±S	D; 7.06±3.29						
Types of family							

Nuclear Joint Extended Education of Respondents Illiterate and Informal class Primary Secondary SLC/SEE and above Occupation of	27 71 11 23 11 59 16	24.8 65.1 10.1 21.1 10.1 54.1 14.7	46 145 27 118 12 50	21.1 66.5 12.4 54.1 5.5	73 216 38 141	22.3 66.1 11.6 43.1
Extended  Education of Respondents Illiterate and Informal class Primary Secondary SLC/SEE and above	11 23 11 59	10.1 21.1 10.1 54.1	27 118 12	12.4 54.1	38 141	11.6 43.1
Education of Respondents Illiterate and Informal class Primary Secondary SLC/SEE and above	23 11 59	21.1 10.1 54.1	118 12	54.1	141	43.1
Respondents Illiterate and Informal class Primary Secondary SLC/SEE and above	11 59	10.1 54.1	12			
Illiterate and Informal class Primary Secondary SLC/SEE and above	11 59	10.1 54.1	12			
Informal class Primary Secondary SLC/SEE and above	11 59	10.1 54.1	12			
Primary Secondary SLC/SEE and above	59	54.1		5.5	22	
Secondary SLC/SEE and above	59	54.1			23	7.0
SLC/SEE and above	16	14.7		22.9	109	33.3
•			38	17.4	54	16.5
Respondents						
Agriculture	24	22.0	68	31.2	92	28.1
Business	35	32.1	31	14.2	66	20.2
Service	6	5.5	16	7.3	22	6.7
Daily Wages	15	13.8	32	14.7	47	14.4
Homemaker	29	26.6	71	32.6	100	30.6
<b>Earning Status</b>						
Not Earning	27	24.8	37	17.0	64	19.6
Earning	82	75.2	181	83.0	263	80.4
<b>Marital Status of</b>						
Parents						
Married	102	93.6	205	94.0	307	93.9
Single, divorced or	7	6.4	13	6.0	20	6.1
widow/widower Family Monthly						
Income (NRs)						
Less than 10000	19	17.4	50	22.9	69	21.1
10000-19999	48	44.0	67	30.7	115	35.2
20000-30000	20	18.3	42	19.3	62	19.0
More than 30000	22	20.2	59	27.1	81	24.8
Median	173.	95.83	188	05.97	182	17.39
Food Sufficiency						
< 3 months	21	19.3	26	11.9	47	14.4
Up to 6 months	29	26.6	33	15.1	62	19.0
Up to 12 months	42	38.5	80	36.7	122	37.3
> 12 months (sell remaining Food)	17	15.6	79	36.2	96	29.4

SLC- School Leaving Certificate

The study revealed that in the case group, 95.4% of pregnancies were desired, compared to 92.2% in the controls. The majority of cases (92.7%) and controls (93.1%) expressed satisfaction with their

recent pregnancies. A higher percentage of cases (80.7%) than controls (66.1%) reported not using any family planning methods. Among those using family planning, irregular use of temporary

methods led to pregnancies for most women. Antenatal Care adherence was higher in controls (81.7%) than cases (69.7%). Similarly, complete immunization rates were higher among controls (90.4%) than cases (81.7%). Hemoglobin level in this study was categorized as  $\geq$  11gm/dl- No anemia and <11 gm/dl as anemia as per the National NDHS 2016 [6]. Anemia was more prevalent in cases (56.9%) than controls (38.1%). Underweight individuals were more common in cases (32.1%) than controls (22.9%). Pregnancy-

Induced Hypertension occurred in 4.6% of cases and 11.9% of controls. Cases had less discussion on sexual and reproductive health (SRH) in families (82.6%) compared to controls (71.6%). Cases (37.6%) reported more instances of teenage pregnancy in the family than controls (51.8%). Peer influence for sexual intercourse was higher in cases (21.1%) than controls (11.9%). Satisfaction with pregnancy experience was high among both cases and controls (**Table 2**).

Table 2: Pregnancy-related characteristics among cases and control

	- Cuscs (	:109)	Control (n=	210)	Total (n	=321)
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Pregnancy Status						
Wanted	104	95.4	201	92.2	305	93.3
Not wanted	5	4.6	17	7.8	22	6.7
Satisfaction towards						
recent pregnancy						
Satisfied	101	92.7	203	93.1	304	93.0
Not satisfied	8	7.3	15	6.9	23	7.0
Status of family						
planning use						
Not using	88	80.7	144	66.1	232	70.9
Using	21	19.3	74	33.9	95	29.1
ANC visit as per						
protocol						
Visited	76	69.7	178	81.7	254	77.7
Not visited	33	30.3	40	18.3	73	22.3
Immunization as per						
protocol						
Complete	89	81.7	197	90.4	286	87.5
Incomplete	20	18.3	21	9.6	41	12.5
Hemoglobin level						
No anemia	47	43.1	135	61.9	145	44.3
(≥11gm/dl)						
Anemia (<11gm/dl)	62	56.9	83	38.1	182	55.7
BMI Status						
Underweight	35	32.1	50	22.9	85	26.0
Healthy Weight	67	61.5	146	67.0	213	65.1
Overweight	7	6.4	22	10.1	29	8.9
Pregnancy Induced						
Hypertension (PIH)						
No PIH	104	95.4	192	88.1	296	90.5
PIH	5	4.6	26	11.9	31	9.5

Discussion on SRH in family						
No discussion	90	82.6	156	71.6	246	75.2
Discussion	19	17.4	62	28.4	81	24.8
History of Teenage pregnancy in family						
No	68	62.4	105	48.2	173	52.9
Yes	41	37.6	113	51.8	154	47.1
Peer Influence for						
sexual Intercourse						
Not Influenced	86	78.9	192	88.1	278	85.0
Influenced	23	21.1	26	11.9	49	15.0
Family Satisfaction						
on pregnancy						
Not Happy	8	7.3	10	4.6	18	5.5
Нарру	101	92.7	208	95.4	309	94.5
Siblings Satisfaction						
on pregnancy						
Not Happy	7	6.4	12	5.5	19	5.8
Нарру	102	93.6	206	94.5	308	94.2

Chi-square tests revealed significant associations (p < 0.05) between teenage pregnancy and ethnicity, residential status, marriage type, education, occupation, and household food sufficiency. Multivariable logistic regression highlighted ethnicity, analysis education, occupation, and food sufficiency as influential factors. Dalit caste women were 3.04 times more likely to experience teenage pregnancy than Brahmin or Chhetri (AOR=3.04, CI=1.02-9.07). Education correlated with decreased odds: primary (AOR= 0.18, CI= 0.06-0.57), secondary (AOR= 0.13, CI= 0.06-0.26), and SLC and above (AOR= 0.36, CI= 0.15-0.85) compared to illiterate. Cases showed higher illiteracy and informal education, while controls had higher education levels. Engagement in business, compared to agriculture, was 23% lower in cases (AOR= 0.23,

CI= 0.10-0.57). Food sufficiency for >12 months raised teenage pregnancy likelihood 2.83 times (AOR =2.83, CI= 1.09-7.31) **(Table 3)**.

Variables including family planning use, ANC visit, immunization, hemoglobin levels, induced hypertension pregnancy (PIH), discussion on sexual and reproductive health (SRH) in family, family history of teenage pregnancy and peer influence for sexual intercourse were significantly associated with (p<0.05) in bivariate analysis. Multivariable analysis model identified the status of family planning use and hemoglobin status as associated factors. Cases were 2.38 times more likely to use family planning (AOR=2.38, CI=1.33-4.25) and 2.58 times more likely to have anemia (AOR= 2.58, CI: 1.56-4.27) compared to controls (Table 4).

**Table 3:** Background-related factors associated with Teenage Pregnancy in using bivariate and multivariable analysis

mattra rabie anatyse									
Characteristics	Cases (n=109)	Control (n=218)	p-value	COR (95% CI)	AOR 95% CI				

Brahmin/Chhert   35   32.1   46   21.1   <0.001   1   1		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage			
Madeshi         23         21         84         38.5         2,78(1,47-5.26)         181(083-3.94)           Dalits         9         8.3         25         11.5         2,11(0.80-5.09)         3,04(1,02-9.07)           Janjatt         31         28.4         27         12.4         0.66(0.34-1.31)         0.58(0.24-1.39)           Muslin         11         10.1         36         16.5         2.49(1.11-5.77)         1.1(042-2.92)           Residential         5         59.6         102         46.8         0.029*         1         1           Rural         48         40.4         102         46.8         0.029*         1         1           Rural         48         40.4         102         46.8         0.029*         1         1           Rural         48         59.6         102         46.8         0.029*         1         1         1           Rural         48         40.1         18.6         85.3         0.496         1         ns         158           Other than         13         19.3         85.8         0.01*         1         ns         1         1         ns         1         1         1         <	Caste/Ethnicity							
Dalits	Brahmin/Chhetri	35	32.1	46	21.1		1	1
Muslim	Madeshi	23	21.1	84	38.5		2.78(1.47-5.26)	1.81(0.83-3.94)
Muslim	Dalits	9	8.3	25	11.5		2.11(0.88-5.09)	3.04(1.02-9.07)
Muslim	Janjati	31	28.4	27	12.4		0.66(0.34-1.31)	0.58(0.24-1.39)
Status         Urban         65         59.6         102         46.8         0.029*         1.68(1.05-2.68)         1.78(0.93-3.40)           Rural         48         59.6         102         46.8         0.029*         1.68(1.05-2.68)         1.78(0.93-3.40)           Religion           Hindu         96         88.1         186         85.3         0.496         1         ns           Other than         13         11.9         32         14.7         2.76(0.4-2.53)         1           Hindu         96         88.1         186         85.3         0.496         1         ns           Hindu           Types of           Hindu         4         1 <td>-</td> <td>11</td> <td>10.1</td> <td>36</td> <td>16.5</td> <td></td> <td>2.49(1.11-5.57)</td> <td></td>	-	11	10.1	36	16.5		2.49(1.11-5.57)	
Status         Urban         65         59.6         102         46.8         0.029*         1.68(1.05-2.68)         1.78(0.93-3.40)           Rural         48         59.6         102         46.8         0.029*         1.68(1.05-2.68)         1.78(0.93-3.40)           Religion           Hindu         96         88.1         186         85.3         0.496         1         ns           Other than         13         11.9         32         14.7         2.76(0.4-2.53)         1           Hindu         96         88.1         186         85.3         0.496         1         ns           Hindu           Types of           Hindu         4         1 <td>Residential</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Residential							
Nural   44   40.4   116   53.2   1.68(1.05-2.68)   1.78(0.93-3.40)	Status							
Religion	Urban	65	59.6	102	46.8	0.029*	1	1
Hindu	Rural	44	40.4	116	53.2		1.68(1.05-2.68)	1.78(0.93-3.40)
Other than Hindu         13   11.9   32   14.7   1.27(0.64-2.53)         1.27(0.64-2.53)         II.27(0.64-2.53)	Religion							
Hindu Types of Marriage Arranged 81 743 187 85.8 0.011* 1 1 Loved 28 25.7 31 14.2 0.48(0.27-0.85) 0.79(0.39-1.57)  Size of Family  ≤ 4 members 27 24.8 42 19.3 0.314 1 ns > 4 members 82 75.2 176 80.7 13.8(0.80-2.39)  Types of family  Nuclear 27 24.8 46 21.1 0.674 1 ns  Loted 17 65.1 145 66.5 1.20(0.69-2.09)  Extended 17 10.1 27 12.4 1.40(0.62-3.36)  Extended 18 10.1 18 54.1 18  Extended 19 10.1 18 54.1 18  Illiterate and 23 21.1 18 54.1 18  Informal class  Primary 11 10.1 12 5.5 0.21(0.89-0.94)  Excendary 59 54.1 50 22.9 0.17(0.09-0.30) 0.18(0.06-0.57)  Secondary 69 54.1 50 22.9 0.17(0.09-0.30) 0.13(0.66-0.57)  Excendary 69 54.1 50 22.9 0.17(0.09-0.30) 0.13(0.06-0.57)  Excendary 69 54.1 50 22.0 0.17(0.09-0.30) 0.13(0.06-0.57)  Excendary 6	Hindu	96	88.1	186	85.3	0.496	1	ns
Types of Marriage           Arranged         81         74.3         187         85.8         0.011*         1 <t< td=""><td>Other than</td><td>13</td><td>11.9</td><td>32</td><td>14.7</td><td></td><td>1.27(0.64-2.53)</td><td></td></t<>	Other than	13	11.9	32	14.7		1.27(0.64-2.53)	
Marriage         Arranged         81         74.3         187         85.8         0.011*         1         1           Loved         28         25.7         31         14.2         0.48(0.27-0.85)         0.79(0.39-1.57)           Size of Family           ≤ 4 members         27         24.8         42         19.3         0.314         1         ns           Types of family           Nuclear         27         24.8         46         21.1         0.674         1         ns           Joint         71         65.1         145         66.5         —         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1           Extended         11         10.1         27         12.4         1.44(0.62-3.36)         —           Extended         11         10.1         27         12.4         1.44(0.62-3.36)         —           Extended         11         10.1         27         12.4         1.44(0.62-3.36)         —           Extended         13         10.1         27         12.4         1.44(0.62-3.36)         —           Extended         13         10.1         2         1.2         1.2         —           Respondents<								
Arranged         81         74.3         187         85.8         0.011*         1         1           Loved         28         25.7         31         14.2         0.48(0.27-0.85)         0.79(0.39-1.57)           Size of Family           ≤ 4 members         27         24.8         42         19.3         0.314         1         ns           > 4 members         27         24.8         42         19.3         0.674         1         ns           Types of family           Nuclear         27         24.8         46         21.1         0.674         1         ns           Joint         71         65.1         145         66.5         1.20(0.69-2.09)	• •							
Loved         28         25.7         31         14.2         0.48(0.27-0.85)         0.79(0.39-1.57)           Size of Family           ≤ 4 members         27         24.8         42         19.3         0.314         1         ns           Types of family           Nuclear         27         24.8         46         21.1         0.674         1         ns           Joint         71         65.1         145         66.5         1.20(0.69-2.09)         ————————————————————————————————————	_	Q1	7/1 2	107	QE Q	0.011*	1	1
Size of Family         4 members         27         24.8         42         19.3         0.314         1         ns           > 4 members         82         75.2         176         80.7         1.38(0.80-2.39)         ns           Types of family           Nuclear         27         24.8         46         21.1         0.674         1         ns           Joint         71         65.1         145         66.5         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1           Extended         11         10.1         27         12.4         1.44(0.62-3.36)         1           Extended         11         10.1         27         12.4         - 1.44(0.62-3.36)         1           Extended         11         10.1         27         12.4         - 4.00         1         1         1           Extended         11         10.1         27         54.1         - 4.00         1         1         1           Extended         1         10.1         1         2         0.00         1         1         1           Secondary         59         54.1         50         22.9 <td>•</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.011</td> <td>•</td> <td></td>	•					0.011	•	
4 members         27         24.8         42         19.3         0.314         1         ns           > 4 members         82         75.2         176         80.7         1.38(0.80-2.39)         ns           Types of family           Nuclear         27         24.8         46         21.1         0.674         1         ns           Joint         71         65.1         145         66.5         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         2.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1         1         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1		20	25.7	31	14.2		0.46(0.27-0.65)	0.79(0.59-1.57)
Nuclear	-	27	24.0	40	10.3	0.244		
Types of family           Nuclear         27         24.8         46         21.1         0.674         1         ns           Joint         71         65.1         145         66.5         1.20(0.69-2.09)         Extended         11         10.1         27         12.4         1.44(0.62-3.36)         1         1         1         1         1         1         1.44(0.62-3.36)         1         1         1         1         1         1         1.44(0.62-3.36)         1						0.314		ns
Nuclear         27         24.8         46         21.1         0.674         1         ns           Joint         71         65.1         145         66.5         1.20(0.69-2.09)         1.20(0.69-2.09)           Extended         11         10.1         27         12.4         1.44(0.62-3.36)         1.20(0.69-2.09)           Education of Respondents         11         10.1         27         12.4         1.44(0.62-3.36)         1.20(0.69-2.09)           Illiterate and Informal class         23         21.1         118         54.1         <0.00		82	75.2	176	80.7		1.38(0.80-2.39)	
Doint   Total   Tota	• •							
Extended         11         10.1         27         12.4         1.44(0.62-3.36)         Lead of Control of Co	Nuclear					0.674		ns
Education of Respondents           Respondents         118         54.1         <0.00         1         1           Illiterate and Informal class         1         118         54.1         <0.00	Joint	71	65.1	145	66.5		1.20(0.69-2.09)	
Respondents	Extended	11	10.1	27	12.4		1.44(0.62-3.36)	
Illiterate and   23   21.1   118   54.1   <0.00   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1   1								
Informal class         1*           Primary         11         10.1         12         5.5         0.21(0.08-0.54)         0.18(0.06-0.57)           Secondary         59         54.1         50         22.9         0.17(0.09-0.30)         0.13(0.06-0.26)           SLC and above         16         14.7         38         17.4         0.46(0.22-0.97)         0.36(0.15-0.85)           Occupation of Respondents           Agriculture         24         22.0         68         31.2         0.005*         1         1         1           Business         35         32.1         31         14.2         0.31(0.16-0.61)         0.23(0.10-0.57)         5ervice         6         5.5         16         7.3         0.94(0.33-2.68)         0.77(0.21-2.76)         0.01(0.35-2.35)         0.01(0.35-2.35)         0.01(0.35-2.35)         0.01(0.35-2.35)         0.005*         1         0.005(0.46-1.63)         0.005(0.38-1.95)         0.005*	•	22	24.4	110	F.4.4	0.00	4	4
Primary         11         10.1         12         5.5         0.21(0.08-0.54)         0.18(0.06-0.57)           Secondary         59         54.1         50         22.9         0.17(0.09-0.30)         0.13(0.06-0.26)           SLC and above         16         14.7         38         17.4         0.46(0.22-0.97)         0.36(0.15-0.85)           Occupation of Respondents           Agriculture         24         22.0         68         31.2         0.005*         1         1         1           Business         35         32.1         31         14.2         0.31(0.16-0.61)         0.23(0.10-0.57)           Service         6         5.5         16         7.3         0.94(0.33-2.68)         0.77(0.21-2.76)           Daily Wages         15         13.8         32         14.7         0.75(0.35-1.63)         0.91(0.35-2.35)           Homemaker         29         26.6         71         32.6         0.86(0.46-1.63)         0.86(0.38-1.95)           Earning Status         Not Earning         27         24.8         37         17.0         0.094         1         ns		23	21.1	118	54.1		1	1
Secondary         59         54.1         50         22.9         0.17(0.09-0.30)         0.13(0.06-0.26)           SLC and above         16         14.7         38         17.4         0.46(0.22-0.97)         0.36(0.15-0.85)           Occupation of Respondents           Agriculture         24         22.0         68         31.2         0.005*         1         1         1           Business         35         32.1         31         14.2         0.31(0.16-0.61)         0.23(0.10-0.57)           Service         6         5.5         16         7.3         0.94(0.33-2.68)         0.77(0.21-2.76)           Daily Wages         15         13.8         32         14.7         0.75(0.35-1.63)         0.91(0.35-2.35)           Homemaker         29         26.6         71         32.6         0.86(0.46-1.63)         0.86(0.38-1.95)           Earning Status           Not Earning         27         24.8         37         17.0         0.094         1         ns		11	10.1	12	5.5	·	0.21(0.08-0.54)	0.18(0.06-0.57)
SLC and above       16       14.7       38       17.4       0.46(0.22-0.97)       0.36(0.15-0.85)         Occupation of Respondents         Agriculture       24       22.0       68       31.2       0.005*       1       1       1         Business       35       32.1       31       14.2       0.31(0.16-0.61)       0.23(0.10-0.57)         Service       6       5.5       16       7.3       0.94(0.33-2.68)       0.77(0.21-2.76)         Daily Wages       15       13.8       32       14.7       0.75(0.35-1.63)       0.91(0.35-2.35)         Homemaker       29       26.6       71       32.6       0.86(0.46-1.63)       0.86(0.38-1.95)         Earning Status         Not Earning       27       24.8       37       17.0       0.094       1       ns								
Occupation of Respondents           Agriculture         24         22.0         68         31.2         0.005*         1         1           Business         35         32.1         31         14.2         0.31(0.16-0.61)         0.23(0.10-0.57)           Service         6         5.5         16         7.3         0.94(0.33-2.68)         0.77(0.21-2.76)           Daily Wages         15         13.8         32         14.7         0.75(0.35-1.63)         0.91(0.35-2.35)           Homemaker         29         26.6         71         32.6         0.86(0.46-1.63)         0.86(0.38-1.95)           Earning Status           Not Earning         27         24.8         37         17.0         0.094         1         ns	•							
Respondents         Agriculture       24       22.0       68       31.2       0.005*       1       1         Business       35       32.1       31       14.2       0.31(0.16-0.61)       0.23(0.10-0.57)         Service       6       5.5       16       7.3       0.94(0.33-2.68)       0.77(0.21-2.76)         Daily Wages       15       13.8       32       14.7       0.75(0.35-1.63)       0.91(0.35-2.35)         Homemaker       29       26.6       71       32.6       0.86(0.46-1.63)       0.86(0.38-1.95)         Earning Status         Not Earning       27       24.8       37       17.0       0.094       1       ns		. •		30			0.10(0.22 0.01)	
Agriculture       24       22.0       68       31.2       0.005*       1       1         Business       35       32.1       31       14.2       0.31(0.16-0.61)       0.23(0.10-0.57)         Service       6       5.5       16       7.3       0.94(0.33-2.68)       0.77(0.21-2.76)         Daily Wages       15       13.8       32       14.7       0.75(0.35-1.63)       0.91(0.35-2.35)         Homemaker       29       26.6       71       32.6       0.86(0.46-1.63)       0.86(0.38-1.95)         Earning Status       Not Earning       27       24.8       37       17.0       0.094       1       ns								
Service       6       5.5       16       7.3       0.94(0.33-2.68)       0.77(0.21-2.76)         Daily Wages       15       13.8       32       14.7       0.75(0.35-1.63)       0.91(0.35-2.35)         Homemaker       29       26.6       71       32.6       0.86(0.46-1.63)       0.86(0.38-1.95)         Earning Status         Not Earning       27       24.8       37       17.0       0.094       1       ns	•	24	22.0	68	31.2	0.005*	1	1
Daily Wages       15       13.8       32       14.7       0.75(0.35-1.63)       0.91(0.35-2.35)         Homemaker       29       26.6       71       32.6       0.86(0.46-1.63)       0.86(0.38-1.95)         Earning Status         Not Earning       27       24.8       37       17.0       0.094       1       ns	Business	35	32.1	31	14.2		0.31(0.16-0.61)	0.23(0.10-0.57)
Daily Wages       15       13.8       32       14.7       0.75(0.35-1.63)       0.91(0.35-2.35)         Homemaker       29       26.6       71       32.6       0.86(0.46-1.63)       0.86(0.38-1.95)         Earning Status         Not Earning       27       24.8       37       17.0       0.094       1       ns	Service	6	5.5	16	7.3		0.94(0.33-2.68)	0.77(0.21-2.76)
Homemaker       29       26.6       71       32.6       0.86(0.46-1.63)       0.86(0.38-1.95)         Earning Status         Not Earning       27       24.8       37       17.0       0.094       1       ns	Daily Wages	15	13.8	32	14.7		0.75(0.35-1.63)	0.91(0.35-2.35)
Earning Status           Not Earning         27         24.8         37         17.0         0.094         1         ns		29	26.6	71	32.6		0.86(0.46-1.63)	0.86(0.38-1.95)
Not Earning 27 24.8 37 17.0 0.094 1 ns								
3	_	27	24.8	37	17.0	0.094	1	ns
	Earning	82	75.2	181	83.0		1.61(0.92-2.82)	

Marital Status of Parents Married	102	93.6	205	94.0	0.870	1	ns
Single, divorced or widow/widower	7	6.4	13	6.0		0.92(0.36-2.39)	
Family Monthly Income (NRs)							
Less than 10000	19	17.4	50	22.9	0.106	1	ns
10000-19999	48	44.0	67	30.7		0.53(0.28-1.01	
20000-30000	20	18.3	42	19.3		0.80(0.38-1.69)	
More than 30000	22	20.2	59	27.1		1.02(0.50-2.09)	
<b>Food Sufficiency</b>							
< 3 months	21	19.3	26	11.9	<0.00 1*	1	1
Up to 6 months	29	26.6	33	15.1		0.92(0.43-1.97)	0.72(0.28-1.86)
Up to 12 months	42	38.5	80	36.7		1.54(0.78-3.05)	1.44(0.60-3.41)
> 12 months	17	15.6	79	36.2		3.75(1.72-8.17)	2.83(1.09-7.31)

<sup>\*</sup> Significant at p< 0.05, 1=reference category, COR = crude odds ratio, AOR = adjusted odds ratio, ns = not significant in bivariate analysis

**Table 4:** Pregnancy related factors associated with Teenage Pregnancy in using bivariate and multivariable analysis

Characteristics	Cases (n=109)		Control (n=218)		p value	COR (95% CI)	AOR 95% CI
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	_		
Pregnancy							
Status							
Wanted	104	95.4	201	92.2	0.275	1	ns
Not wanted	5	4.6	17	7.8		1.76(0.63-4.90)	
Satisfaction							
towards recent							
pregnancy							
Satisfied	101	92.7	203	93.1	0.878	1	ns
Not satisfied	8	7.3	15	6.9		0.93(0.38-2.27)	
Status of family planning use							
Not using	88	80.7	144	66.1	0.006*	1	1
Using	21	19.3	74	33.9		2.15(1.24-3.74)	2.38(1.33-4.25)
ANC visit as per protocol							
Visited	76	69.7	178	81.7	0.015*	1	1
Not visited	33	30.3	40	18.3		1.93(1.33-3.29)	0.77(0.39-1.51)
Immunization							
<b>as per protocol</b> Complete	89	81.7	197	90.4	0.025	1	1

Incomplete	20	18.3	21	9.6		0.47(0.25-0.92)	0.63(0.29-1.39)
Hemoglobin							
level			40-				
No anemia	47	43.1	135	61.9	0.001*	1	1
Anemia	62	56.9	83	38.1		3.49(2.16-5.66)	2.58(1.56-4.27)
<b>BMI Status</b>							
Underweight	35	32.1	50	22.9	0.150	1	ns
Healthy Weight	67	61.5	146	67.0		1.53(0.91-2.57)	
Overweight	7	6.4	22	10.1		2.20(0.85-5.71)	
PIH							
No PIH	104	95.4	192	88.1	0.033*	1	1
PIH	5	4.6	26	11.9		2.81(1.05-7.55)	2.79(0.99-7.87)
Discussion on SRH in family							
No discussion	90	82.6	156	71.6	0.030*	1	1
Discussion	19	17.4	62	28.4		0.53(0.30-0.95)	1.79(0.96-3.31)
History of Teenage pregnancy in family							
No	68	62.4	105	48.2	0.015*	1	1
Yes	41	37.6	113	51.8		1.79(1.12-2.86)	1.47(0.89-2.43)
Peer Influence for sexual Intercourse							
Not Influenced	86	78.9	192	88.1	0.028	1	1
Influenced	23	21.1	26	11.9		1.98(1.07-3.66)	1.54(0.77-3.08)
Family Satisfaction on pregnancy							
Not Happy	8	7.3	10	4.6	0.304	1	ns
Нарру	101	92.7	208	95.4		1.65(0.63-4.30)	
Siblings Satisfaction on pregnancy							
Not Happy	7	6.4	12	5.5	0.738	1	ns
Нарру	102	93.6	206	94.5		1.18(0.45-3.08)	

<sup>\*</sup> Significant at p< 0.05, 1=reference category, COR = crude odds ratio, AOR = adjusted odds ratio, ns = not significant in bivariate analysis

## **DISCUSSION**

Women who were from Dalit caste were three times more likely to be pregnant at the age of teenage than those who were from Brahmin or Chhetri. This finding is consistent with pooled analysis of Nepal Demographic and Health Surveys (2006, 2011 and 2016) [23] and another hospital based case-control study conducted in Pokhara Nepal where teenage pregnancy was higher among Dalit and disadvantaged ethnicity [16]. In concordance to this study several other studies conducted in Nepal [15, 24] and Ethiopia [25] found lower ethnic background were significantly more likely to have teenage pregnancy. Dalit women had a greater rate of teenage pregnancy; the observed situation could be attributed to the fact that Dalit belongs to a lower caste. while Nepalese culture predominately controlled by upper castes [26]. Women having formal education were less likely to have teenage pregnancy compared to those who were illiterate. This finding is in line with several other studies conducted in Nepal [16, 23] and Ethiopia [27]. This could be attributed to the that education promotes autonomy, decision-making ability, and economic liberation, leading to the postponement of the marriage [28]. In the present study, women involved in business work were less likely to experience teenage pregnancy compared to those who involved in agriculture work. This finding is consistent with study conducted in Nepal [16], Uganda [29]. A possible explanation for this is that women engaged in business tend to have more exposure to people and various social determinants of health. As a result, they may find it challenging to allocate sufficient time for their families and raising children [29, 30]. Teenage pregnancies were nearly three times more likely among respondents who had food sufficiency for more than 12 month per year compared to those with food sufficiency for less than 3 months in a year. This finding is concordance with the finding of previous study conducted in rural Honduras where teenage pregnancy was significantly associated with food security [31]. This could be because women with sufficient food availability do not have to worry as much about raising, feeding, and providing for the education of their

children. However, they might not be fully conscious of health impact and consequences of early-age pregnancy.

In the present study family planning users were at higher risk of experiencing teenage pregnancy compared to those who did not used family planning. This result contrasts with the finding of another study conducted in Ethiopia [25], which found that contraceptives non users were more likely to be pregnant. This might indicate that despite a higher proportion of family planning users in developing countries, there is still higher contraceptives failure, irregular use of temporary methods, inadequate counseling on family planning, low awareness, and low utilization skills, resulting in unplanned and unwanted pregnancies [32]. However, this finding is consistent with the previous case control study conducted in Ethiopia, where bivariate analysis showed that current users of contraceptives were nearly 5 times more likely to be pregnant 33]. In this study, women having teenage pregnancy had a significantly higher risk of anemia. This finding is in line with several other studies, conducted in West Bengal, India [9] and Uganda [26]. This association may be attributed to both the physiological and social factors. adolescence, a rapid growth and the onset of menstruation deplete the body's iron reserves. Additionally, pregnant teenagers may be less likely to engage in professional job due to their lower educational status, lack of sufficient experiences [60], and their younger age [34]. Consequently, we hypothesize that these women may have limited access to nutritious foods or lack understanding of nutrition.

Implications of the study: Nepal's government has implemented laws and strategies for prohibiting adolescent marriage and improves teen well-being, aiming to reduce teenage pregnancy rates. However, teenage pregnancy remains a significant public health and social concern in Nepal, hindering progress towards Sustainable Development Goal 3, in reducing maternal mortality rate to at least 70 per 100,000

live births and neonatal mortality rate to at least 12 per 1000 live births. Analytical data on factors contributing to teenage pregnancies in Nepal are scare. Thus, this study's findings will be valuable insights for healthcare professionals and policymakers to develop targeted strategies for reducing teenage pregnancy in Nepal. Additionally, this study will serve as a baseline data for further research and policy formulation.

**Limitations of the study:** This study was conducted in a single tertiary hospital, underscoring the need for broader communitybased research. Previous studies often used pregnant teenagers (15-19 years) as cases and non-pregnant peers as controls. However, this study diverged by selecting pregnant individuals aged 15-19 as cases and non-teens as controls, aiming to explore pregnancy-related factors alongside socio-demographic and socioeconomic elements. Further research with larger sample sizes and matched age groups are recommended to mitigate potential selection biases arising from educational opportunities influenced by age differences among respondents.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

Ethnicity, women's education, occupation, food sufficiency, family planning use and hemoglobin level was found to be independent associated factors teenage of pregnancy. Teenage pregnancy was significantly high among Dalit women, those who have food sufficiency for more than 12 months per year, using family planning methods and anemic women. Similarly, it was significantly low among formally educated and business women. Thus policy makers and local focus on administrators should increasing awareness related program regarding reproductive health, programs to promote communication between teenagers and their parents, should emphasize on providing employment, and develop intervention for providing counseling on utilization skills of family planning, and promotion of nutritional diet during pregnancy especially for disadvantages people, such as Dalits.

**Data Availability:** The data used to support the findings of this study will be provided from the corresponding author upon request.

**Conflicts of Interests:** The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

**Funding Statement:** No any external financial support for this study

**Acknowledgements:** Authors would like to express gratitude to Universal College of Medical Sciences and Teaching Hospital for granting approval for this study. We would like to acknowledge bachelor in public health students Mr. Chandra Mohan Yadav, Mr. Humnath Ale, Ms. Kumari Sweta Gupta Kalwar, Ms. Madhu Chaudary, Ms. Prakriti Bhandari, Ms. Radha Kafle, Mr. Suraj Kumar Kandu and Ms. Sushmita Pokhrel for their assistant in data collection. Last but not least, we extend heartfelt thanks to all study participants for their invaluable time and support. **List of abbreviations:** ANC: Antenatal care; AOR: Adjusted odds ratio; BMI: Body mass index; CI: Confidence interval; COR: Crude odds ratio; IRC: Institutional review committee; NRs: Nepalese rupees; OPD: Outpatient department; OR: Odds ratio; PIH: Pregnancy induced hypertension; SD: Standard deviation; SLC: School certificate; SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences; SRH: Sexual and reproductive health; UCMS-TH: Universal College of Medical Sciences and Teaching Hospital; VIF: Variation inflation factor

#### **REFERENCES**

 Kawakita T, Wilson K, Grantz KL, Landy HJ, Huang C-C, Gomez-Lobo V. Adverse maternal and neonatal outcomes in adolescent pregnancy. Journal of pediatric and adolescent gynecology. 2016;29(2):130-6. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4886236/ [PMC] [Pubmed] [PMID][DOI].

- 2. WHO Facts sheet, "Adolescent and young adult health," 2021. Accessed on: 15 February 2021. Available from: <a href="https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescents-health-risks-and-solutions">https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/adolescents-health-risks-and-solutions</a>. [Link]
- 3. Darroch JE, Woog V, Bankole A, Ashford LS. Adding it up: costs and benefits of meeting the contraceptive needs of adolescents. 2016. Available from: https://www.guttmacher.org/report/adding-it-meeting-contraceptive-needs-of-adolescents [Weblink].
- 4. Birechi J. Child Marriage; A Cultural Health Phenomenon. 2013. Available from: https://library.adhl.africa/handle/123456789/7363 [Googlescholar] [Link].
- 5. Ministry of Health, Nepal; New ERA; and ICF (2017) Nepal Demographic and Health Survey 2016. Kathmandu, Nepal: Ministry of Health, Nepal Available from: https://www.dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/fr336/fr336.pdf. [Fulltext]. .
- 6. Acharya DR, Bhattarai R, Poobalan A, Teijlingen vE, Chapman G. Factors associated with teenage pregnancy in South Asia. 2014. [Link] [Fulltextpdf].
- 7. Mersal F, Esmat O, Khalil G. Effect of prenatal counselling on compliance and outcomes of teenage pregnancy. EMHJ-Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal, 19 (1), 10-17, 2013. [PMID] [Pubmed].
- 8. Neal S, Matthews Z, Frost M, Fogstad H, Camacho AV, Laski L. Childbearing in adolescents aged 12–15 years in low resource countries: a neglected issue. New estimates from demographic and household surveys in 42 countries. Acta obstetricia et gynecologica Scandinavica. 2012;91(9):1114-8. [PMID] [DOI].
- 9. Banerjee B, Pandey G, Dutt D, Sengupta B, Mondal M, Deb S. Teenage pregnancy: a socially inflicted health hazard. Indian journal of community medicine: official publication of Indian Association of Preventive & Social Medicine. 2009;34(3):227.[PMID] [PMCID] [DOI]
- 10. Ganchimeg T, Ota E, Morisaki N, Laopaiboon M, Lumbiganon P, Zhang J, et al. Pregnancy and childbirth outcomes among adolescent mothers: a W orld H ealth O rganization multicountry study. BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology. 2014;121:40-8. [PMID] [DOI] [Link].
- 11. Nord CW, Moore KA, Morrison DR, Brown B, Myers DE. Consequences of teen-age parenting. Journal of School Health. 1992;62(7):310-8. [PMID] [DOI] [Link].
- 12. Osaikhuwuomwan JA, Osemwenkha AP. Adolescents' perspective regarding adolescent pregnancy, sexuality and contraception. Asian pacific journal of reproduction. 2013;2(1):58-62. [DOI] [Link].
- 13. National Code (Muluki Ain) 2020 (1963) Equal Rights Trust. Accessed on : 15 March 2022. Available on: <a href="http://www.lawcommission.gov.np">http://www.lawcommission.gov.np</a>. [Link].
- 14. Gautam L, Gupta A, Khadka R, Pant GP. A Study to Assess Contributing Factors of Teenage Pregnancy in Sunsari District of Nepal. Indian Journal of Youth and Adolescent Health (E-ISSN: 2349-2880). 2020;7(2):5-11. [DOI].
- 15. Pradhan R, Wynter K, Fisher J. Factors associated with pregnancy among married adolescents in Nepal: secondary analysis of the National demographic and health surveys from 2001 to 2011. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2018;15(2):229. [PMID] [PMCID] [DOI].
- 16. Neupane N, Bhandari P, Kaphle HP. Factors Associated with Teenage Pregnancy: A Case Control Study. Journal of Health and Allied Sciences. 2019;9(1):21-7. [DOI] [Link]
- 17. Omar K, Hasim S, Muhammad NA, Jaffar A, Hashim SM, Siraj HH. Adolescent pregnancy outcomes and risk factors in Malaysia. International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics. 2010;111(3):220-3. [PMID] [DOI]
- 18. Sharma AK, Verma K, Khatri S, Kannan A. Determinants of pregnancy in adolescents in Nepal. The Indian journal of pediatrics. 2002;69(1):19-22. [PMID] [DOI]
- 19. A. G. Dean, K. M. Sullivan, and M. M. Soe, "Openepi: open source epidemiologic statistics for public health," 2013. Available from: https://www.openepi.com/Menu/OE Menu.htm. [Link]

- 20. Bhusal CK, Bhattarai S, Chhetri P, Myia SD. Nutritional status and its associated factors among under five years Muslim children of Kapilvastu district, Nepal. PloS one. 2023;18(1):e0280375. [PMID] [PMCID] [DOI] [Link]
- 21. Bhusal CK, Bhattarai S, Kafle R, Shrestha R, Chhetri P, Adhikari K. Level and associated factors of knowledge regarding menstrual hygiene among school-going adolescent girls in Dang district, Nepal. Advances in preventive medicine. 2020;2020.[PMID] [PMCID] [DOI] [Link]
- 22. Bhusal CK. Determinant of Mother's Health Promotional Measures Practice of Infant with Age 6–12 Months in a Tertiary Hospital of Nepal. Advances in Preventive Medicine. 2021;2021. [PMID] [PMCID] [DOI] [Link]
- 23. Poudel S, Upadhaya N, Khatri RB, Ghimire PR. Trends and factors associated with pregnancies among adolescent women in Nepal: Pooled analysis of Nepal Demographic and Health Surveys (2006, 2011 and 2016). PloS one. 2018;13(8):e0202107. [PMID] [PMCID] [DOI]
- 24. Gurung R, Målqvist M, Hong Z, Poudel PG, Sunny AK, Sharma S, et al. The burden of adolescent motherhood and health consequences in Nepal. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2020;20:1-7. [PMID] [PMCID] [DOI]
- 25. Beyene A, Muhiye A, Getachew Y, Hiruye A, Haile Mariam D, Derbew M. Assessment of the magnitude of teenage pregnancy and its associated factors among teenage females visiting Assosa General Hospital. EMJ. 2015:25-37. [PMID]
- 26. Ononge S, Campbell O, Mirembe F. Haemoglobin status and predictors of anaemia among pregnant women in Mpigi, Uganda. BMC research notes. 2014;7(1):1-8. [PMID] [PMCID] [DOI]
- 27. Ayele BGk, Gebregzabher TG, Hailu TT, Assefa BA. Determinants of teenage pregnancy in Degua Tembien District, Tigray, Northern Ethiopia: A community-based case-control study. PloS one. 2018;13(7):e0200898. [PMID] [PMCID] [DOI]
- 28. Undie C-C, MacKenzie I, Birungi H, Barongo S, Ahindukha D, Omondi C. Education sector response to early and unintended pregnancy: A policy dialogue in Homa Bay County, Kenya. 2015. [Link] [Fulltextpdf]
- 29. Ochen AM, Chi PC, Lawoko S. Predictors of teenage pregnancy among girls aged 13–19 years in Uganda: a community based case-control study. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2019;19(1):1-14. [PMID] [PMCID] [DOI]
- 30. Poduval J, Poduval M. Working mothers: how much working, how much mothers, and where is the womanhood? Mens sana monographs. 2009;7(1):63. [PMID] [PMCID] [DOI]
- 31. Shakya H, Weeks J, Christakis N, editors. Village Level Normative: Spatial and Social Network Predictors of Adolescent Pregnancy in Rural Honduras. PAA 2018 Annual Meeting; 2018: PAA. [Googlescholar]
- 32. Arcidiacono P, Khwaja A, Ouyang L. Habit persistence and teen sex: Could increased access to contraception have unintended consequences for teen pregnancies? Journal of Business & Economic Statistics. 2012;30(2):312-25. [DOI] [Link]
- 33. Geda YF. Determinants of teenage pregnancy in Ethiopia: a case–control study, 2019. Current medical issues. 2019;17(4):10.4103/cmi. cmi\_12\_19. [DOI] [Link]60.
- 34. Cook SM, Cameron ST. Social issues of teenage pregnancy. Obstetrics, Gynaecology & Reproductive Medicine. 2015;25(9):243-8. [DOI] [Link]