RESEARCH NOTE

Open Access



Seroprevalence of syphilis and its risk factors among pregnant women attending antenatal care at Felege Hiwot Referral Hospital, Bahir Dar, northwest Ethiopia: a cross-sectional study

Kiros Tareke¹, Abaineh Munshea^{1,2*} and Endalkachew Nibret^{1,2}

Abstract

Objective: The objective of this study was to investigate the seroprevalence and associated risk factors of syphilis among pregnant women attending antenatal care at Felege Hiwot Referral Hospital, northwest Ethiopia.

Result: Of the total 384 screened women for syphilis, 10 (2.6%) were found to be seropositive for Treponema pal*lidum.* The odds of infection were about ten times (COR = 9.77, p = 0.002) higher in divorced women than in married women. The likelihood of syphilis was almost three times higher among rural residents compared to urban residents (COR = 3.48, p = 0.079). The likelihood of being infected with syphilis was about five times higher (COR = 5.25, p = 0.018) in women who had prior history of multiple sexual partners. The risk of syphilis was 4.42 (p = 0.071) and 2.67 fold (p = 0.226) greater in women with previous history of abortion and other sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), respectively. It can be concluded that a relatively low seroprevalence of syphilis was observed among the study subjects. Nevertheless, health promotion activity directed at raising the awareness of the community towards the modes of transmission of syphilis and its health impact is important in the prevention of the disease in pregnant women.

Keywords: Pregnant women, Risk factors, Seroprevalence, Syphilis

Introduction

Syphilis is a sexually transmitted infectious disease caused by the bacterium Treponema pallidum and it spreads most commonly through sexual activity. In addition, it can also be transmitted from infected pregnant women to their unborn children. If syphilis is left untreated, it can lead to devastating fetal outcomes in the second or third trimesters of pregnancy [1, 2].

Despite the availability of inexpensive and effective antibiotic therapy, syphilis remains a prevalent disease in developing countries and has re-emerged as a public health threat in developed nations [3]. An estimated 36 million people are infected with syphilis worldwide, with

*Correspondence: abitew2003@yahoo.com

¹ Biology Department, College of Science, Bahir Dar University, P.O.

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



12 million new infections are reported every year, and of which 2 millions are pregnant women. More than half of infected women transmit the infection to their babies resulting in adverse pregnancy outcomes including early fetal death, stillbirth, preterm birth, low birth weight, neonatal death, and congenital infection in infants [4-6]. In Africa, seroprevalence of syphilis ranges from 4 to 15% among antenatal clinic attendees and it contributes to approximately 20% of prenatal deaths [7-9].

Variations in socio-demographic characteristics, sexual practices and behavior of the communities, inaccessibility to treatment of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) and cultural practices are amongst the risk factors associated with syphilis [10-12].

Ethiopia is one of resource constrained countries in the world and shows no continuous effort in generating epidemiological data about syphilis and its associated risk factors among pregnant women. In view of this, we

© The Author(s) 2019. This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/ publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

Box-79, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

undertook this study to determine the seroprevalence of syphilis among pregnant women attending antenatal care at Felege Hiwot Referral Hospital (FHRH), Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

Main text

Methods

Study design and area

Hospital based prospective cross-sectional study was conducted among pregnant women attending antenatal clinic (ANC) at FHRH. All newly registered pregnant women at ANC of the hospital were considered as a source population, while those who visited the center during sample collection period (November 2013 to June 2014) were considered as a study population.

Bahir Dar is the capital city of Amhara National Regional State and is located at 11°36′ latitude N and 37°23′ longitude E in north-western part of Ethiopia with an altitude of 1800 m. According to Amhara Bureau of Finance and Economic Development 2014 report, population of Bahir Dar city was estimated to be 284,020, of which 134,818 are males and 149,202 are females [13]. Among females, 93,174 of them are between 15 and 49 years of age (reproductive age groups).

Sample size estimation and sampling technique

The minimum sample size, 384 study subjects, was calculated using a single population proportion formula, with 95% confidence interval, 5% margin of error, and 50% prevalence [14]. Then, every eligible pregnant woman was included in the study through simple random sampling technique until the required sample size was obtained.

Data collection and processing

Questionnaire was administered to every eligible consented woman to gather data on socio-demographic characteristics, gestational age, parity status, sexual behavior, and awareness toward syphilis.

After administering the questionnaire, five milliliters of venous blood sample was drawn from each of the study participant and put into plain vacutainer tubes. Sera were then separated from the whole blood by centrifugation at 3000 rpm for 5 min and transferred into labeled tubes and kept at -20 °C for further laboratory analysis.

Serological analyses of serum samples were carried with two types of diagnostic kits according to the manufacturers' instructions and recommendations. The sera were initially tested with Rapid Plasma Reagin (RPR) card test to detect non-Treponemal antibodies. Positive and negative controls were included in the assays. All RPR positive sera were subjected to Immunochromatography test strips (ICS) as a confirmatory test. When RPR and ICS tests are positive, then the subject is considered as syphilis positive.

Data analysis and interpretation

Questionnaire and serodiagnosis data were analyzed using SPSS version 20. Chi square (χ^2) test was conducted to determine the association between syphilis and risk factors. Then, strength of association in terms of crude odds ratio (COR) between syphilis and risk factors was analyzed using univariate logistic regression.

Results

Socio-demographic variables

The mean age and age range of subjects were 26.95 and 18–44 years old, respectively. Majority (73.7%) of participants were in the age group of 20 to 29 years old. Most of them were married (93.2%) and urban dwellers (88.5%). Similar proportions of women attended high school (30.2%) and college and above (31.8%) followed by those (26.8%) who could read and write. Occupationally, 43% of the participants were housewives followed by government employees (29.4%). Most (57.8%) earned above 1000 Ethiopian Birr (ETB) per month while 19.3% earned less than 500 ETB (1 USD \approx 20 ETB, 2014 exchange rate) (Table 1).

Seroprevalence of syphilis across socio-demographic variables

Of the total of 384 participants, 10 (2.6%) were seropositive for syphilis. A significant association between syphilis and age categories, marital status and residence of the subjects was observed. Most of the infections were detected among 40 and above years old (28.5%) and divorced women (40%). Three fold higher (6.8%) seroprevalence was found among rural dwelling compared to urban dwelling women (2.1%) (Table 2).

Medical history, sexual behavior and awareness of subjects

About 43.5%, 30.7% and 25.8% of the women had one, two and more than two pregnancies, respectively. A quarter (24.7%) of participants reported history of abortion and while 5.7% encountered stillbirths. Thirty-nine (10.2%) of the women were in their first, (35.4%) second and (54.4%) third trimesters of their pregnancies. More than 90% and 68.2% of the participants had no any previous history of STD and multi-sexual exposure, respectively. Majority (78.4%) of study subjects had awareness towards sexual transmission of syphilis while almost three-fourth (73.0%) did not know transplacental transmission of the disease. Likewise, majority (66.9%) of subjects did not clearly identify the symptoms of syphilis while the rest (33.1%) clearly knew the symptoms of the disease. About 85% of the subjects knew that STDs

Table 1	Sociodemographic	characteristics	of	pregnant
women	attending ANC at Fo	elege Hiwot Re	ferra	l Hospital,
Novem	ber 2013 to June 2014	4		

Characteristics	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)	
Age categories (years)			
< 20	6	1.6	
20–29	283	73.7	
30–39	88	22.9	
≥40	7	1.8	
Marital status			
Single	21	5.5	
Divorced	5	1.3	
Married	358	93.2	
Residence			
Rural	44	11.5	
Urban	340	88.5	
Educational status			
Illiterate	43	11.2	
Read and write	103	26.8	
High school	116	30.2	
College and above	122	31.8	
Occupational status			
Government employee	113	29.4	
Private	86	22.4	
House wife	165	43.0	
Daily laborers	20	5.2	
Monthly income (Eth Birr)			
< 500	74	19.3	
500-1000	88	22.9	
>1000	222	57.8	

could be prevented through the use of condom. Majority (74.1%) of the participants' partners did not use condom during sexual activity (Table 3).

Statistically significant association was observed between syphilis and gestational period, multi-sexual exposure and previous history of still birth. The highest (10.3%) and the lowest (1.5%) prevalence of syphilis were found in pregnant women who were in their first and second trimesters. Participants who had multi-sexual exposure were more (5.7%) infected than unexposed ones (1.1%). In contrast, parity, history of STDs, habit of condom use and awareness of women towards transmission and prevention were not associated with syphilis.

Univariate logistic regression analysis of potential risk factors Divorced women were 9.77 times more likely to be

infected with syphilis than married ones. Similarly, the odds of syphilis were 3.48 times higher among rural residing pregnant women compared to urban dwellers. However, no associations were detected between syphilis and age, occupation, educational status, and monthly income (Table 2).

Pregnant women who were in their second and third trimesters were 5.85 and 3.40 times more likely infected with syphilis compared with those in their first trimester. Furthermore, the risk of T. pallidum infection was 4.42 and 2.67 times higher among those who had previous history of abortion and STIs, respectively. Pregnant women who had previous history of multi-sexual exposure were at 5.25 folds of increased risk of getting the infection compared to those women who had no exposure at all. Likewise, nearly fourfolds of risk of the disease were observed among women who had no knowledge of prevention of STDs through condom use compared to those who had the awareness. However, no significant association was observed between syphilis and the risk factors considered like parity, history of stillbirth, habit of condom use and knowledge of the study subjects toward sexual and transplacental transmission and symptoms of this disease (Table 3).

Discussion

The seroprevalence of syphilis among pregnant women in current study was 2.6%. This is consistent with reports of two hospital based studies in Ethiopia [15, 16]. However, it is much higher than syphilis sero-positivity reported among pregnant women in Nigeria (0.3%) [11] and in Tanzania (0.5%) [17]. It is also higher than findings from India (0.36%) [18] and China (0.39%) [19]. Compared to similar studies, it is lower than prevalence of 4.3%, 5.0%, 5.8% and 7.3% reported from Botswana [20], Malawi [21], the Niger Delta, Nigeria [22] and Tanzania [23], respectively. These discrepancies in the seroprevalence of syphilis among different populations within and outside Ethiopia might be a reflection of variations in sexual practice and behavior of the communities, awareness about syphilis and difference in access to treatment of STDs, cultural practices, and also differences in the laboratory techniques employed in detecting T. pallidum infection.

In Several epidemiological studies found significant association between risk of syphilis and educational status, where study subjects with no education or less educational attainment were at higher risk of getting syphilis [24–27]. Contrary to this, in our study we could not find any association between educational status and *T. pallidum* seropositivity. Nevertheless, the significance of education toward avoidance of the potential risk factors cannot be ruled out.

It was found that divorced pregnant women were ten times more likely to be infected with syphilis than married women. This might be due to the tendency of divorced women to have more sexual partners. On the

Characteristics	Total examined	Serostatus for T. pallidum		χ² (df)	COR (CI 95%)	P-value
	n (%)	Positive n (%)	Negative n (%)	<i>p</i> value		
Age categories (years)						
< 20	6 (1.5)	0 (0)	6 (100)		1.00	
20–29	283 (73.6)	7 (2.4)	276 (97.6)	19.53	0.02 (0.00, 0.30)	0.004
30–39	88 (22.9)	1 (1.1)	87 (98.9)	(3)	0.07 (0.01, 0.47)	0.006
≥40	7 (1.8)	2 (28.5)	5 (71.5)	P = 0.000	0.04 (0.00, 54)	0.015
Marital status						
Single	21 (5.5)	3 (14.3)	18 (85.7)	18.92	0.67 (0.54, 8.19)	0.751
Divorced	5 (1.3)	2 (40)	3 (60)	(2)	9.77 (2.26, 2.29)	0.002
Married	358 (93.2)	5 (1.4)	353 (98.6)	P = 0.000	1.00	
Residence						
Urban	340 (88.5)	7 (2.1)	333 (97.9)	3.47 (1)	1.00	0.079
Rural	44 (11.5)	3 (6.8)	41 (93.2)	P = 0.052	3.48 (0.86, 13.98)	
Educational status						
Illiterate	43 (11.2)	4 (9.3)	39 (90.6)	1.11 (3)	1.62 (0.26, 10.09)	0.262
Read and write	103 (26.8)	3 (2.9)	100 (97.1)	P = 0.774	2.78 (0.37, 20.38)	0.379
High school	116 (30.2)	2 (1.7)	114 (98.3)		1.93 (0.31, 11.99)	0.312
College and above	122 (31.8)	1 (0.8)	121 (99.1)		1.00	
Occupational status						
Govt. employee	113 (29.4)	1 (0.9)	112 (99.1)		1.00	
Private	86 (22.3)	3 (3.6)	83 (96.4)	5.91 (3)	0.25 (0.02, 2.41)	0.230
House wife	165 42.9)	4 (2.4)	161 (97.6)	P = 0.116	0.36 (0.04, 3.25)	0.363
Daily laborer	20 (5.2)	2 (10)	18 (90)		0.08 (0.07, 0.93)	0.044
Family monthly income (Eth Birr)					
< 500	74 (19.3)	3 (4.1)	71 (95.9)	3.29 (2)	0.32 (0.64–1.64)	0.174
500-1000	88 (22.9)	3 (3.4)	85 (96.6)	P = 0.193	0.28 (0.63, 1.13)	0.108
>1000	222 (57.8)	4 (1.8)	218 (98.2)		1.00	

 Table 2 Socio-demographic characteristics of pregnant women in relation to their serostatus at Felegehiwot Referral

 Hospital, November 2013 to June 2014

contrary, reports from southern [26] and central [28] Ethiopia showed no association between marital status and syphilis.

In this study, no statistically significant association was found between parity and syphilis. This is in conformity with the report of Onwuezobe et al. [29]. However, a study done at Harare Maternity Hospital reported significant increase in the risk of syphilis as the parity increased [30].

Being at the third trimester was significantly associated with the syphilis and it was shown that women at this stage of pregnancy were three times more likely to get the infection compared to those at first trimester of pregnancy. This finding could be attributed to a possible common practice where most pregnant women visit ANC later in their pregnancies.

In our study, the risk of syphilis was greater in women with previous history of abortion and other STDs. This is in line with Zhou et al. [27] and Macêdo et al. [31] who reported significant association between syphilis and prior history of induced abortion and other STDs.

The likelihood of syphilis was almost two times higher among women living in rural setting as compared to their urban dwelling counterparts. This could be due to low level of awareness of women and limited access to mass media and social networks in rural areas. Contrary to the current finding, Assefa [15] reported a relatively higher rate of this disease among urban pregnant women.

Pregnant women who had previous history of multisexual exposure were six times more likely to be infected with syphilis than unexposed ones. This is in agreement with the reports of Eticha et al. [28], Moges [32] and Sule [33] who noted increased odds of syphilis among women with many sexual partners as compared to those with one sexual partner.

In conclusion, the seroprevalence of syphilis in this study was relatively lower than previous studies in Ethiopia. This might be due to preventive interventions taken

n (%) Positive n (%) Negative n (%) P-value Parity Parity 10.0 5.58 (2) 1.00 Bigravidae 118 (0.7) 5 (4.2) 113 (0.5.8) P=0.061 1.12 (0.18,6.6.0) 0.837 Multigravidae 99 (25.8) 2 (2.0) 97 (98.0) P=0.061 1.12 (0.18,6.6.0) 0.837 Scatational period (stage) Ist trimester 39 (10.2) 3 (10.3) 36 (89.7) 1.01 (2) 1.00 2nd trimester 39 (10.2) 3 (10.3) 36 (89.7) 1.01 (2) 1.00 0.065 3rd trimester 39 (15.4) 5 (1.9) 2.05 (81.1) 3.04 (0.77,14.83) 0.104 Stillbirths	Characteristics	Total examined	Serostatus		X ² (df)	COR (CI 95%)	P-value
Parity Parity Parity parity 167 (43.5) 3 (1.8) 164 (98.2) 5.58 (2) 1.00 Bigravidae 118 (30.7) 5 (4.2) 113 (95.8) P = 0.061 11.12 (0.18.6.86) 0.897 Multigravidae 99 (25.8) 2 (20) 97 (98.0) 0.46 (0.08.2.45) 0.368 Gestational period (stage) 1 1.01 (2) 1.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 0.01 (2) 1.00 2.01 1.01 (2) 1.00 2.01 1.01 (2) 1.00 2.01 1.01 (2) 1.00 2.01 2.01 (20.1 (20.0 (20.1 (20.0		n (%)	Positive n (%)	Negative n (%)	P-value		
Primigravidae 167 (43.5) 3 (1.8) 164 (98.2) 5.58 (2) 1.00 Bigravidae 118 (60.7) 5 (4.2) 113 (65.8) P=0.061 1.12 (0.18.686) 0.897 Bigravidae 99 (52.8) 2 (2.0) 97 (98.0) 0.46 (0.08,2.45) 0.368 Gestational period (stage) 3 (10.3) 36 (89.7) 10.1 (2) 1.00 1.00 2nd trimester 39 (10.2) 3 (10.3) 36 (89.7) 10.1 (2) 1.00 0.053 3 rd trimester 39 (10.2) 5 (15) 134 (98.5) P=0.064 0.00 0.015 Stillitrihs	Parity						
Bigravidae 118 (30,7) 5 (4.2) 113 (95.8) P=0.061 1.12 (0.18,6.86) 0.0361 Multigravidae 99 (25.8) 2 (2.0) 97 (98.0) 10.4 (0.08,2.45) 0.308 Gestational period (stage) 1 strimester 39 (10.2) 3 (10.3) 36 (97.7) 10.1(2) 1.00 Intrimester 39 (10.2) 5 (10.9 205 (98.1) P=0.006 5.58 (0.89,346.8) 0.056 3rd trimester 209 (54.4) 5 (19.9 205 (98.1) P=0.006 5.58 (0.89,346.8) 0.056 Silbilorith 7 209 (54.4) 6 (1.9) 205 (98.1) 128 (1) 0.48 (0.13,1.74) 0.267 No 295 (24.7) 4 (4.2) 91 (95.8) 128 (1) 0.48 (0.13,1.74) 0.267 No 295 (25.7) 6 (20.0) 20 (91.0) 3.82 (1) 4.42 (0.88,22.21) 0.071 No 36 (91.4) 8 (2.2) 354 (97.8) P=0.049 1.00 2.57 (1.31,10) 0.26 (1.53,11) 0.26 (1.53,11) 0.26 (1.53,11) 0.26 (1.53,11) 0.26 (1.53,11) 0.26 (1	Primigravidae	167 (43.5)	3 (1.8)	164 (98.2)	5.58 (2)	1.00	
Multigravidae 99 (258) 2 (2.0) 97 (98.0) 0.46 (0.08,245) 0.368 Gestational period (stage) Istrimester 39 (0.2) 3 (10.3) 36 (97.7) 10.1 (2) 1.00 2 nd trimester 136 (35.4) 2 (1.5) 134 (98.5) P=0.005 558 (0.89, 34.68) 0.065 3 rd trimester 209 (54.4) 5 (1.9) 205 (98.1) .40 (0.77, 14.85) 0.104 Stillbirths .	Bigravidae	118 (30.7)	5 (4.2)	113 (95.8)	P = 0.061	1.12 (0.18,6.86)	0.897
Gestational period (stage) 1 3 (10.3) 3 6 (8.7) 1.01 (2) 1.00 2nd trimester 136 (35.4) 2 (1.5) 134 (98.5) P = 0.00 5.58 (0.89, 34.68) 0.005 3 rd trimester 209 (54.4) 5 (1.9) 205 (98.1) 3.40 (0.77, 14.85) 0.104 Stilbirths 91 (95.8) 12.80 0.48 (0.13, 1.74) 0.267 No 289 (75.3) 6 (2.0) 283 (98.0) P = 0.257 1.00 1.00 History of abortion 91 (95.8) 3.82 (1) 4.42 (0.88,22.21) 0.71 No 362 (94.3) 8 (2.0) 3.02 (91.0) 3.82 (1) 4.20 (0.82,2.21) 0.71 No 362 (94.3) 8 (2.0) 3.20 (91.0) 3.82 (1) 4.20 (0.82,2.21) 0.71 No 362 (94.3) 2 (5.9) 3.20 (91.0) 3.82 (1) 4.20 (0.82,2.21) 0.71 No 362 (91.3) 2 (5.9) 3.20 (91.0) 3.82 (1) 4.20 (0.82,2.21) 0.71 No 3.20 (91.4) 8 (2.3	Multigravidae	99 (25.8)	2 (2.0)	97 (98.0)		0.46 (0.08,2.45)	0.368
İstrimester 39 (10.2) 3 (10.3) 36 (89.7) 10.1 (2) 1.00 2nd timester 136 (35.4) 2 (1.5) 134 (08.5) P=0.006 5.8 (0.09, 34.68) 0.064 3rd trimester 209 (54.4) 5 (1.5) 0.20 (59.1) 3 (0.07, 14.85) 0.104 Sillbirths 4 (4.2) 91 (95.8) 1.28 (1) 0.48 (0.13, 1.74) 0.267 No 289 (75.3) 6 (2.0) 283 (98.0) P=0.257 1.00 History of abortion 2 (2.57) 2 (9.0) 20 (91.0) 3.82 (1) 4.42 (0.88,22.21) 0.71 No 362 (94.3) 8 (2.2) 354 (97.8) P=0.049 1.00 History of any STDs Yes 34 (8.9) 2 (5.9) 32 (94.1) 1.58 (1) 2.67 (0.54,13.11) 0.0 Multi-sexual exposure Yes 32 (6 (6.2) 37 (94.99 P=0.072 0.71 (0.14, 34.2) Yes 99 (25.9) 2 (2.0) 97 (98.0)	Gestational period (stage)						
2nd trimester 136 (35.4) 2 (1.5) 134 (98.5) P = 0.006 5.58 (0.89, 34.68) 0.005 3rd trimester 209 (54.4) 5 (1.9) 205 (98.1)	1st trimester	39 (10.2)	3 (10.3)	36 (89.7)	10.1 (2)	1.00	
3 rd trimester209 (54.4)5 (1.9)205 (98.1)3.40 (0.77,14.85)0.104StillbirthsYes95 (24.7)4 (4.2)91 (95.8)1.28 (1)0.48 (0.13,1.74)0.267No289 (75.3)6 (2.0)283 (98.0)P=0.2571.00History of abortion82 (1)3.82 (1)4.42 (0.88,22.21)0.071No36 (04.3)8 (2.0)354 (97.8)P=0.0491.00266No350 (91.4)8 (2.3)342 (97.7)P=0.2091.00266No350 (91.4)8 (2.3)342 (97.7)P=0.2091.00266No350 (91.4)8 (2.3)342 (97.7)P=0.2091.00266No250 (91.4)8 (2.3)3.92 (1)5.25 (1.33, 20.68)0.18No263 (62.2)3 (1.1)260 (98.9)P=0.0091.00267Condom use27 (79.2)P=0.6720.71 (0.14, 3.42)27Yes99 (25.9)2 (2.0)97 (98.0)1.17 (1)1.000.673No28 (1.1)8 (2.7)27 (97.2)P=0.7272.19 (0.35, 13.65)0.386P=0.737221.99 (19.7)1.99 (1)2.19 (0.35, 13.65)0.386P=0.741.55 (0.26, 10.24)0.51 (1.596)22991.510.11Shamed to ask my partner51 (17.89%)2 (4.9%)49 (6%)1.65 (0.26, 10.24)0.511.55 (0.26, 10.24)0.511.55 (0.26, 10.24)0.51<	2nd trimester	136 (35.4)	2 (1.5)	134 (98.5)	P = 0.006	5.58 (0.89, 34.68)	0.065
Stillbirths View 95 (2,47) 4 (4) 91 (95,8) 1.28 (1) 0.48 (0.13,1.74) 0.267 No 289 (7.3.) 6 (2.0) 28 (90.0) P=0.257 1.00 1.00 History of abortion Yes 2 (2,5.7) 2 (0,0) 2.0 (91.0) 3.82 (1) 4.42 (0.88,22.21) 0.01 No 362 (94.3) 8 (2.2) 354 (97.8) P=0.049 1.00 2.01 0.01 1.00 2.01 0.01 2.01 0.01 2.01 0.01 2.01 0.01 2.01 0.01 2.01 0.01 2.01 0.01 2.01 0.01 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 0.00 2.01 <td>3rd trimester</td> <td>209 (54.4)</td> <td>5 (1.9)</td> <td>205 (98.1)</td> <td></td> <td>3.40 (0.77,14.85)</td> <td>0.104</td>	3rd trimester	209 (54.4)	5 (1.9)	205 (98.1)		3.40 (0.77,14.85)	0.104
Yes95 (24.7)4 (4.2)91 (95.8)1.28 (1)0.48 (0.13,1.74)0.267No289 (75.3)6 (2.0)283 (98.0)P=0.2571.00History of abortion </td <td>Stillbirths</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Stillbirths						
No 289 (75.3) 6 (2.0) 283 (98.0) P = 0.257 1.00 History of abortion Yes 22 (5.7) 2 (9.0) 20 (91.0) 3.82 (1) 4.42 (0.8,22.2.1) 0.071 No 362 (94.3) 8 (2.2) 354 (97.8) P = 0.049 1.00 History of any STDs Yes 34 (8.9) 2 (5.9) 32 (94.1) 1.58 (1) 267 (0.54,13.11) 0.226 No 350 (91.4) 8 (2.3) 342 (97.7) P = 0.299 1.00 200 Multi-sexual exposure Yes 326 (82.3) 31.01 267 (0.54,13.11) 0.226 No 350 (91.4) 8 (2.3) 342 (97.7) P = 0.299 1.00 200 Multi-sexual exposure Yes 126 (31.8) 7 (5.7) 115 (94.3) 3.95 (1) 5.25 (1.33, 20.68) 0.018 No 263 (68.2) 31.11 260 (98.9) 1.00 0.673 No 285 (74.1) 8 (2.7) 277 (97.2) P = 0.572 0.71 (0.14, 3.42) Parture objection 70 (24.56%)	Yes	95 (24.7)	4 (4.2)	91 (95.8)	1.28 (1)	0.48 (0.13,1.74)	0.267
History of abortionYes22 (5.7)2 (9.0)20 (91.0)3.82 (1)4.42 (0.88,22.21)0.01No32 (94.3)8 (2.2)354 (97.8)P = 0.0491.00History of any STDs5.26 (0.54,13.11)0.26Yes34 (8.9)2 (5.9)32 (94.1)1.58 (1)2.67 (0.54,13.11)0.26No350 (91.4)8 (2.3)342 (97.7)P = 0.2091.001.00Multi-sexual exposure7 (5.7)115 (94.3)3.95 (1)5.25 (1.33, 20.68)0.018No23 (68.2)3 (1.1)26 (98.9)P = 0.091.000.673No23 (68.2)3 (1.1)20 (97.9)9 P = 0.070.671Condom use8 (2.7)9 (9.65.9)2 (2.0)97 (98.0)0.17 (1)1.000.673No285 (74.1)8 (2.7)277 (97.2)P = 0.6720.71 (0.14, 3.42)2.673Partner objection70 (24.56%)2 (5.1%)2.79 (9.2.9)9.99 (4.2.9)0.804Ashamed to ask my partner51 (17.89%)2 (4.9%)4.99 (9.6%)1.65 (0.2.6, 10.2.4)0.581Faithful to my partner15 (17.89%)2 (4.9%)12 (97.6%)1.65 (0.2.6, 10.2.4)0.581Faithful to my partner51 (17.89%)3 (2.4%)12 (97.6%)1.65 (0.2.6, 10.2.4)0.581Faithful to my partner51 (17.89%)2 (4.9%)4.9 (9.6%)1.65 (0.2.6, 10.2.4)0.581No83 (0.1.6)3 (0.6)8 (0.64)P =0	No	289 (75.3)	6 (2.0)	283 (98.0)	P = 0.257	1.00	
Yes22 (5.7)2 (9.0)20 (91.0)3.82 (1)4.42 (0.88,22.21)0.071No362 (94.3)8 (2.2)354 (97.8)P=0.0491.00History of any STDsYes34 (8.9)2 (5.9)32 (94.1)1.58 (1)2.67 (0.54,13.11)0.226No350 (91.4)8 (2.3)342 (97.7)P=0.0091.000.00Multi-sexual exposure0.0180.018No263 (68.2)3 (1.1)260 (98.9)P=0.0091.000.018No263 (68.2)3 (1.1)260 (98.9)P=0.0091.000.673Condom use97 (98.0)0.17 (1)1.000.673No285 (74.1)8 (2.7)277 (97.2)P=0.6720.71 (0.14, 3.42)Reason not to use condom2 (5.1%)37 (94.9%)1.99 (4)2.19 (0.35, 13.65)0.386Partner objection39 (13.7%)2 (5.1%)37 (94.9%)1.99 (4)2.19 (0.35, 13.65)0.386Faithful to my partner51 (17.89%)2 (4.9%)49 (96%)1.90 (4.17, 13.1)0.846Ashamed to ask my partner51 (17.89%)2 (4.9%)49 (96%)1.90 (4.17, 13.1)0.846Faithful to my partner51 (17.89%)2 (4.9%)49 (96%)1.65 (0.26, 10.24)0.581Faithful to my partner51 (17.89%)2 (4.9%)49 (96%)1.60 (0.10, 1.000.517No83 (21.6)3 (3.6)80 (96.4)P=0.5140.63 (0.16, 2.51) <tr<tr></tr<tr>	History of abortion						
No362 (94.3)8 (2.2)354 (97.8)P = 0.491.00History of any STDsYes34 (8.9)2 (5.9)32 (94.1)1.58 (1)2.67 (0.54,13.1)0.226No350 (91.4)8 (2.3)342 (97.7)P = 0.2091.00Multi-sexual exposureYes122 (31.8)7 (5.7)115 (94.3)3.95 (1)5.25 (1.33, 20.68)0.018No263 (68.2)3 (1.1)2.60 (98.9)P = 0.0091.000.673Condom useYes99 (25.9)2 (2.0)97 (98.0)0.17 (1)1.000.673No285 (74.1)8 (2.7)277 (97.2)P = 0.6720.71 (0.14, 3.42)Reason not to use condomPartner objection39 (13.7%)2 (5.9%)37 (94.9%)1.99 (4)2.19 (0.35, 13.65)0.386P = 0.737Dislike using condom70 (24.56%)2 (2.9%)68 (97.1%)1.19 (0.19, 7.33)0.846Ashamed to ask my partner51 (17.89%)2 (4.9%)49 (96%)1.65 (0.26, 10.24)0.511Knowledge of sexual transmissionYes301 (78.4)7 (2.3)294 (97.7)0.42 (1)1.000.517No83 (21.6)3 (3.6)80 (96.4)P = 0.5140.63 (0.16, 2.51)Knowledge of transplacental transmissionYes301 (78.4)7 (2.3)294 (97.7)0.42 (1)1.000.78No83 (21.6)3 (3.6)80 (96.4)P = 0.5140.63 (0.16, 2.51)No83 (21.6)3 (2.	Yes	22 (5.7)	2 (9.0)	20 (91.0)	3.82 (1)	4.42 (0.88,22.21)	0.071
History of any STDs Yes 34 (8.9) 2 (5.9) 32 (94.1) 1.58 (1) 2.67 (0.54, 13.1) 0.226 No 350 (91.4) 8 (2.3) 342 (97.7) P=0.209 1.00 Multi-sexual exposure 352 (31.3) 0.7 (5.7) 115 (94.3) 395 (1) 5.25 (1.33, 20.68) 0.018 No 263 (68.2) 3 (1.1) 266 (08.9) P=0.009 1.00 0.017 Condom use 255 (74.1) 8 (2.7) 277 (97.2) P=0.672 0.71 (0.14, 3.42) Reason not to use condom 91 (3.7%) 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Partner objection 39 (13.7%) 2 (5.9%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (7.8%) 2 (4.9%) 49 (96%) 1.19 (0.19, 7.33) 0.486 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (7.8%) 2 (4.9%) 49 (96%) 1.65 (0.26, 10.04) 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (2.9%) 2.94 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517	No	362 (94.3)	8 (2.2)	354 (97.8)	P = 0.049	1.00	
Yes 34 (8.9) 2 (5.9) 32 (94.1) 1.58 (1) 2.67 (0.54,13.11) 0.226 No 350 (91.4) 8 (2.3) 342 (97.7) P=0.209 1.00	History of any STDs						
No 350 (91.4) 8 (2.3) 342 (97.7) P = 0.299 1.00 Multi-sexual exposure Yes 122 (31.8) 7 (5.7) 115 (94.3) 3.95 (1) 5.25 (1.3.3, 20.68) 0.018 No 263 (68.2) 3 (1.1) 260 (98.9) P = 0.009 1.00 200 Condom use	Yes	34 (8.9)	2 (5.9)	32 (94.1)	1.58 (1)	2.67 (0.54,13.11)	0.226
Multi-sexual exposure Yes 122 (31.8) 7 (5.7) 115 (94.3) 3.95 (1) 5.25 (1.33, 20.68) 0.018 No 263 (68.2) 3 (1.1) 260 (98.9) P = 0.009 1.00 Condom use 99 (25.9) 2 (2.0) 97 (98.0) 0.17 (1) 1.00 0.673 No 285 (74.1) 8 (2.7) 277 (97.2) P = 0.672 0.71 (0.14, 3.42) 0.018 Reason not to use condom 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Partner objection 39 (13.7%) 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 So in ot to use condom 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 So in ot to use condom 70 (24.56%) 2 (2.9%) 68 (97.1%) 1.19 (0.19, 7.33) 0.846 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (17.89%) 2 (4%) 42 (97.6%) 1.65 (0.26, 10.24) 0.517 No 3 0 1.63 0 (9 (9.17) 0.42 (1) 1.	No	350 (91.4)	8 (2.3)	342 (97.7)	P = 0.209	1.00	
Yes 122 (31.8) 7 (5.7) 115 (94.3) 3.95 (1) 5.25 (1.33, 2.0.68) 0.018 No 263 (68.2) 3 (1.1) 260 (98.9) P=0.099 1.00 Condom use Yes 99 (25.9) 2 (2.0) 97 (98.0) 0.17 (1) 1.00 0.673 No 285 (74.1) 8 (2.7) 277 (97.2) P=0.672 0.71 (0.14, 3.42) Reason not to use condom 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Partner objection 39 (13.7%) 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Partner objection 39 (13.7%) 2 (2.9%) 68 (97.1%) 1.19 (0.19, 7.33) 0.846 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (17.89%) 2 (49%) 49 (96%) 1.65 (0.26, 10.24) 0.581 Faithful to my partner 10 (78.4) 2 (3.6) 3 (2.9%) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (94.4) P=0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.9%) </td <td>Multi-sexual exposure</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Multi-sexual exposure						
No 263 (68.2) 3 (1.1) 260 (98.9) P = 0.09 1.00 Condom use Yes 99 (25.9) 2 (2.0) 97 (98.0) 0.17 (1) 1.00 0.673 No 285 (74.1) 8 (2.7) 277 (97.2) P = 0.672 0.71 (0.14, 3.42) Reason not to use condom -	Yes	122 (31.8)	7 (5.7)	115 (94.3)	3.95 (1)	5.25 (1.33, 20.68)	0.018
Condom use Yes 99 (25.9) 2 (2.0) 97 (98.0) 0.17 (1) 1.00 0.673 No 285 (74.1) 8 (2.7) 277 (97.2) P=0.672 0.71 (0.14, 3.42) Reason not to use condom 39 (13.7%) 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Partner objection 39 (13.7%) 2 (2.9%) 68 (97.1%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (17.89%) 2 (4%) 49 (96%) 1.00 (0.9, 7.33) 0.846 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (17.89%) 2 (4%) 49 (96%) 1.65 (0.26, 10.24) 0.581 Faithful to my partner 125 (43.85%) 3 (2.4%) 122 (97.6%) 1 1 Knowledge of sexual transmission Yes 301 (78.4) 7 (2.3) 294 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P=0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) Knowledge of transplacental transmission Yes 104 (27.0) 3 (2.9) 101 (97.1) 0.04 (1)	No	263 (68.2)	3 (1.1)	260 (98.9)	P = 0.009	1.00	
Yes 99 (25.9) 2 (2.0) 97 (98.0) 0.17 (1) 1.00 0.673 No 285 (74.1) 8 (2.7) 277 (97.2) P=0.672 0.71 (0.14, 3.42) Reason not to use condom 7 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Partner objection 39 (13.7%) 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Partner objection 70 (24.56%) 2 (2.9%) 68 (97.1%) 1.19 (0.19, 7.33) 0.846 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (17.89%) 2 (4%) 49 (96%) 1.65 (0.26, 10.24) 0.581 Faithful to my partner 125 (43.85%) 3 (2.4%) 122 (97.6%) 1 1 Knowledge of sexual transmission Yes 301 (78.4) 7 (2.3) 294 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P=0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) Knowledge of transplacental transmission Yes 104 (27.0) 3 (2.9) 101 (97.1) 0.04 (1) 1.00 0.738 <td>Condom use</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Condom use						
No 285 (74.1) 8 (2.7) 277 (97.2) P=0.672 0.71 (0.14, 3.42) Reason not to use condom 39 (13.7%) 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Partner objection 39 (13.7%) 2 (2.9%) 68 (97.1%) 1.19 (0.19, 7.33) 0.846 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (17.89%) 2 (4%) 49 (96%) 1.65 (0.26, 10.24) 0.581 Faithful to my partner 125 (43.85%) 3 (2.4%) 122 (97.6%) 1 1.00 0.517 Knowledge of sexual transmission 7 (2.3) 294 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P=0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) Knowledge of transplacental transmission 7 (2.3) 294 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P=0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) 7.51 No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P=0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5)	Yes	99 (25.9)	2 (2.0)	97 (98.0)	0.17 (1)	1.00	0.673
Reason not to use condom 39 (13.7%) 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) P = 0.737 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 Dislike using condom 70 (24.56%) 2 (2.9%) 68 (97.1%) 1.19 (0.19, 7.33) 0.846 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (17.89%) 2 (4%) 49 (96%) 1.65 (0.26, 10.24) 0.581 Faithful to my partner 125 (43.85%) 3 (2.4%) 122 (97.6%) 1 1 Knowledge of sexual transmission 7 (2.3) 294 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P = 0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) Knowledge of transplacental transmission 3 (2.9) 101 (97.1) 0.04 (1) 1.00 0.738 No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P = 0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) 7.738 Knowledge about symptoms 104 (27.0) 3 (2.4) 124 (97.6) 0.040 (1) 1.00 0.738 No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P = 0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) 7.738 Knowled	No	285 (74.1)	8 (2.7)	277 (97.2)	P = 0.672	0.71 (0.14, 3.42)	
Partner objection 39 (13.7%) 2 (5.1%) 37 (94.9%) 1.99 (4) 2.19 (0.35, 13.65) 0.386 P=0.737 P=0.737 Dislike using condom 70 (24.56%) 2 (2.9%) 68 (97.1%) 1.19 (0.19, 7.33) 0.846 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (17.89%) 2 (4%) 49 (96%) 1.65 (0.26, 10.24) 0.581 Faithful to my partner 125 (43.85%) 3 (2.4%) 122 (97.6%) 1 1 Knowledge of sexual transmission 7 (2.3) 294 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P=0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) 1 Knowledge of transplacental transmission Yes 104 (27.0) 3 (2.9) 101 (97.1) 0.04 (1) 1.00 0.738 No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P=0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) 7.38 Knowledge about symptoms Yes 127 (33.1) 3 (2.4) 124 (97.6) 0.040 (1) 1.00 0.834	Reason not to use condom						
P=0.737Dislike using condom70 (24.56%)2 (2.9%)68 (97.1%)1.19 (0.19, 7.33)0.846Ashamed to ask my partner51 (17.89%)2 (4%)49 (96%)1.65 (0.26, 10.24)0.581Faithful to my partner125 (43.85%)3 (2.4%)122 (97.6%)1Knowledge of sexual transmission7 (2.3)294 (97.7)0.42 (1)1.000.517No83 (21.6)3 (3.6)80 (96.4)P = 0.5140.63 (0.16, 2.51)1Knowledge of transplacental transmission7 (2.5)273 (97.5)P = 0.8331.30 (0.27, 6.31)Yes104 (27.0)3 (2.4)124 (97.6)0.040 (1)1.000.834	Partner objection	39 (13.7%)	2 (5.1%)	37 (94.9%)	1.99 (4)	2.19 (0.35, 13.65)	0.386
Dislike using condom 70 (24.56%) 2 (2.9%) 68 (97.1%) 1.19 (0.19, 7.33) 0.846 Ashamed to ask my partner 51 (17.89%) 2 (4%) 49 (96%) 1.65 (0.26, 10.24) 0.581 Faithful to my partner 125 (43.85%) 3 (2.4%) 122 (97.6%) 1 1 Knowledge of sexual transmission 7 (2.3) 294 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P = 0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) 1 Knowledge of transplacental transmission 7 (2.5) 294 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P = 0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) 1 Knowledge of transplacental transmission 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P = 0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P = 0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) Knowledge about symptoms Yes 127 (33.1) 3 (2.4) 124 (97.6) 0.040 (1) 1.00 0.834					P = 0.737		
Ashamed to ask my partner51 (17.89%)2 (4%)49 (96%)1.65 (0.26, 10.24)0.581Faithful to my partner125 (43.85%)3 (2.4%)122 (97.6%)1Knowledge of sexual transmissionYes301 (78.4)7 (2.3)294 (97.7)0.42 (1)1.000.517No83 (21.6)3 (3.6)80 (96.4)P = 0.5140.63 (0.16, 2.51)0.738Knowledge of transplacental transmissionYes104 (27.0)3 (2.9)101 (97.1)0.04 (1)1.000.738No280 (73.0)7 (2.5)273 (97.5)P = 0.8331.30 (0.27, 6.31)Knowledge about symptomsYes127 (33.1)3 (2.4)124 (97.6)0.040 (1)1.000.834	Dislike using condom	70 (24.56%)	2 (2.9%)	68 (97.1%)		1.19 (0.19, 7. 33)	0.846
Faithful to my partner 125 (43.85%) 3 (2.4%) 122 (97.6%) 1 Knowledge of sexual transmission Yes 301 (78.4) 7 (2.3) 294 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P = 0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) Knowledge of transplacental transmission Yes 104 (27.0) 3 (2.9) 101 (97.1) 0.04 (1) 1.00 0.738 No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P = 0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) Knowledge about symptoms Yes 127 (33.1) 3 (2.4) 124 (97.6) 0.040 (1) 1.00 0.834	Ashamed to ask my partner	51 (17.89%)	2 (4%)	49 (96%)		1.65 (0.26, 10.24)	0.581
Knowledge of sexual transmission Yes 301 (78.4) 7 (2.3) 294 (97.7) 0.42 (1) 1.00 0.517 No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P = 0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) Knowledge of transplacental transmission	Faithful to my partner	125 (43.85%)	3 (2.4%)	122 (97.6%)		1	
Yes301 (78.4)7 (2.3)294 (97.7)0.42 (1)1.000.517No83 (21.6)3 (3.6)80 (96.4)P = 0.5140.63 (0.16, 2.51)Knowledge of transplacental transmissionYes104 (27.0)3 (2.9)101 (97.1)0.04 (1)1.000.738No280 (73.0)7 (2.5)273 (97.5)P = 0.8331.30 (0.27, 6.31)Knowledge about symptomsYes127 (33.1)3 (2.4)124 (97.6)0.040 (1)1.000.834	Knowledge of sexual transmissio	'n					
No 83 (21.6) 3 (3.6) 80 (96.4) P = 0.514 0.63 (0.16, 2.51) Knowledge of transplacental transmission Ves 104 (27.0) 3 (2.9) 101 (97.1) 0.04 (1) 1.00 0.738 No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P = 0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) Knowledge about symptoms Yes 127 (33.1) 3 (2.4) 124 (97.6) 0.040 (1) 1.00 0.834	Yes	301 (78.4)	7 (2.3)	294 (97.7)	0.42 (1)	1.00	0.517
Knowledge of transplacental transmission Yes 104 (27.0) 3 (2.9) 101 (97.1) 0.04 (1) 1.00 0.738 No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P = 0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) Knowledge about symptoms Yes 127 (33.1) 3 (2.4) 124 (97.6) 0.040 (1) 1.00 0.834	No	83 (21.6)	3 (3.6)	80 (96.4)	P = 0.514	0.63 (0.16, 2.51)	
Yes 104 (27.0) 3 (2.9) 101 (97.1) 0.04 (1) 1.00 0.738 No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P = 0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) Knowledge about symptoms Yes 127 (33.1) 3 (2.4) 124 (97.6) 0.040 (1) 1.00 0.834	Knowledge of transplacental trar	nsmission					
No 280 (73.0) 7 (2.5) 273 (97.5) P = 0.833 1.30 (0.27, 6.31) Knowledge about symptoms	Yes	104 (27.0)	3 (2.9)	101 (97.1)	0.04 (1)	1.00	0.738
Knowledge about symptoms Yes 127 (33.1) 3 (2.4) 124 (97.6) 0.040 (1) 1.00 0.834	No	280 (73.0)	7 (2.5)	273 (97.5)	P = 0.833	1.30 (0.27, 6.31)	
Yes 127 (33.1) 3 (2.4) 124 (97.6) 0.040 (1) 1.00 0.834	Knowledge about symptoms	•	·				
	Yes	127 (33.1)	3 (2.4)	124 (97.6)	0.040 (1)	1.00	0.834
No 257 (66.9) 7 (2.7) 250 (97.3) P=0.834 1.15 (0.29,4.55)	No	257 (66.9)	7 (2.7)	250 (97.3)	P = 0.834	1.15 (0.29,4.55)	
Knowledge of prevention of STI through condom use	Knowledge of prevention of STI t	through condom use				,	
Yes 326 (84.9) 6 (1.8) 320 (98.2) 4.96 (1) 1.00 0.038	Yes	326 (84.9)	6 (1.8)	320 (98.2)	4.96 (1)	1.00	0.038
No 58 (15.1) 4 (6.9) 54 (93.1) P = 0.833 3.95 (1.07,14.46)	No	58 (15.1)	4 (6.9)	54 (93.1)	P = 0.833	3.95 (1.07,14.46)	

Table 3 Syphilis infection in relation to clinical history, sexual behavior, and awareness of pregnant women about the disease

and improved surveillances. Prevalence of syphilis was strongly associated with variables like rural residence, divorced marital status, and history multiple sexual exposure of the participants. So, raising the awareness of the community towards safe sex practice is still important in the reduction of the prevalence of the disease not only in pregnant women but also in general population.

Limitation

Since this is a hospital based cross-sectional study, the reported prevalence of syphilis might not reflect the actual burden of the disease at community level. The study might be susceptible to responder recall and interviewer bias regarding the risk factors.

Abbreviations

AIDS: Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome; ANC: antenatal clinic; CI: confidence interval; COR: crude odds ratio; ETB: Ethiopian Birr; FHRH: Felege Hiwot Referral Hospital; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; ICS: immuno-chromatography test strips; RPR: rapid plasma reagin; STIs: sexually transmitted infections; WHO: World Health Organization.

Authors' contributions

AM and EN conceived and designed the study. AM and KT collected samples and performed the laboratory works. EN and KT checked and analyzed the data. AM wrote the manuscript. EN and KT edited the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Author details

¹ Biology Department, College of Science, Bahir Dar University, P.O. Box-79, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia. ² Biotechnology Research Institute, Bahir Dar University, P.O. Box-79, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Research and Community Service Office of the College of Science, Bahir Dar University for the financial support, the study participants for their involvement in this study and the laboratory technicians, nurses and doctors of Bahir Felege Hiwot Referral Hospital for their assistance during blood sample and data collection.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Availability of data and materials

The socio-demographic, behavioural parameters and clinical data of the subjects enrolled in the study are anonymously collected in a dataset. The readers may contact the corresponding author to access these data.

Consent to publish

Not applicable.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Ethical Review Committee of Postgraduate, Research and Community Service office of College of Science, Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants before their enrolment into the study. Then, interviewer administered questionnaire to gather information on socioeconomic, behavioral characteristics and clinical parameters of the pregnant women and blood samples were collected for serological analysis. Subject confidentiality and privacy were protected by ensuring that no names appeared on any part of the report. Pregnant women who were found to be syphilis seropositive were advised to attend at STI clinics with their partners for treatment.

Funding

This research was partly supported by the Research and Community Service office of College of Science, Bahir Dar University, Ethiopia with identification number BDU/RCS/Sc 32/2007.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Received: 23 October 2018 Accepted: 25 January 2019 Published online: 31 January 2019

References

- Peeling RW, Hook EW. The pathogenesis of syphilis: the Great Mimicker, revisited. J Pathol. 2006;208:224–32.
- Miller BA, Hicks CB. Syphilis and HIV: the intersection of two epidemics. 2010. http://www.jwatch.org/ac201009030000001/2010/09/03/syphi lis-and-hiv-intersectiontwo-epidemics. Accessed 11 Oct 2014.
- 3. Camerona CE, Lukehartb SA. Current status of syphilis vaccine development: need, challenges, prospects. Vaccine. 2014;32(14):1602–9.
- World Health Organization. The Global elimination of congenital syphilis: rationale and strategy for action. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2007.
- 5. Stamm LV. Global challenge of antibiotic-resistant *Treponema pallidum*. Antimicrob Agents Ch. 2010;54:583–9.
- World Health Organization. Prevalence and incidence of selected sexually transmitted infections *Chlamydia trachomatis*, *Neisseria gonorrhoeae*, syphilis and *Trichomonas vaginalis*: methods and results used by WHO to generate 2005 estimates. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2011.
- 7. Schmid G. Economic and programmatic aspects of congenital syphilis prevention. Bull World Health Organ. 2004;82(6):402–9.
- Rydzak CE, Goldie SJ. Cost-effectiveness of rapid point-of-care prenatal syphilis screening in sub-Saharan Africa. Sex Transm Dis. 2008;35:775–84.
- Karumudi UR, Augenbraun M. Syphilis and HIV: a dangerous duo. Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther. 2005;3:825–31.
- Mullick S, Watson-Jones D, Beksinska M, Mabey D. Sexually transmitted infections in pregnancy: prevalence, impact on pregnancy outcomes, and approach to treatment in developing countries. Sex Transm Infect. 2005;81:294–302.
- Ogiogwa JI, Akingbade OA, Aboderin BW, Okerentugba PO, Innocent-Adiele HC, Onoh CC, et al. Prevalence of *Treponema pallidum* in serum of pregnant women in Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria. Nat Sci. 2012;10:91–4.
- 12. Todd J, Munguti K, Grosskurth H, Mngara J, Changalucha J, Mayaud P, et al. Risk factors for active syphilis and TPHA seroconversion in a rural African population. Sex Transm Infect. 2001;77(1):37–45.
- BoFED. Population Affairs Reports of Bureau of finance and economic development (BoFED) of Amhara National Regional State (ANRS). Bahir Dar: BoFED; 2014.
- 14. Naing L, Winn T, Rusil BN. Practical issues in calculating sample size for prevalence studies. Archel Orphanet Sci. 2006;1:9–14.
- Assefa A. A three year retrospective study on seroprevalence of syphilis among pregnant women at Gondar University Teaching Hospital, Ethiopia. Afr Health Sci. 2014;14:119–24.
- Endris M, Deressa T, Belyhun Y, Moges F. Seroprevalence of syphilis and human immunodeficiency virus infections among pregnant women who attend the University of Gondar teaching hospital, Northwest Ethiopia: a cross sectional study. BMC Infect Dis. 2015;15:111.
- Yahya-Malima IK, Evjen-Olsen B, Matee IM, Fylkesnes K, Haarr L. HIV-1, HSV-2 and syphilis among pregnant women in a rural area of Tanzania: prevalence and risk factors. BMC Infect Dis. 2008;8:75.
- Nair N, Urhekar AD, Pachpute S, Srivastava A. Incidence of Syphilis among pregnant women attending a tertiary care hospital in Navi Mumbai, India. Int J Curr Microbiol. 2013;2:79–84.
- Yang L, Tucker DJ, Liu FY, Ren XQ, Hong X, Wang C, et al. Syphilis screening among 27,150 pregnant women in South Chinese rural areas using point-of-care tests. PLoS. 2013;8:e72149.
- Creek TL, Thuku H, Kolou B, Rahman M, Kilmarx PH. Declining syphilis prevalence among pregnant women in northern Botswana: an encouraging sign for the HIV epidemic? Sex Transm Infect. 2005;81:453–5.
- Kwiek JJ, Mwapasa V, Alker AP, Muula AS, Misiri HE, Molyneux ME, et al. Socio-demographic characteristics associated with HIV and syphilis seroreactivity among pregnant women in Blantyre, Malawi, 2000–2004. Malawi Med J. 2008;20:80–5.
- 22. Buseri FI, Seiyaboli E, Jeremiah ZA. Surveying infections among pregnant women in Niger Delta. Niger J Glob Infect Dis. 2010;2:202–11.
- Swai RO, Geofrey RS, Matee MI, Ndayongeje J. Surveillance of HIV and syphilis infections among antenatal clinic attendees in Tanzania-2003/2004. BMC Public Health. 2006;6:1470–2458.
- Ruan Y, Luo F, Jia Y, Li X, Li Q, Liang H, et al. Risk factors for syphilis and prevalence of HIV, hepatitis B and C among men who have sex with men in Beijing, China: implications for HIV prevention. AIDS Behav. 2009;13(4):663–70.

- Miranda AE, Figueiredo NC, Pinto VM, Page K, Talhari S. Risk factors for syphilis in young women attending a family health program in Vitória, Brazil. An Bras Dermatol. 2012;87(1):76–83.
- Shimelis T, Lemma K, Ambachew H, Tadesse E. Syphilis among people with HIV infection in southern Ethiopia: sero-prevalence and risk factors. BMC Infect Dis. 2015;15:189.
- Zhou H, Chen X-S, Hong F-C, Pan P, Yang F, Cai Y-M, et al. Risk factors for syphilis infection among pregnant women: results of a case-control study in Shenzhen, China. Sex Transm Infect. 2007;83:476–80. https://doi. org/10.1136/sti.2007.026187.
- Eticha TB, Sisay Z, Alemayehu A, Shimelis T. Seroprevalence of syphilis among HIV-infected individuals in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: a hospitalbased cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2013;3:e002566.
- Onwuezobe IA, Ochang EA, Umoiyoho A, Bassey EA, Umoffia EM. Prevalence of syphilis seropositivity in antenatal clinic clients in a teaching hospital in South–South region of Nigeria. APJTM. 2011;1:21–3.

- Pham L, Woelk GB, Ning Y, Madzime S, Mudzamiri S, Mahomed K, et al. Seroprevalence and risk factors of syphilis infection in pregnant women delivering at Harare Maternity Hospital, Zimbabwe. Cent Afr J Med. 2005;51(3–4):24–30.
- Macêdo VC, Lira PIC, Frias PG, Romaguera LMD, Caires SFF, Ximenes RAA. Risk factors for syphilis in women: case-control study. Rev Saude Publica. 2017;51:78.
- Moges F, Kebede Y, Kassu A. Seroprevalence of HIV, HBV infections and syphilis among street dwellers in Gondar city, northwest Ethiopia. Ethiop J Health Dev. 2006;20:160–5.
- Sule J. Treponema pallidum specific antibodies among sexually active people. Appl Biosci. 2010;28:1731–5.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

