Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Russell Kabir, Anglia Ruskin University, United Kingdom

REVIEWED BY Sarah Gino, University of Eastern Piedmont, Italy Michael Amera, Debre Berhan University, Ethiopia

*CORRESPONDENCE Hari Prasad Kaphle ⊠ harikafle07@gmail.com

RECEIVED 09 February 2023 ACCEPTED 15 May 2023 PUBLISHED 02 June 2023

CITATION

Sharma R and Kaphle HP (2023) Intimate partner violence during pregnancy among married women in Putalibajar municipality, Nepal. *Front. Psychol.* 14:1158406.

doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1158406

COPYRIGHT

© 2023 Sharma and Kaphle. This is an openaccess article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Intimate partner violence during pregnancy among married women in Putalibajar municipality, Nepal

Rakshya Sharma and Hari Prasad Kaphle*

School of Health and Allied Sciences, Pokhara University, Pokhara, Nepal

Introduction: Intimate partner violence during pregnancy (IPVDP) is increasingly being recognized as a significant problem in the developing world due to its adverse health consequences on both pregnant women and children. The objective of the study is to measure the magnitude of intimate partner violence during pregnancy and the factors associated with IPVDP.

Methods: A community-based cross-sectional study was conducted among 263 married women in their extended postpartum period between October 2019 and March 2020 in Putalibajar municipality, Nepal. A face-to-face interview was conducted and data were collected using an interview schedule. A Chi-square test and logistic regression analysis were performed to examine the association between IPVDP and the independent variables.

Results: Among the 263 women interviewed, 30% experienced IPV during pregnancy, the most common type of violence was controlling behavior (20.2%) followed by emotional (18.6%), sexual (10.6%), economic (6.1%), and physical violence (5.3%). It was observed that IPV was more likely to occur among women whose husbands consumed alcohol (AOR=3.171; CI 95%: 1.588–9.167), women whose husbands consumed tobacco (AOR = 3.815; CI 95%: 2.157–7.265), women who sometimes received family support during pregnancy (AOR =2.948; CI 95%: 1.115–7.793) and women who did not decide on marriage timing (AOR =2.777; CI 95%: 1.331–5.792).

Conclusion: Three out of ten pregnant women experienced IPVDP. To prevent violence, and ensure women's empowerment, formulating strict laws and discouraging the element of a violent milieu is important.

KEYWORDS

intimate partner violence, pregnancy, postpartum woman, factors associated, cross sectional study

Introduction

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is defined as any act of physical, sexual, or psychological controlling actions or economic violence that takes place between intimate partners. It is regarded as global public health and human rights issue (García-Moreno et al., 2005). Globally, 30% of women experience violence by their intimate partner (García-Moreno et al., 2013). In recent years, intimate partner violence during pregnancy (IPVDP) is increasingly being recognized as a significant problem in the world due to its prevalence and its adverse health

consequences on both pregnant women and children. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimated that, globally, the proportion of ever-pregnant women who reported violence during pregnancy varied from 1 to 28%. Physical violence exceeded 5% in 11 out of 15 settings where one-half of the women reported being punched or kicked in the abdomen and the majority (90%) of abuse was perpetrated by the biological father of the child she was carrying (García-Moreno et al., 2005).

Women experiencing violence during pregnancy are less likely to receive prenatal care and may experience adverse health outcomes such as poor nutrition, miscarriage, premature labor, trauma, placenta abruption, low birth weight (LBW), stillbirth, UTI, Chronic Pelvic infection, depression, and maternal death (García-Moreno et al., 2005; Nejatizade et al., 2017; Regmi et al., 2017). Nepal is a diverse ecological, ethnic, cultural, and multi-language society but is predominantly a Hindu country where it has its own cultural practices, norms, and values regarding men and women. In the context of Nepal, the key structural factors that make women vulnerable to IPV are economic dependency on men, cultural obligations, early marriage, giving birth to a girl, dowry practices, and lower social position which constructs and reinforces male dominance in society (Office of the Prime Minister and Council of Ministers, 2012; Deuba et al., 2016; Gurung and Acharya, 2016).

According to the Nepal Demographic Health Survey (NDHS) 2016, 26% of ever-married women have ever experienced physical, sexual, or emotional violence at the hands of their husbands. Of the 6% of women who have ever been pregnant and experienced physical violence during pregnancy, the majority of them experienced violence that was perpetrated by their current husbands (Ministry of Health Nepal, 2016). Studies conducted in Nepal showed a significant prevalence of IPVDP, 28.9% in Dhanusha and 53.2% in Kathmandu (Regmi et al., 2017; Singh et al., 2018). The aim of the study was to identify the magnitude of IPVDP and the factors associated with IPVDP.

Methodology

Study design and population

A community-based cross-sectional analytical study was carried out among 263 married women aged 15 to 49 years who had at least one child aged 12 months and younger in Putalibajar municipality, Gandaki Province, Nepal from October 2019 to March 2020. The sample size was calculated by using the finite population formula:

$$n = \frac{Z_{\infty}^2 pqN}{d^2 (N-1) + Z_{\infty}^2 pq}$$

A sample size of 263 was determined based on a 28.9% prevalence of IPVDP from a previous study conducted in Dhanusha, Nepal, with a 10% non-response rate and an estimated population of children aged 0–11 months in 2075/76 (2018/2019) of Putalibajar municipality (N) of 954 (Singh et al., 2018). Married women aged 15 to 49 years who had at least one child aged 12 months or younger were eligible for the study but mothers who were temporary residents, who refused to participate, who had no contact with their husband during the period of pregnancy, who could not answer, and who did not understand the Nepali language were excluded. A multi-stage random sampling technique was followed where 4 out of 14 wards were selected using a simple random technique; participants from each selected ward were determined proportionately based on the sample population. Finally, a systematic random sampling technique was carried out to select individual study participants where the sampling interval (K) was determined by dividing the total population size by the sample size.

Data collection and quality control

A face-to-face interview was carried out using an interview schedule to gather the information. To ensure the validity of the study, a tool was developed by using a standard questionnaire on IPVDP from the instrument of the WHO multi-country study questionnaire (García-Moreno et al., 2005). The Cronbach's alpha values for the physical and psychological IPV scales of the WHO multi-country study questionnaire were 0.78 and 0.75, respectively, in a study conducted in Bangladesh (Islam et al., 2017). Reliability was ensured by pretesting the tool among 10% of the estimated sample size. The tool was developed in both English and Nepali language.

Variables

The interview schedule included questions about sociodemographic characteristics such as family type, ethnicity, religion, the main occupation of the family, the woman's age, education, and involvement in an income-generating activity. The participants also provided information about their partner's characteristics such as age, education, involvement in an income-generating activity, substance use, gambling, presence of polygamy, and partner's preference for the specific sex of their child. Obstetric and reproductive characteristics such as age at marriage, type of marriage, the decision on marriage timing, duration of the marriage, gravida, previous history of miscarriage or induced abortion, number of living children, pregnancy intention, family support, and timing of 1st antenatal care (ANC) visit.

The dependent variable (IPVDP) was measured through a structured questionnaire regarding physical, sexual, emotional, and economic violence and controlling behavior from the instrument of the WHO multi-country study (García-Moreno et al., 2005). Participants answered yes or no whether they have experienced each of five forms of IPV.

Data analysis

Data entry was done using EPI-DATA and data analysis was done using SPSS. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the study population, which included means, ranges, frequencies, and percentages. The first step in the analysis was to find out the association between IPVDP and independent variables using the chi-square test. Variables that were significant in the chi-square test with a value of p < 0.05 were further analyzed by using bivariate and multivariate logistic regression to assess the strength of the association.

Ethical consideration

The study was given ethical approval by the Nepal Health Research Council (NHRC). The 2001 guidelines of Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on Domestic Violence against Women by the WHO were followed (World Health Organization, 2001). The participants were fully informed about the nature and benefits of the research and full informed consent was taken prior to the conduction of the interview. The participants were informed about the rights of women under the law regardless of their experience of violence. If a woman needed help, contact was made with support institutions or police stations only after the woman's consent had been obtained.

Results

Socio-demographic characteristics

Out of 263 participants, more than half of the respondents [146 (55.5%)] were between 25 and 34 years old. Of the upper caste group 117(44.5%) belonged to Hindu 228(86.7%). The mean age of the participants was 27 years (SD \pm 4.9). Nearly all respondents were literate [256 (97.3%)], and nearly half [125(47.5%)] of the participants belonged to a nuclear family. The majority of the participants' husbands were aged between 25 and 34 years [168(63.9%)]. The mean age of the participants' husbands was 30 years old (SD \pm 5.4), and ranged from 19 to 51 years. Almost all the participants' husbands were literate [261(99.2%)] and were involved in any type of incomegenerating activity [246(93.5%); Table 1].

Magnitude of IPVDP

Out of 263 participants, 79 (30%) experienced any kind of IPVDP. The most common type of IPV faced by the participants among the different forms of violence was controlling behavior [53(67.1%)], followed by emotional [49(62.0%)], sexual [28(35.4%)], economic [16(20.3%)], and physical violence [14(17.7%)].

Association between variables and IPVDP

Association between socio-demographic characteristics and IPVDP

Intimate partner violence during pregnancy was significantly associated with family size (p < 0.01), ethnicity (p < 0.01), the main occupation of the family (p < 0.05), and women's education (p < 0.05; Table 2).

Association between the participants' husband's characteristics and IPVDP

IPVDP was strongly associated with the husband's alcohol consumption, frequency of alcohol consumption, and the husband's tobacco consumption (p < 0.001). Similarly, family support during pregnancy and the husband's involvement in gambling were also associated with IPVDP (p < 0.01; Table 3).

Association between obstetric and reproductive characteristics and IPVDP

IPVDP was significantly associated with decisions about marriage timing by the participants (p < 0.01) and family support during pregnancy (p < 0.001; Table 4).

TABLE 1 Socio-demographic characteristics.

Prequency (7)Percent (%)Woman's age15-24923525-3414655.5≥35259.5Eamily type12547.5Joint11543.7Extended238.7Budchar22886.7Buddhism2183.0Muslim22886.7Buddhism210.8Muslim220.8Christianity20.8Ethnicity11744.5Upper caste group11744.5Baltively advantaged Janajati238.7Joind259.5Dalit5019.0No formal education72.7Primary176.5Secondary10539.9Higher Secondary19335.4Joint Income-generative9335.4Higher Secondary19072.2Ivolved7327.8Secondary19335.4Secondary19072.2Ivolved in income-generative9335.4Secondary19.012.0Secondary19.012.0Secondary19.03.0Secondary19.03.0Secondary19.012.0Secondary13.23.0Secondary13.03.0Secondary13.03.0Secondary13.03.0Secondary13.03.0Se	Variable				
15-2492352-5-3414655.5≥ 35259.5Family type12547.5Nuclear11543.7joint11543.7Extended2386.7Bidgion22.886.7Hinduism22.886.7Muslim21.09.5Christianity20.8Huthism12.59.5Christianity2.10.8Pyper caste group11.744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati2.38.7Isadvantaged Janajati2.38.7Oto formal education72.7Primary17.04.5Scondary10.53.9Higher Scondary9.33.54Isadvantaged7.32.7Primary17.65.3Prinder Guettion7.32.7Primary17.65.3Prinder Scondary9.33.54Prinder Guettion7.32.7Prinder Guettion7.33.7.8Prinder Guettion7.33.6.2Prinder Guettion7.33.6.2Prinder Guettion7.33.6.2Prinder Guettion2.33.6.2Prinder Guettion2.33.6.2Prinder Guettion2.33.6.2Prinder Guettion2.33.6.2Prinder Guettion2.33.6.2Prinder Guettion2.33.6.2Prinder Guettion2.3		Frequency (<i>n</i>)	Percent (%)		
25-3414655.5≥35235235Family type12547.5Nuclear11543.7Joint11543.7Extended2386.7Birduism22886.7Buddhism210.8Muslim210.8Muslim210.8Extended12386.7Piper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati4818.3Disadvantaged Janajati2387.7Pinary210.9No formal education72.7Pirmary10539.9Scondary10335.4Pixoley10335.4Pixoley1335.4Pixoley	-				
≥352532539.5FamilytypeNuclear12547.5Nuclear11543.7Joint238.7Extended238.6.7Binduism2288.6.7Rudhism2159.5Christianity20.8Dyper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati238.7Pisadvantaged Janajati238.7Roffer advantaged Janajati238.7Roffer advantaged Janajati239.5Pisadvantaged Janajati239.5Postor279.5Scondary176.5Scondary1053.9.9Higher Secondary1333.5.4Pisadvantaged1333.5.4Standardse1303.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4Standardse133.5.4 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
ParameterFamily typeNuclear12547.5Joint11543.7Extended238.7Extended238.67Buddhism22886.7Buddhism2139.5Christianity20.8Dyper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati238.7Disadvantaged Janajati238.7Poisadvantaged Janajati238.7Primary259.5Scondary259.5Primary732.7Primary176.5Scondary933.5.4Higher Secondary933.5.4Pathetin Secondary1007.2Scondary1329.5Scondary1303.2.8Stain Norbied732.7.8Scondary1303.5.4Stain Norbied732.6Primary1059.5Scondary1329.5Scondary1323.5.4Stain Norbied732.7.8Stain Norbied1323.5.4Scondary1363.9.9Scondary1323.5.4Scondary1323.5.4Scondary1323.5.4Scondary1323.5.4Scondary1323.5.4Scondary1323.5.4Scondary1323.5.4Scondary1323.5.4Scondar	25-34	146	55.5		
Nuclear12547.5Joint11543.7Extended238.7Extended238.7Hinduism22886.7Buddhism83.0Muslim259.5Christianity20.8Extended group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati4818.3Disadvantaged Janajati238.7Religious minorities259.5Dait509.5Dait509.5Dait509.5Secondary1744.5Higher Secondary238.7Higher Secondary10539.9Higher Secondary1053.0Secondary19335.4Not involved732.7.8Secondary19335.4Secondary1907.2.2Secondary1933.6.7Secondary1933.6.7Secondary1907.2.2Secondary1903.2.2Secondary1903.6.2Secondary2.36.3.9Secondary2.42.5Secondary2.63.0Secondary2.63.0Secondary2.63.0Secondary3.13.0Secondary3.13.0Secondary3.13.0Secondary2.53.0Secondary3.13.0Secondary3.13.0<	≥35	25	9.5		
Joint11543.7Extended238.7Extended238.7Hinduism22886.7Buddhism83.0Muslim259.5Christianity20.8Extnicity20.8Upper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati238.7Joind259.5Disdvantaged Janajati238.7Religious minorities259.5Dail509.5Dailt509.5Scondary174.5Secondary1053.9.9Higher Secondary1053.9.9Higher Secondary1333.5.4Not involved1732.7.8Scindardsate1903.5.4Higher Secondary1903.5.4Secondary1903.5.4Standbadsate1903.5.4Not involved1903.6.2Scindard above1903.6.2Scindardsate2.53.6.2Scindardsate3.6.2Scindardsate3.6.2Scindardsate3.6.2Scindardsate3.6.2Scindardsate3.6.2Scindary63.3Scindary63.3Scindary63.3Scindary5.33.6.2Scindary3.125.6.2Scindary63.3Scindary6.33.6.2Scin	Family type				
Extended2338.7ReligionHinduism22886.7Buddhism83.0Muslim259.5Christianity20.8Christanity20.8Ethnicity120.8Upper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati238.7Josadvantaged Janajati239.5Dati259.5Dati5019.0Primary239.5Yoffer ad adore72.7Primary176.5Secondary9335.4Higher Secondary190539.9Not involved732.7.8Not involved732.7.8System19.03.0.2Privated732.7.8System19.03.0.2System19.03.0.2Hushard's age19.03.0.2System259.5System1686.3.9System12.63.0.2System13.23.0.2System13.23.0.2System13.23.0.2System13.23.0.2System13.23.0.2System13.23.0.2System13.23.0.2System13.23.0.2System13.23.0.2System13.23.0.2System13.23.0.2 <trr>System13.2<t< td=""><td>Nuclear</td><td>125</td><td>47.5</td></t<></trr>	Nuclear	125	47.5		
ReligionHinduism22886.7Buddhism83.0Muslim259.5Christianity20.8Christianity20.8Ethnicity120.8Upper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati2.38.7Disadvantaged Janajati2.59.5Diaduantaged Janajati2.59.5Dalit5019.0Portinal education72.7No formal education72.7Primary176.5Secondary9.173.5.4Higher Secondary9.33.5.4Not involved7.32.7.8Not involved7.32.7.8Secondary1.013.9.9Sitabad's age3.5.43.5.4Secondary9.33.5.4Not involved7.32.7.8System Secondary1.023.5.4Secondary1.033.5.4Secondary1.043.0.2System Secondary2.59.5Secondary2.59.5Secondary2.63.9Secondary2.13.6.2Primary62.3Secondary3.13.5.4Secondary3.13.5.4Secondary3.63.9Secondary3.63.5.4Secondary3.63.5.4Secondary3.63.5.4Secondary3.63.6.2	Joint	115	43.7		
Hinduism22886.7Buddhism83.0Muslim259.5Christianity20.8Ethnicty120.8Upper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati4818.3Disadvantaged Janajati238.7Religious minorities259.5Dalit5019.0Vormaris education72.7Primary10539.9Secondary10539.9Higher Secondary9335.4Not involved732.7.8Not involved732.7.8Not involved1907.2.2Secondary10539.9Secondary2.33.5.4Not involved7.32.7.8Not involved19.07.2.2Secondary19.07.2.2Secondary19.03.5.4Secondary19.03.5.4Secondary19.03.5.4Secondary19.03.5.4Secondary19.03.5.4Secondary2.39.5Secondary2.33.5.4Secondary2.33.5.4Secondary3.63.9Secondary3.63.9Secondary3.63.3Secondary3.63.6Secondary3.63.6Secondary3.63.6Secondary3.63.6Secondary3.63.6 </td <td>Extended</td> <td>23</td> <td>8.7</td>	Extended	23	8.7		
Buddhism83.0Buddhism259.5Christianity20.8Ethnicity20.8Upper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati2.38.7Disadvantaged Janajati2.59.5Dalit5019.0Dalit5019.0Vorman's education72.7Primary176.5Secondary9335.4Bachelor and above191035.4Involved in income-generating9335.4Not involved732.7.8System1933.5.4Secondary9.133.5.4Involved in income-generating9.33.5.4System19.07.32.7.8System19.03.5.4Secondary9.133.5.4Not involved732.7.8System19.07.3System9.53.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4System19.03.5.4 </td <td>Religion</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Religion				
Muslim259,5Christianity20.8Ehnicity20.8Elhnicity11744.5Upper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati4818.3Disadvantaged Janajati238.7Religious minorities259.5Dalit5019.0Woman's education72.7Primary10539.9Higher Secondary9335.4Bachelor and above4115.6Involved in income-generatione9335.4Privolved7327.8Not involved19072.2Secondary19036.9Husband's age19036.925-34259.525-3416863.925-34200.8Primary62.3No formal education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Husband's education5320.2Husband's involvement in income-generatione20.2Husband's involvement in	Hinduism	228	86.7		
Christianity20.8EthnicityUpper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati4818.3Disadvantaged Janajati238.7Religious minorities259.5Dalit5019.0Woman's education72.7Primary176.5Secondary10539.9Higher Secondary9335.4Not involved732.7.8Noti nicome-generating19.03.5.4Yethold Sage19.03.5.4Secondary19.33.5.4Higher Secondary9.33.5.4Not involved732.7.8Soft involved19.07.2.2Involved in income-generating9.07.2.2Secondary19.03.5.4Not involved7.32.7.8Secondary19.03.6.1Secondary16.86.3.9Secondary2.63.9Secondary13.20.8Primary62.3Secondary13.20.2Higher Secondary702.6.6Bachelor and above5.32.0.2Husband's involvement in income-generative10.2Husband's involvement in income-generative<	Buddhism	8	3.0		
IterationIterationEthnicityUpper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati4818.3Disadvantaged Janajati238.7Religious minorities259.5Dalit5019.0Woman's education72.7Primary1776.5Secondary9335.4Bachelor and above4115.6Involved inicome-generating9335.4Not involved7327.8224259.525-3416863.925-3416863.925-34259.525-34269.525-34263.9259.026.6Husband's education20.8Primary62.326 ordary1320.2Husband's education20.8Primary62.325-3420.210.2Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in increme-generativetty10.8Husband's involveme	Muslim	25	9.5		
Upper caste group11744.5Relatively advantaged Janajati4818.3Disadvantaged Janajati238.7Palit259.5Dalit5019.0Woman's education72.7Primary176.5Secondary9335.4Higher Secondary9335.4Not in income-generative176.5Secondary19072.2Involved in income-generative19072.2Secondary19072.2Secondary19072.2Involved in income-generative19072.2Secondary1906.5Secondary1659.5Secondary16863.9Secondary16863.9Secondary20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Higher Secondary62.3Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in income-generative10.2Husband's involvemen	Christianity	2	0.8		
It is the serierIt is the serierRelatively advantaged Janajati4818.3Disadvantaged Janajati238.7Religious minorities259.5Dalit5019.0Woman's education72.7Primary176.5Secondary10539.9Higher Secondary9335.4Bachelor and above4115.6Involved in income-generating9327.8Not involved1907.2.2Husband's age259.525-3416863.92357026.6Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary7026.6Husband's education20.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in income-generating activity102Husband's involvement in income-generating activity103Husband's involvement in income-generating activity104Husband's involvement in income-generating activity104	Ethnicity				
Disadvantaged Janajati 23 8.7 Religious minorities 25 9.5 Dalit 50 19.0 Woman's education 7 2.7 No formal education 7 2.7 Primary 17 6.5 Secondary 93 35.4 Bachelor and above 41 15.6 Involved in income-generating 170 6.7 Not involved 190 72.2 Husband's age 224 25 9.5 25-34 168 63.9 25.5 25-34 168 63.9 25.6 Primary 6 2.3 2.6 Primary 70 2.6.6 2.6 Prigher Seconda	Upper caste group	117	44.5		
Religious minorities 25 9.5 Dalit 50 19.0 Woman's education 7 2.7 No formal education 7 2.7 Primary 17 6.5 Secondary 93 35.4 Bachelor and above 41 15.6 Involved in income-generating civity 73 27.8 Not involved 190 72.2 Husband's age 25 9.5 ≤ 24 25 9.5 $\leq 5-34$ 168 63.9 ≥ 35 70 26.6 Husband's education 2 0.8 Primary 6 2.3 Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 53 20.2 Husband's involvement in income-generating activity 26.6 Higher Secondary 53 20.2	Relatively advantaged Janajati	48	18.3		
Dalit5019.0Woman's education72.7Woman's education72.7Primary176.5Secondary10539.9Higher Secondary9335.4Bachelor and above4115.6Involved in income-generating7327.8Not involved19072.2Husband's age259.525-3416863.925-3416863.925-3416863.925-34259.525-3462.3Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in income-generating activity10.8Involved9335.4	Disadvantaged Janajati	23	8.7		
Woman's education72.7No formal education72.7Primary176.5Secondary10539.9Higher Secondary9335.4Bachelor and above4115.6Involved in income-generativity19072.2Involved in income-generativity7327.8Not involved19072.2Secondary age259.5 ≤ 24 259.525-3416863.9 ≥ 35 7026.6Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in incovergenerating activity100Involved24693.5	Religious minorities	25	9.5		
No formal education72.7Primary176.5Secondary10539.9Higher Secondary9335.4Bachelor and above4115.6Involved in income-generating-trivity17327.8Involved 07327.8Not involved19072.2Husband's age259.525–3416863.9≥357026.6Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in income-generating activity146Involved3320.2	Dalit	50	19.0		
Primary176.5Secondary10539.9Higher Secondary9335.4Bachelor and above4115.6Involved in income-generating witterInvolved in income-generating witter7327.8Not involved7327.8Not involved19072.2Secondary259.525-3416863.9≥357026.6Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in income-generating activity104Involved24693.5	Woman's education				
Secondary 105 39.9 Higher Secondary 93 35.4 Bachelor and above 41 15.6 Involved in income-generating ±vivity 100 27.8 Involved 190 72.2 Musband's age 25 9.5 $≤24$ 25 9.5 $25-34$ 168 63.9 $≥35$ 70 26.6 Husband's education 2 0.8 Primary 6 2.3 Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 70 26.6 Bachelor and above 53 20.2 Higher Secondary 6 2.3 Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 70 26.6 Bachelor and above 53 20.2 Husband's involvement in incovergenerating activity 10.2 10.2	No formal education	7	2.7		
Higher Secondary9335.4Bachelor and above4115.6Involved in income-generating15.6Involved7327.8Not involved19072.2Husband's age259.525-3416863.9≥357026.6Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in incovergenerating activity10.8Involved24693.5	Primary	17	6.5		
Bachelor and above 41 15.6 Involved in income-generating activity 1 1 Involved 73 27.8 Not involved 190 72.2 Husband's age 2 25 $≤24$ 25 9.5 25–34 168 63.9 $≥35$ 70 26.6 Husband's education 2 0.8 Primary 6 2.3 Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 70 26.6 Bachelor and above 53 20.2 Husband's involvement in incovergenerating activity 132 50.2	Secondary	105	39.9		
Involved in income-generating activityInvolved7327.8Not involved19072.2Husband's age259.5≤24259.525–3416863.9≥357026.6Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Involved24693.5	Higher Secondary	93	35.4		
Involved7327.8Not involved19072.2Husband's age259.5≤24259.525-3416863.9≥357026.6Husband's education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in incovergenerating activity104Involved24693.5	Bachelor and above	41	15.6		
Not involved 190 72.2 Husband's age ≤24 25 9.5 25-34 168 63.9 ≥35 70 26.6 Husband's education No formal education 2 0.8 Primary 6 2.3 Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 70 26.6 Bachelor and above 53 20.2 Husband's involvement in incoversementing activity 23.3	Involved in income-generating a	ctivity			
Husband's age Image ≤ 24 25 9.5 $25-34$ 168 63.9 ≥ 35 70 26.6 Husband's education 2 0.8 Primary 6 2.3 Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 70 26.6 Bachelor and above 53 20.2 Husband's involvement in incretenting activity 10.2 10.2	Involved	73	27.8		
≤24 25 9.5 25-34 168 63.9 ≥35 70 26.6 Husband's education 2 0.8 Primary 6 2.3 Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 70 26.6 Bachelor and above 53 20.2 Husband's involvement in incovergenerating activity 100.2 100.2	Not involved	190	72.2		
25-34 168 63.9 ≥35 70 26.6 Husband's education 2 0.8 Primary 6 2.3 Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 70 26.6 Bachelor and above 53 20.2 Husband's involvement in incovergenerating activity 100.2 100.2	Husband's age	·			
≥35 70 26.6 Husband's education 26.6 No formal education 0.8 Primary 6 2.3 Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 70 26.6 Bachelor and above 53 20.2 Husband's involvement in increating activity 100.2 100.2	≤24	25	9.5		
Husband's education 2 0.8 No formal education 2 0.8 Primary 6 2.3 Secondary 132 50.2 Higher Secondary 70 26.6 Bachelor and above 53 20.2 Husband's involvement in incommergenerating activity 100 100	25-34	168	63.9		
No formal education20.8Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in incorregenerating activity100100Involved24693.5	≥35	70	26.6		
Primary62.3Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in incomergenerating activity100100Involved24693.5					
Secondary13250.2Higher Secondary7026.6Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in incomergenerating activity100100Involved24693.5	No formal education	2	0.8		
Higher Secondary 70 26.6 Bachelor and above 53 20.2 Husband's involvement in income-generating activity 100 246	Primary	6	2.3		
Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in income-generating activityInvolved24693.5	Secondary	132	50.2		
Bachelor and above5320.2Husband's involvement in income-generating activityInvolved24693.5	Higher Secondary	70	26.6		
Involved 246 93.5		53	20.2		
Involved 246 93.5	Husband's involvement in income-generating activity				
Not involved 17 6.5			93.5		
	Not involved	17	6.5		

Bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis between IPVDP and selected variables

In multivariate logistic regression analysis, after adjusting for potential confounding factors, IPV was significantly associated with

	IPVDP		+		
Variable	Yes 79(30.0%)	No 184 (70.0%)	Total	Value of <i>p</i>	
Family type					
Nuclear	26(20.8%)	99(79.2%)	125	0.008**	
Joint	44(38.3%)	71(61.7%)	115		
Extended	9(39.1%)	14(60.9%)	23		
Religion					
Hinduism	67(29.4%)	131(70.6%)	228	0.556	
Others	12(34.3%)	23(65.7%)	184		
Ethnicity					
Upper caste group	30(25.6%)	87(74.4%)	117	0.002**	
Relatively advantaged Janajati	7(14.6%)	41(85.4%)	48		
Disadvantaged Janajati	8(34.8%)	15(65.2%)	23		
Religious Minorities	9(36.0%)	16(64.0%)	25	-	
Dalit	25(30.0%)	25(70.0%)	50		
Main occupation of the family					
Agriculture	5(41.7%)	7(53.3%)	12	0.030*	
Job	13(16.7%)	65(83.3%)	78	-	
Business	28(42.4%)	38(57.6%)	66		
Daily wage laborer	7(31.8%)	15(68.2%)	22		
Foreign laborer	9(33.3%)	18(66.7%)	27	-	
Foreign Service	17(29.3%)	41(70.7%)	58		
Woman's age					
<25	27(29.3%)	65(70.7%)	92	0.967	
25-34	44(30.1%)	102(69.9%)	146		
≥35	8(32.0%)	17(68.0%)	25		
Woman's education					
< 10 years of schooling	26(40.6%)	38(59.4%)	64	0.027*	
\geq 10 years of schooling	50(26.0%)	142(74.0%)	192		
Woman's involvement in any income-generating activity					
Involved	23(31.9%)	49(68.1%)	72	0.679	
Not involved	56(29.3%)	135(70.7%)	191		

TABLE 2 Association between socio-demographic characteristics of participants and Intimate partner violence during pregnancy (IPVDP).

 $Other \ religion = Buddhism, Islam, and \ Christianity. * p-value \ significant \ at \ \alpha < 0.05, ** p-value \ significant \ at \ \alpha < 0.01.$

the husband's alcohol consumption (AOR=3.171; CI 95%:1.454 - 6.912), husband's tobacco consumption (AOR=3.815; CI 95%:1.588 - 9.167). Similarly, women who reported receiving family support only sometimes during their pregnancy were more likely to experience IPV in comparison to women who received family support on a daily basis (AOR=2.948; CI 95%:1.115-7.793), and women who did not decide upon their marriage timing (AOR=2.777; CI 95%:1.331-5.792) were more likely to experience IPVDP (Table 5).

Discussion

The prevalence of IPVDP in this study was 30% among the 263 participants, which is consistent with another study from Dhanusha,

Nepal, showing a prevalence of 28.9%. This may be due to the similarities in the population based on the setting (Singh et al., 2018). The prevalence figures of this study were also consistent with the global prevalence of IPVDP estimated by the WHO in a multi-country study (García-Moreno et al., 2005).

However, our prevalence figure is lower than that of other studies conducted in Ethiopia (Abebe Abate et al., 2016), Nigeria (Ezeudu et al., 2019), Vietnam (Hoang et al., 2016), Kenya (Makayoto et al., 2013), Rwanda (Ntaganira et al., 2008), South Korea (Lee and Lee, 2018), and Gambia (Idoko et al., 2015) but higher than the studies conducted in Belgium (Van Parys et al., 2014) Japan (Doi et al., 2019), South Africa (Groves et al., 2012), Guatemala (Johri et al., 2011), and India (Jain et al., 2017). Such a difference may be attributed due to the differences in methodologies, population, and assessments that have been used

TABLE 3 Association between participants' husband's characteristics and IPVDP.

Variable	IPVDP		Total	Value of <i>p</i>
variable	Yes 79(30.0%)	No 184(70.0%)	TOLAL	value of p
Husband's age				
≤24	7(28%)	18(72%)	25	0.775
25-30	53(31.5%)	115(68.5%)	168	
≥35	19(27.1%)	51(72.9%)	70	
Husband's education				
< 10 years of schooling	21(36.8%)	36(63.2%)	57	0.222
\geq 10 years of schooling	58(28.4%)	146(71.6%)	204	
Husband's involvement in incom	e-generating activities			
Involved	73(29.7%)	173(70.3%)	246	0.625
Not involved	6(35.3%)	11(64.7%)	17	
Husband's alcohol consumption				
Yes	52(44.4%)	65(55.6%)	117	<0.001***
No	27(18.5%)	119(81.5%)	146	
Frequency of alcohol consumption	on			
Daily	18 (90%)	2 (10%)	20	<0.001***
Usually	11(47.8%)	12 (52.2%)	23	
Sometimes	17 (31.5%)	37 (68.5%)	54	
Rarely	6 (30%)	14 (70%)	20	
Husband's tobacco consumption				
Yes	32(54.2%)	27(45.8%)	59	<0.001***
No	47(23%)	157(77%)	204	
Presence of gambling				
Yes	28(45.9%)	33(54.1%)	61	0.002**
No	51(25.2%)	151(74.8%)	202	
Polygamy [#]				
Yes	4(33.3%)	8(66.7%)	12	1.000
No	75(29.9%)	176(70.1%)	251	
Husband's preference for a specif	îc sex of the child			
No preference	54(27%)	146(73%)	200	0.122
Preference for son	16(43.2%)	21(56.8%)	37	
Preference for daughter	9(34.6%)	17(65.4%)	26	
Family support				
Daily	13(17.3%)	62(82.7%)	75	0.008**
Usually	21(26.9%)	57(73.1%)	78	
Sometimes	32(38.1%)	52(61.9%)	84	
Rarely	8(47.1%)	9(52.9%)	17	
Never	5(55.6%)	4(44.4%)	9	

*Yates continuity correction. ***p*-value significant at α <0.01, ****p*-value highly significant at α <0.001.

in the previous research. A strong association was found between alcohol use by the husband and the experience of IPVDP by women. Consistent with our findings, strong links have been found between alcohol use and the occurrence of IPV in many countries such as India (Das et al., 2013), Kenya (Makayoto et al., 2013; Owaka et al., 2017), Rwanda (Ntaganira et al., 2008), Brazil (Teixeira et al., 2015), and Zimbabwe (Shamu et al., 2013).

TABLE 4 Association between IPVDP and obstetric and reproductive characteristics.

Variable	IPVDP		Total	Value of <i>p</i>
	Yes 79(30.0%)	No 184(70.0%)		
Woman's age at marriage				
≤19	42(33.3%)	84(66.7%)	126	0.264
≥20	37(27%)	100(73%)	137	
Type of marriage				
Love marriage	28(29.5%)	67(70.5%)	95	0.881
Arranged marriage	51(30.4%)	117(69.6%)	168	
Duration of marriage				
≤ 4	31(30.4%)	71(69.6%)	102	0.634
5–9	25(26.9%)	68(73.1%)	93	
≥10	23(33.8%)	45(66.2%)	68	
Gravida				
Primigravida	33(28.0%)	85(72.0%)	118	0.508
Multigravida	46(31.7%)	99(68.3%)	145	
Parity				
Nulliparous	37(29.1)	90(70.9)	127	0.953
Primiparous	30(30.9)	67(69.1)	97	
Multiparous	12(30.8)	27(69.2)	39	
Total number of living children ex	ccluding their recent child $(n = 137)$			
1	70(70.0%)	30(30.0%)	100	0.565
>1	24(64.9%)	13(35.1%)	37	
Presence of abortion/miscarriage				
Yes	17(40.5%)	25(59.5%)	42	0.107
No	62(28.1%)	159(71.9%)	221	
Pregnancy intention				
Intended	45(26.5%)	125(73.5%)	170	0.088
Unintended	34(36.6%)	59(63.4%)	93	
Timing of first antenatal visit				
Early initiation of ANC	74(29.7%)	175(70.3%)	249	0.860
Late initiation of ANC	5(35.7%)	9(64.3%)	14	
Decision on marriage timing				
Yes	38(22.4%)	132(77.6%)	170	< 0.001***
No	41(44.1%)	52(55.9%)	93	

p-value highly significant at α <0.001.

Our study showed that women whose husbands consumed alcohol were more than three times more likely to experience violence than women whose husbands did not consume alcohol. Studies from other countries showed that women who had partners who drank alcohol were more than two times as likely in Kenya (Makayoto et al., 2013), and four times as likely in Rwanda (Ntaganira et al., 2008), to experience violence. This might be explained due to the low-socioeconomic status of the family, societal beliefs, or the impulsive personality of the husband, which accounts for an unhappy and stressful partnership, thus resulting in violence. However, our study does not determine that the increased stress from the use of alcohol leads to IPV or that the abuse of alcohol is a result of the stress of IPV but the association is significant.

Women whose husbands consumed tobacco were more than three times more likely to experience violence than women whose husbands did not consume tobacco. Similar to our finding, a study conducted in Iran showed an association between a smoking partner and psychological violence during pregnancy where women whose partner smoked were more than two times more likely to experience violence during pregnancy (Hajikhani Golchin

TABLE 5 Bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis between	
IPVDP and selected variables.	

Variable	UOR(95%CI)	AOR(95%CI)			
Family type					
Nuclear	1	1			
Joint	2.360(1.331-4.184)	1.934(0.864-4.326)			
Extended	2.448(0.954-6.280)	1.465(0.421-5.097)			
Ethnicity					
Upper caste group	1	1			
Relatively advantaged Janajati	0.495(0.201-1.221)	0.258(0.086-0.778)			
Disadvantaged Janajati	1.547(0.596-4.012)	1.041(0.257-4.207)			
Religious Minorities	1.631(0.653-4.077)	1.088(0.326-3.628)			
Dalit	2.9(1.451-5.797)	1.871(0.711-4.923)			
Main occupation of the family					
Agriculture	1.723(0.479-6.192)	1.555(0.346-6.983)			
Job	0.482(0.212-1.096)	0.349(0.116-1.053)			
Business	1.777(0.842-3.751)	1.713(0.674-4.356)			
Daily wage laborer	1.125(0.390-3.250)	0.087(0.015-0.515)			
Foreign laborer	1.206(0.453-3.212)	0.641(0.184-2.239)			
Foreign Service	1	1			
Woman's education					
<10 years of schooling	1.943(1.073-3.519)	2.168(0.884-5.316)			
\geq 10 years of schooling	1	1			
Husband's alcohol consumption					
Yes	3.526(2.025-6.139)	3.171(1.454-6.912)			
No	1	1			
Husband's tobacco consumption	Husband's tobacco consumption				
Yes	3.959(2.157-7.265)	3.815(1.588-9.167)			
No	1	1			
Presence of gambling					
Yes	2.512(1.385-4.556)	1.736(0.758-3.973)			
No	1	1			
Family support					
Daily	1	1			
Usually	1.757(0.806-3.832)	1.808(0.646-5.056)			
Sometimes	2.935(1.397-6.167)	2.948(1.115-7.793)			
Rarely	4.239(1.377-13.051)	1.916(0.474-7.745)			
Never	5.962(1.406-25.271)	4.497(0.680-29.757)			
Decision on marriage timing					
Yes	1	1			
No	2.739(1.587-4.727)	2.777(1.331-5.792)			

*Value of p significant at $\alpha < 0.05$, **Value of p significant at $\alpha < 0.01$, ***Value of p highly significant at $\alpha < 0.001$.

Adjusted for family type, ethnicity, main occupation of the family, women's education, husband's alcohol consumption, husband's tobacco consumption, gambling, family support, and decision on marriage timing.

Bold values indicate significant result after adjustment of covariates.

et al., 2014). However, this study took only one type of violence to show their association while in our study, the association was shown with the experience of any type of violence as a whole. A significant association was found between family support and IPVDP. Our study revealed that women who never received any assistance from family members in taking care of them during pregnancy or helping with household chores were almost six times more likely to experience violence during pregnancy. Similar literature on this topic was not found in previous studies. However, this variable is very important since pregnancy is a time when women need more care and support from their families. No support during this period might cause quarreling and violence in the family. However, our study does not determine that a lack of care during pregnancy led to the generation of a stressful relationship between the woman and their intimate partner or that the experience of IPV led to a lack of care during pregnancy but there remains a strong association.

Similarly, a strong association was found between the woman's decision on marriage timing and the experience of IPVDP. Our study showed that women who did not decide upon their marriage timing were more than two times more likely to experience IPVDP.

Conclusion

Our results demonstrate that in Putalibajar municipality, Syangja, three out of ten women experienced IPVDP. Controlling behavior inflicted by the husband was the most common type of violence followed by emotional, sexual, economic, and physical violence. To prevent violence, educating young people about respectful relationships, ensuring women's empowerment by focusing on higher education opportunities as well as discouraging the element of a violent milieu are important. Appropriate laws prohibiting violence against women and actions regarding screening of IPVDP at antenatal visits with proper management and referral to relevant care are needed.

Data availability statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

Ethics statement

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by IRC, Pokhara University Research Center and ERB, Nepal Health Research Council. The patients/participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

Author contributions

RS and HPK: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, methodology, visualization, and writing—review and editing. RS: funding acquisition, investigation, and writing—original draft. HPK: supervision and validation. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Funding

This research has been funded by Nepal Health Research Council with Under Graduate Health Grant.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the School of Health and Allied Science, Pokhara University for giving this opportunity to conduct research. The authors' deep gratitude to the Institutional Review Committee, PURC, and all the participants of the study.

References

Abebe Abate, B., Admassu Wossen, B., and Tilahun, D. T. (2016). Determinants of intimate partner violence during pregnancy among married women in Abay Chomen district, Western Ethiopia: a community based cross sectional study. *BMC Womens Health* 16:16. doi: 10.1186/s12905-016-0294-6

Das, S., Bapat, U., Shah More, N., Alcock, G., Joshi, W., Pantvaidya, S., et al. (2013). Intimate partner violence against women during and after pregnancy: a cross-sectional study in Mumbai slums. *BMC Public Health* 13:817. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-13-817

Deuba, K., Mainali, A., Alvesson, H. M., and Karki, D. K. (2016). Experience of intimate partner violence among young pregnant women in urban slums of Kathmandu Valley, Nepal: a qualitative study. *BMC Womens Health* 16:11. doi: 10.1186/s12905-016-0293-7

Doi, S., Fujiwara, T., and Isumi, A. (2019). Development of the intimate partner violence during pregnancy instrument (IPVPI). *Front. Public Health* 7:43. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2019.00043

Ezeudu, C. C., Akpa, O., Waziri, N. E., Oladimeji, A., Adedire, E., Saude, I., et al. (2019). Prevalence and correlates of intimate partner violence, before and during pregnancy among attendees of maternal and child health services, Enugu, Nigeria: mixed method approach, January 2015. *Pan Afr. Med. J.* 32:14. doi: 10.11604/pamj. supp.2019.32.1.13287

García-Moreno, C., Jansen, H., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., and Watts, C.. WHO Multicountry Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women. Geneva: World Health Organization. (2005); 204:1–18.

García-Moreno, C., Pallitto, C., Devries, K., Stöckl, H., Watts, C., and Abrahams, N.. Global and Regional Estimates of Violence Against Women: Prevalence and Health Effects of Intimate Partner Violence and Non-partner Sexual Violence. Geneva: World Health Organization; (2013).

Groves, A. K., Kagee, A., Maman, S., Moodley, D., and Rouse, P. (2012). Associations between intimate partner violence and emotional distress among pregnant women in Durban, South Africa. *J. Interpers. Violence* 27, 1341–1356. doi: 10.1177/0886260511425247

Gurung, S., and Acharya, J. (2016). Gender-based violence among pregnant women of Syangja District, Nepal. *Osong Public Health Res. Perspect.* 7, 101–107. doi: 10.1016/j. phrp.2015.11.010

Hajikhani Golchin, N. A., Hamzehgardeshi, Z., Hamzehgardeshi, L., and Shirzad, A. M. (2014). Sociodemographic characteristics of pregnant women exposed to domestic violence during pregnancy in an Iranian setting. *Iran Red Crescent Med J* 16:e11989. doi: 10.5812/ircmj.11989

Hoang, T. N., Van, T. N., Gammeltoft, T., Nguyen Thi Thuy, H., and Rasch, V. (2016). Association between intimate partner violence during pregnancy and adverse pregnancy outcomes in Vietnam: a prospective cohort study. *PLoS One* 11:e0162844. doi: 10.1371/ journal.pone.0162844

Idoko, P., Ogbe, E., Jallow, O., and Ocheke, A. (2015). Burden of intimate partner violence in the Gambia—a cross sectional study of pregnant women. *Reprod. Health* 12:34. doi: 10.1186/s12978-015-0023-x

Islam, M. J., Broidy, L., Baird, K., and Mazerolle, P. (2017). Intimate partner violence around the time of pregnancy and postpartum depression: the experience of women of Bangladesh. *PLoS One* 12:e0176211. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0176211

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Jain, S., Varshney, K., Vaid, N. B., Guleria, K., Vaid, K., and Sharma, N. (2017). A hospital-based study of intimate partner violence during pregnancy. *Int. J. Gynaecol. Obstet.* 137, 8–13. doi: 10.1002/ijgo.12086

Johri, M., Morales, R. E., Boivin, J. F., Samayoa, B. E., Hoch, J. S., Grazioso, C. F., et al. (2011). Increased risk of miscarriage among women experiencing physical or sexual intimate partner violence during pregnancy in Guatemala City, Guatemala: cross-sectional study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 11:49. doi: 10.1186/1471-2393-11-49

Lee, S., and Lee, E. (2018). Predictors of intimate partner violence among pregnant women. *Int. J. Gynaecol. Obstet.* 140, 159–163. doi: 10.1002/ijgo.12365

Makayoto, L. A., Omolo, J., Kamweya, A. M., Harder, V. S., and Mutai, J. (2013). Prevalence and associated factors of intimate partner violence among pregnant women attending Kisumu District Hospital, Kenya. *Matern. Child Health J.* 17, 441–447. doi: 10.1007/s10995-012-1015-x

Ministry of Health Nepal. Nepal Demographic Health Survey. Kathmandu: Ministry of Health, New Era, ICF, (2016).

Nejatizade, A. A., Roozbeh, N., Yabandeh, A. P., Dabiri, F., Kamjoo, A., and Shahi, A. (2017). Prevalence of domestic violence on pregnant women and maternal and neonatal outcomes in Bandar Abbas, Iran. *Electron. Physician.* 9, 5166–5171. doi: 10.19082/5166

Ntaganira, J., Muula, A. S., Masaisa, F., Dusabeyezu, F., Siziya, S., and Rudatsikira, E. (2008). Intimate partner violence among pregnant women in Rwanda. *BMC Womens Health* 8:17. doi: 10.1186/1472-6874-8-17

Office of the Prime Minister and Council of Ministers. A Study on Gender-based Violence Conducted in Selected Rural Districts of Nepal. Nepal: Office of the Prime Minister and Council of Ministers, (2012).

Owaka, I. O., Nyanchoka, M. K., and Atieli, H. E. (2017). Intimate partner violence in pregnancy among antenatal attendees at health facilities in west Pokot county, Kenya. *Pan Afr. Med. J.* 28:229. doi: 10.11604/pamj.2017.28.229.840

Regmi, M. C., Subedi, L., Shrestha, R., Dixit, B., and Shrestha, N. (2017). Prevalence of domestic violence among the pregnant women attending BPKIHS. *Nepal J. Obstet. Gynaecol.* 12, 32–35. doi: 10.3126/njog.v12i1.18978

Shamu, S., Abrahams, N., Zarowsky, C., Shefer, T., and Temmerman, M. (2013). Intimate partner violence during pregnancy in Zimbabwe: a cross-sectional study of prevalence, predictors and associations with HIV. *Trop. Med. Int. Health* 18, 696–711. doi: 10.1111/tmi.12078

Singh, J. K., Evans-Lacko, S., Acharya, D., Kadel, R., and Gautam, S. (2018). Intimate partner violence during pregnancy and use of antenatal care among rural women in southern Terai of Nepal. *Women Birth* 31, 96–102. doi: 10.1016/j.wombi.2017.07.009

Teixeira, S. V. B., Moura, M. A. V., Silva, L. R., Queiroz, A. B. A., Souza, K. V., and Albuquerque, N. L. (2015). Intimate partner violence against pregnant women: the environment according to Levine's nursing theory. *Rev. Esc. Enferm. U.S.P.* 49, 882–889. doi: 10.1590/S0080-623420150000600002

Van Parys, A. S., Deschepper, E., Michielsen, K., Temmerman, M., and Verstraelen, H. (2014). Prevalence and evolution of intimate partner violence before and during pregnancy: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* 14:294. doi: 10.1186/1471-2393-14-294

World Health Organization. *Putting Women First: Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on Domestic Violence Against Women.* Geneva: World Health Organization, (2001).