### **SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 4:**

Equity and intrapartum care by skilled birth attendant globally: data extraction form

#### Notes:

- Please be consistent in the order and style used to enter information for each item.
- Please record missing data as unclear or missing in the study report.
- If an item is not applicable, please mark as NA.

### **General information**

General Data	
1. Study ID	
<ol><li>Date form completed</li></ol>	
(dd/mm/yy)	
3. Primary author	
4. Name of reviewer	
5. Study title	
6. Year of publication	
7. Journal	
8. Country	
9. Study funding source	
10. Conflict of interest	
(reviewer)	☐ Yes ☐ No

# Study Eligibility

Review	of inclusion crite	ria				
Study characteristics Eligibility criteria		Eligibility criteria met?		Location in text or source		
			Yes	No	Unclear	(pg/fig/table)
1.	Population	Women who experienced childbirth within the scope of the specific study.				
2.	Intervention	Access to skilled care with SBA or institutional deliveries				
3.	Comparison	Utilization of non-SBA birth attendants or traditional birth attendants at the time of delivery.				
4.	Outcome	Evaluation of inequity in access to SBA at the time of childbirth.				
5.	Study design	All observational quantitative studies on human subjects (including but not limited to prospective and retrospective cohort studies, cross-sectional studies, mixmethods studies).				
6.	Context	All countries with health facility and/or community-based services offering childbirth care.				
7.	Results	Quantitative results of the association between potential determinants and access to SBA				
8.	Decision	☐ Include ☐ Exclude				
9.	Reason for exclusion					
Notes:						

## Methods

Study c	haracteristics				
10.	Aim of study				
11.	Study design	□ cross-se		□ cohort	☐ mixed-methods
12.	Unit of allocation (part/person/group)				
13.	Start date (dd/mm/yy)				
14.	End date (dd/mm/yy)				
15.	Duration of participation (from recruitment to last follow up)				
16.	Ethics approval obtained?	□ yes	□ no	☐ not nee	eded
Notes:					
Popula	tion and setting				
	Population description (from which study participants are drawn)				
18.	Setting (including location and social context)				
19.	Specific geographic region				
20.	Inclusion criteria				
21.	Exclusion criteria				
22.	Method(s) of participant recruitment				
23.	Informed consent?	□ yes	□ no	□ not nee	ded

24. Participants (n)	
25. Subgroups (n)	SBA/institutional delivery
	TAB or other non-SBA birth attendant delivery
	Non-institutional delivery
	Other
Notes:	

## Intervention

Attendants at birth	
26. SBA cadre included (check all correct answers)	□ nurse □ nurse-midwife □ clinical officer/physician  assistant □ doctor □ unspecified
	□ other:
27. Details of SBA care	Any additional measure (add details to note section below):  ☐ time spent ☐ intrapartum care only ☐ postpartum care
	only ☐ quality of care received ☐ felt respected by  SBA ☐ Other
28. Non-SBA cadre included (check all correct answers)	☐ traditional birth attendant ☐ unspecified ☐ other:
29. Facility included (check all correct answers)	□ birth centre     □ health centre     □ district/local hospital       □ referral/tertiary hospital     □ unspecified       □ other:     □
Notes:	

### Outcomes

Equity/inequity and Results	
30. Primary outcome	
31. Participant determinants included <sup>1</sup>	☐ Place of residence:
(check all applicable)	Definition/stratification:
	☐ Urban/rural/humanitarian
	$\square$ Geographic distinction
	☐ Transportation access
	☐ Road access
	☐ Race/Ethnicity/culture/language:
	Definition/stratification:
	Occupation:
	Definition/stratification:
	<u>Gender</u> :
	☐ Employment in non-agricultural sector
	☐ Children <15 years old working
	☐ Gender/Sex:
	Definition/stratification:
	<u>Gender</u> :
	$\square$ Intimate partner violence (recent/ever)

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from the Progress-Plus framework; O'Neill J, Tabish H, Welch V, Petticrew M, Pottie K, Clarke M, et al. Applying an equity lens to interventions: using PROGRESS ensures consideration of socially stratifying factors to illuminate inequities in health. J Clin Epidemiol. 2014;67(1):56-64.

☐ Power differential
☐ Acceptability of suggesting condom use, refusing sex
☐ Age difference of sex partner
$\square$ Decision making about own health
☐ Marriage/union
$\square$ choice of spouse
$\square$ age < 15 years old / < 18 years old
Sexual health:
$\square$ Sex before age 15
$\square$ History of sexual violence (recent/ever) and or by age 18 years
$\square$ History of female genital cutting
Reproductive/maternal health:
☐ Parity/grand-multiparity
$\square$ Adolescent pregnancy
$\square$ Obstetrical history
$\square$ self – complications/adverse outcome
$\Box$ other – complications/adverse outcome
$\square$ Four or more antenatal visits
$\square$ Early postnatal/postpartum care (within 2 days)
$\square$ Uterotonic immediately after birth (facility birth)
☐ Contraception use
☐ Religion:
Definition/stratification:
☐ Education:
Definition/stratification:

<u>Gender</u> :
☐ Primary/secondary/tertiary education
☐ Literacy
☐ Socioeconomic status:
Definition/stratification:
$\square$ Access to safely managed sanitation services (e.g.
hand-washing with water and soap)
☐ Children with stunting < 5 years of age
☐ Primary reliance on clean fuels and technology
Gender:
☐ Ownership (goods/land/bank account)
$\square$ Technology use (mobile phone/internet/media)
☐ Social capital:
Definition/stratification:
☐ Personal characteristics that attract discrimination:
Definition/stratification:
☐ Young/old age
☐ Orphan
☐ Sex worker
☐ Features of relationships:
Definition/stratification:

	<u>Gender</u> :
	☐ Single/divorced/widowed
	$\square$ Husband's characteristics (e.g. education, etc.)
	☐ Other:
	☐ Time-dependent relationships:
	Definition/stratification:
	☐ Pregnant/postpartum/breastfeeding
	☐ Humanitarian setting (e.g. refugee, internally displaced person)
	☐ Political instability
	☐ Other:
	□ other:
	Definition/stratification:
	□ other:
	Definition/stratification:
32. Systematic determinants	_
included <i>(check all</i>	☐ Maternal mortality ratio
applicable)	☐ Maternal cause of death (based on ICD-MM coding)
	☐ Maternal death registration
	☐ Under-5 mortality rate
	☐ Neonatal mortality rate
	☐ Proportion of children < 5 years old with registered birth

	☐ Stillbirth rate
	☐ C-section rate
	☐ Availability of functional Emergency Obstetric Care facilities
	☐ Adolescent mortality rate
	☐ Out-of-pocket as a percentage of total health expenditure
	☐ Current country health expenditure per capita
	☐ Presence of laws/regulations that guarantee SRH care
33. Participant determinants that were statistically	☐ Place of residence:
significant (check all correct answers)	Definition/stratification:
	$\square$ Urban/rural/humanitarian
	$\square$ Geographic distinction
	☐ Transportation access
	☐ Road access
	☐ Race/Ethnicity/culture/language:
	Definition/stratification:
	☐ Occupation:
	Definition/stratification:
	<u>Gender</u> :
	☐ Employment in non-agricultural sector
	☐ Children <15 years old working
	☐ Gender/Sex:
	Definition/stratification:

Gender:
$\square$ Intimate partner violence (recent/ever)
$\square$ Power differential
☐ Acceptability of suggesting condom use, refusing sex
☐ Age difference of sex partner
☐ Decision making about own health
☐ Marriage/union
$\square$ choice of spouse
$\square$ age < 15 years old / < 18 years old
Sexual health:
☐ Sex before age 15
$\square$ History of sexual violence (recent/ever) and or by age 18 years
$\square$ History of female genital cutting
Reproductive/maternal health:
☐ Parity/grand-multiparity
$\square$ Adolescent pregnancy
☐ Obstetrical history
$\square$ self – complications/adverse outcome
$\Box$ other – complications/adverse outcome
$\square$ Four or more antenatal visits
$\square$ Early postnatal/postpartum care (within 2 days)
$\square$ Uterotonic immediately after birth (facility birth)
☐ Contraception use
☐ Religion:
Definition/stratification:
☐ Education:

Definition/stratification:
Gender:
$\square$ Primary/secondary/tertiary education
☐ Literacy
☐ Socioeconomic status:
Definition/stratification:
$\square$ Access to safely managed sanitation services (e.g.
hand-washing with water and soap)
☐ Children with stunting < 5 years of age
$\square$ Primary reliance on clean fuels and technology
<u>Gender</u> :
<u>Genuer</u> .  ☐ Ownership (goods/land/bank account)
☐ Technology use (mobile phone/internet/media)
☐ Social capital:
Definition/stratification:
$\square$ Personal characteristics that attract discrimination:
Definition/stratification:
☐ Young/old age
☐ Orphan
☐ Sex worker

	☐ Features of relationships:  Definition/stratification:			
	Gender:  ☐ Single/divorced/widowed ☐ Husband's characteristics (e.g. education, etc.) ☐ Other: ☐ Time-dependent relationships:			
	Definition/stratification:			
	☐ Pregnant/postpartum/breastfeeding ☐ Humanitarian setting (e.g. refugee, internally displaced person) ☐ Political instability ☐ Other:  ☐ other:  Definition/stratification:			
	□ other:			
	Definition/stratification:			
34. Systematic determinants that were statistically significant (check all correct answers)	☐ Maternal mortality ratio			
	☐ Maternal cause of death (based on ICD-MM coding)			
	☐ Maternal death registration			
	☐ Under-5 mortality rate			
	☐ Neonatal mortality rate			

	☐ Proportion of children < 5 years old with registered birth			
	☐ Stillbirth rate			
	☐ C-section rate			
	☐ Availability of functional Emergency Obstetric Care facilities			
	☐ Adolescent mortality rate			
	☐ Out-of-pocket as a percentage of total health expenditure			
	☐ Current country health expenditure per capita			
	☐ Presence of laws/regulations that guarantee SRH care			
35. Confounding factors/effect modifiers:				
ractors/effect modifiers.				
36. Results (specify, e.g. OR, RR, IRR)				
(specify, e.g. or, ritt, ritty				

37. Limitations:			
38. Scientific quality and	□ high	☐ moderate	□ low
Study bias <sup>2</sup>	high	$\square$ moderate	□low
39. Conclusions of authors			
Notes:			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Based on the Effective Public Health Practice Project's quality assessment tool for quantitative studies (Effective Public Health Practice Project. Quality Assessment Tool For Quantitative Studies. Hamilton, ON: Effective Public Health Practice Project; 1998.)