

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ijans

Factors promoting exclusive breastfeeding at a public health facility in Windhoek Namibia: A descriptive comparative study

Ruusa Megameno Nangolo^{a,*}, Anneline Robertson^a, Talitha Crowley^b

^a University of Stellenbosch, South Africa

^b University of the Western Cape, School of Nursing, South Africa

ARTICLE INFO	A B S T R A C T
Keywords: Exclusive breastfeeding Factors Infants Knowledge Mothers Namibia	Introduction: Exclusive breastfeeding (EBF) refers to the practice of giving an infant breast milk only up to the age of six months, except for oral rehydration solutions or drops/syrups of vitamins, minerals or medicines. Globally and in Namibia, EBF rates remain well below the 70% World Health Organisation (WHO) target. <i>Objective</i> : This study aimed to investigate factors that promote EBF amongst mothers at a public health facility in Windhoek, Namibia. <i>Methods and materials</i> : A quantitative comparative descriptive design was used. Women aged 18 and above with infants aged 0 to 6 months attending a public health facility (n = 270) in Windhoek, Namibia, were selected using non-probability consecutive sampling. A structured self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data on socio-demographic, economic, knowledge, psychosocial, biophysical and sociocultural factors. Data was analysed using descriptive statistics and logistic regression. <i>Results</i> : A large majority of participants practised EBF (87.8 %, n = 237). No significant socio-demographic, economic, knowledge, psychosocial or sociocultural predictors of EBF were identified. Having more than two pregnancies and more than two children were found to be statistically significant predictors of EBF (OR = 2.9, CI = 1.0 to 8.4, p = 0.05), (OR = 3.2, CI = 1.0 to 10.1, p = 0.05) <i>Conclusion</i> : EBF practice in this study is high, suggesting that mothers who access maternal healthcare services may be more likely to practice EBF. Primiparous mothers need increased support to promote EBF.

1. Introduction

The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends the practice of exclusive breastfeeding (EBF) during the first six months of life to achieve optimal health, growth and development (WHO, 2021). However, only 44 % of infants aged 0–6 months worldwide were exclusively breastfed from 2015 to 2020 (WHO, 2021). Optimal breastfeeding is so critical that the practice can avoid over 820 000 infant deaths annually (Dalcastagnê, Giugliani, Nunes, Hauser, & Giugliani, 2018). Therefore, global EBF guidelines were created to promote, protect and support breastfeeding in all mothers, irrespective of HIV status and increase the rate of EBF to at least 50 % by 2025 (WHO/UNICEF, 2014).

The positive benefits of EBF for the infant include decreasing morbidity and mortality, reducing the risk of chronic disease and hospitalisations, and fostering better neurodevelopment (Bhattacharjee, Schaeffer, & Hay, 2021; Chowdhury et al., 2015; Domenici & Vierucci,

2022; Laksono, Wulandari, Ibad, & Kusrini, 2021; Vaz et al., 2021).

The benefits for mothers practising EBF include a reduction in the risk of postpartum haemorrhage and depression, a decrease in the incidence of ovarian and breast cancer, cardiovascular diseases, diabetes and obesity, and birth spacing (Chowdhury et al., 2015; Laksono et al., 2021; Tesfu, Beyene, Sendeku, Wudineh, & Azeze, 2022).

EBF remains a key strategy to help control societal costs as it may stabilise individual financial strain of purchasing formula milk and improve the national economy expenditure related to hospitalisation, healthcare visits and medicine (Al-Binali, 2012).

Multiple factors are regarded as vital in promoting EBF. These factors include socio-demographic and economic (the mother's age, level of education, marital status, geographical location, employment status); knowledge of EBF; psychosocial and biophysical factors (attitude and self-efficacy); and sociocultural factors (societal norms, family and partner support, healthcare worker support and positive cultural beliefs)

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2023.100544

Received 1 June 2022; Received in revised form 17 January 2023; Accepted 24 January 2023 Available online 27 January 2023

^{*} Corresponding author at: P O BOX 90010, Ongwediva, Namibia.

E-mail addresses: rmnangolo@gmail.com, rmnangolo@icloud.com (R.M. Nangolo), anneliner@sun.ac.za (A. Robertson), tcrowley@uwc.ac.za, talithacrowley@gmail.com (T. Crowley).

^{2214-1391/© 2023} The Author. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

R.M. Nangolo et al.

(Balogun, Dagvadorj, Anigo, Ota, & Sasaki, 2015; Nguyen, Prasopkittikun, Payakkaraung, & Vongsirimas, 2021; Kimani-Murage et al., 2015; Wanjohi et al., 2016).

Although many EBF promoting factors have been identified, their influence may be individual and context-specific. For example, one study found that EBF practice decreases with the age of the mother as older mothers have more responsibilities and less time to breastfeed (Indongo & Mutorwa, 2017), whereas another study found that older mothers are more likely to breastfeed due to their experience (Edwards, Cragg, Dunn, & Peterson, 2021).

The benefits of EBF are well articulated in the guidelines and reports; however, the rate of EBF remains relatively low in most middle and low-income countries (UNICEF & WHO, 2018; Rollins et al., 2016). The EBF rate in Namibia was 16 % in 2013 (NDHS, MOHSS, & ICF, 2014) with a slight increase to 19 % in 2017 (Indongo & Mutorwa, 2017).

A study conducted on factors promoting EBF in Namibia has shown mixed results (Indongo & Mutorwa, 2017). Therefore, the evidence remains unclear on which factors may promote EBF in this context. Most studies did not include a comprehensive list of factors influencing EBF practice. This study aimed to investigate the factors promoting EBF amongst mothers at a public health facility in Windhoek, Namibia.

2. Methods and materials

2.1. Study design

This study used a quantitative comparative descriptive design to describe variables and examine differences in variables between participants who practised EBF and those who did not.

2.2. Study setting and participants

The study was conducted in the postnatal and immunisation departments at a public health facility in Windhoek, Namibia. This centre is located in the Katutura district of Windhoek and is a referral public health facility that operates 24 h a day. The population included all mothers who were practicing EBF and those not practicing EBF who attended the services at the postnatal and immunization departments at KHC within the three months' study period. The health facility provides healthcare services to a catchment population of approximately 120 594 people (MoHSS, NIP, & NSA, 2013). The total population is not known, but an average of 200 mothers use the postnatal services every month. The postnatal services at the centre include assessment and clinical examination of the mother and the baby, immunisation, growth monitoring and follow-up treatments for infant's 0–5 years. Sick infants are referred to Windhoek Central Hospital, which has a neonatal care unit.

2.3. Sample size and sampling technique

Mothers aged 18 years and above with infants between 0 and 6 months attending the postnatal and immunisation departments of the health facility were included in the study. Mothers under 18 were excluded since adolescent mothers may have unique factors contributing to their EBF practices.

Since no sampling frame was available, participants were sampled using a non-probability consecutive sampling technique. This meant that all eligible women attending the facility who consented to participate were included until the minimum sample size was reached. Representativeness was increased by sampling over three months, on a Monday and a Friday.

A power analysis was performed with the assistance of a biostatistician to determine the required sample size to test for the association of a single factor with EBF. Knowledge of EBF was considered an important factor, and considering the question, '*Breastmilk provides all the nutrients a child needs in the first six months (true/ false)*', we expected that 40 % of the participants would consider this a true statement. Based on the WHO estimate of EBF prevalence for Namibia of 19 %, the significance level proposed was 5 %, and it was assumed that the EBF proportions were 14 % in the 'false' group versus 28 % in the 'true' group. Therefore, the estimated sample size required for a power level of 80 % was 264. In this study, 270 women were recruited to account for any attrition due to incomplete questionnaires. After checking the questionnaires for completeness, all 270 questionnaires were included.

2.4. Data collection instrument

This study used the structured self-administered questionnaire adapted from other instruments (Maonga, Mahande, Damian, & Msuya, 2016; Rahman, Dewi, Fitrasyah, Oktaviani, & Rifai, 2017) and based on the literature. Permission was granted to use the questionnaires. The questionnaire was prepared in English and translated in Oshiwambo; forward and backward translations were used.

The baby's age and self-reported duration of EBF were used to determine the proportion of mothers practising EBF. In this study, EBF was operationalised as exclusive breastfeeding practice for infants aged 0–6 months. The dependent variable, EBF, was coded as 0 = no EBF and 1 = EBF.

The questionnaire contained questions related to socio-demographic and economic factors such as the mother's age, level of education, marital status, employment status, residential location, baby's age and gender and family income status. These questions were measured on a nominal scale, categorising responses into different categories.

Knowledge of EBF consisted of twelve true or false questions assessing mothers' understanding of several aspects of EBF. A knowledge score was created with a maximum score of 12.

Questions related to psychosocial and biophysical factors sought to determine the mothers' intrapartum experience, attitudes towards EBF and confidence to practice EBF. The section included thirteen questions on biophysical factors and four on previous breastfeeding experience. Attitudes towards EBF were measured using 18 Likert-scale questions ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree. An attitude score was created with a maximum score of 72.

Sociocultural factors were measured by seven questions related to the support received from healthcare workers, family and partners, as well as seven questions on cultural beliefs.

2.5. Validity and reliability

As stated above, the questionnaire was adapted based on the literature on factors promoting EBF among mothers. The tool was evaluated for content validity by two postnatal midwifery experts and two academic experts in midwifery. The study instrument was pretested with 30 participants at Windhoek Central Hospital. As a result, alterations were made to the questionnaire. Some medical terms were changed to layman's terms. No changes were made to the translated version of the questionnaire. Pilot data were excluded from the main study.

Reliability analysis was performed on the attitude scale. The included questions' Cronbach's alpha was 0.72 and was found to be suitable for the purpose of the study (Taber, 2018).

2.6. Data collection procedures

Data was collected from April 2020 to June 2020 by the researcher (first author) during the Covid-19 pandemic. The first author is not employed at the healthcare facility where data was collected and was present during data collection to assist participants in case of questions or assistance needed to complete questionnaires. All risk mitigation guidelines were adhered to, such as the compulsory wearing of a surgical mask, practising hand hygiene upon facility entry and frequently after every procedure using an alcohol-based hand rub, social distancing by keeping at least one metre between the researcher and the participants, and a Covid-19 register was kept of all the participants (MOHSS, 2021).

Mothers were allowed to bring their babies for scheduled immunisation and postnatal follow-up care during the pandemic.

Before approaching the prospective participants, the researcher reported to the facility matron and the operational manager or the nursein-charge allocated to the specific department.

2.7. Ethical considerations

The study was approved by the Health Research Ethics Committee of Stellenbosch University (S19/06/112) and the Research Management Committee (RMC) of Namibia (protocol number 17/3/3RMN). Information about the study was provided to the participants in the waiting room, and then a time was arranged with the mothers to complete the questionnaire – either while they waited for their appointment or after their appointment. The researcher obtained written informed consent from the participants in a private counselling room. The mothers who provided written informed consent were requested to complete the self-administered questionnaire in the private counselling room.

2.8. Data processing and analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using STATA version 16 with the assistance of a biostatistician. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the demographic characteristics of the participants and the factors promoting EBF. The dependent variable in this study was EBF, which is dichotomous. All the independent variables were nominal or ordinal. The frequencies and the percentages were computed and presented in a table comparing the EBF and non-EBF groups. Means and standard deviations were used to calculate the continuous variables, such as the knowledge and attitude scores. Logistic regression was performed to determine the individual factors that predicted EBF among the mothers. A level of statistical significance was set at p < 0.05, and the corresponding confidence interval was 95 %.

3. Results

A total of 270 mothers participated in the study. The mean age of these mothers was 28.74 years (SD 6.1). Of the 270 participants, 237 (87.8 %) practised EBF and 33 (12.2 %) did not practice EBF. The reported EBF rate was the highest amongst mothers with three-month-old babies (98.5 %, n = 65) and the lowest amongst six-month-old babies (68.5 %, n = 50) (not shown in the table).

Most participants had a higher secondary level education (56.1 %, n = 5) and above (34.2 %, n = 81). The majority were single (82.7 %, n = 196) and resided in an urban area (84.8 %, n = 201).

Most mothers were unemployed (43.0 %, n=102) with an average family income of less than N\$10 000 in the EBF group (87.3 %, n=207) and non-EBF group (78.8 %, n=26).

Table 1 depicts the socio-demographic and economic factors. None of the factors was associated with EBF practice.

Table 2 depicts biophysical factors. More than two pregnancies and having more than two children were identified as statistically significant predictors of EBF (OR = 2.9, CI = 1.0 to 8.4, p = 0.05), (OR = 3.2, CI = 1.0 to 10.1, p = 0.05). Overall, participants reported high antenatal care (ANC) attendance (96.2 % in the EBF group vs 93.9 % in the non-EBF group).

Participants also reported high frequencies of receiving health education on EBF; 88.6 % (n = 210) in the EBF group and 84.9 % (n = 28) in the non-EBF group.

Participants who practised EBF had a higher frequency of previous breastfeeding experience (63.7 %, n = 151) than those who were not exclusively breastfeeding (51.5 %, n = 17), although the difference was not significant.

The participants had predominantly positive attitudes towards EBF. The EBF group had a slightly higher mean attitude score toward EBF practice (54.9/76.3 % vs 54.4/75.6 %), but the difference was not

Table 1

Socio-demographic and economic factors.

Variables:	EBF - Yes n (%)	EBF - No n (%)	Odds ratio (OR)	P value	95 % Confidence Interval	
Education level (n	= 270)					
None	5 (2.1)	0 (0)	1			
Primary education	18 (7.6)	2 (6.1)	1.1	0.90	0.2–5.5	
Secondary	133	21	0.8	0.55	0.4–1.7	
education	(56.1)	(63.6)				
Tertiary	81	10	1 (omitted) ¹			
education	(34.2)	(30.3)				
Marital status (n =	= 270)					
Married	40	4 (12.1)				
	(16.9)					
Single	196	29	0.7	0.49	0.2 - 2.0	
	(82.7)	(87.9)				
Widow	1 (0.4)	0 (0.0)				
Location (n = 270)					
City (urban)	201	28				
	(84.8)	(84.9)				
Village (rural)	36	5 (15.2)	1.0	1.00	0.4-2.8	
	(15.2)					
Employment statu	s (n = 270)					
Employed	94	17				
	(39.7)	(51.5)				
Unemployed	102	14	1.3	0.48	0.6 - 2.8	
	(43.0)	(42.4)				
Self-employed	41	2 (6.1)	3.7	0.09	0.8-0.8	
	(17.3)					
Gender of baby (n	= 270)					
Female	125	14				
	(52.7)	(42.4)				
Male	112	19	0.7	0.27	0.3-1.4	
	(47.3)	(57.6)				
Family average income $(n = 270)$						
Less than N\$	207	26				
10 000	(87.3)	(78.8)				
More than N\$	30	7 (21.2)	0.5	0.19	0.2 - 1.3	
10 000	(12.7)					

Source: Author's table.

¹Omitted because of collinearity.

significant (OR 1.0, 95 % CI 1.0 to 1.1, p = 0.63).

The mean knowledge scores of EBF were high in both groups. Although the scores were slightly higher in the EBF group (9.2/76.5%) vs 9.0/75.3%), the difference was not significant (OR 1.1, 95%CI 0.8 to 1.4, p = 0.54).

Participants reported high levels of support across the EBF and non-EBF groups (see Table 3). In some instances, the support frequency was higher in the group not practising exclusive breastfeeding. Of concern is that more than half of the participants in both groups indicated that they encountered family constraints when initiating breastfeeding (65.4 % and 57.6 %).

The influence of cultural factors could be seen in that many participants reported that there are still traditional or cultural practices that may hinder EBF, such as other foods (EBF 26.6 % and non-EBF 30.3 %), herbs (EBF 33.3 % and non-EBF 30.3 %) and covering the breast (EBF 55.3 % and non-EBF 51.5 %) (Table 4). However, these practices were not associated with EBF practice.

Table 2

Biophysical factors.

Number of pregnancies (=270) 84 (35.4) 15 Two 71 (30.0) 13 1.0 0.95 0.4-2.2 More than two 82 (34.6) 5 (15.1) 3.0 0.05 1.0-8.4 ANC attendance during pregnancy (n = 270) Yes 228 31	Variable	EBF-yes n (%)	EBF-no n (%)	Odds ratio (OR)	P- value	95 % confidence interval
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Number of pregnanci	ies (=270)				
Two 71 (30.0) 13 (39.4) 1.0 0.95 0.4-2.2 (39.4) More than two 82 (34.6) 5 (15.1) 3.0 0.05 1.0-8.4 ANC attendance during pregnancy (n = 270) Yes (96.2) (93.9) 0.6 0.54 0.1-3.0 Health education on EBF (n = 270) Yes (96.2) (93.9) 0.6 0.54 0.1-3.0 Health education on EBF (n = 270) Yes (96.2) (93.9) 0.6 0.54 0.1-3.0 Health education on EBF (n = 270) Yes (96.7) (97.0) 0.72 0.53 0.1-2.0 Baby place of birth (n = 270) Hospital (98.7) (97.0) 0.4 0.45 0.0-4.1 Mode of delivery (n = 270) Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Mode of children (n = 270) One (81.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiationtum (n = 270) Immediately 80 (33.8) 11 0.3 0.4-4.2 More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4	One	84 (35.4)	15			
More than two 82 (34.6) 5 (15.1) 3.0 0.05 1.0-8.4 ANC attendance during pregnancy $(n = 270)$ Yes 228 31 6(6.2) (93.9) No 9 (3.8) 2 (6.1) 0.6 0.54 0.1-3.0 Health education on EBF (n = 270) Yes 210 28 88.6) (84.9) No 27 (11.4) 5 (15.1) 0.72 0.53 0.1-2.0 Baby place of birth $(n = 270)$ Hospital 234 32 68.6) (84.9) Nomal delivery 192 9 (27.3) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Mode of delivery (n = 270) Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children (n = 270) One 85 (55) 7 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children (n = 270) (42.4) 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) Immediately 80 (33.8) 11 0.34 0.3-3.8 I don't re			(45.5)			
More than two 82 (34.6) 5 (15.1) 3.0 0.05 1.0-8.4 ANC attendance during pregnancy (n = 270) Yes 228 31 (96.2) (93.9) No 9 (3.8) 2 (6.1) 0.6 0.54 0.1-3.0 Health education on EBF (n = 270) Yes (86.6) (84.9) 0.05 0.1-3.0 No 27 (11.4) 5 (15.1) 0.72 0.53 0.1-2.0 Baby place of birth (n = 270) Hospital 234 32 0.05 0.0-4.1 Mode of delivery (n = 270) Nomal delivery (n = 270) 0.66 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children (n = 270) (81.0) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Caesarean section 45 (19.0) 24 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) Immediately 8 (37.1) 1.4 0.99 0.5-2.2 (More than two 73 (30.8) 1 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270)	Two	71 (30.0)		1.0	0.95	0.4–2.2
ANC attendance during pregnancy $(n = 270)$ Yes 228 31 (96,2) (93,9) No 9 (3.8) 2 (6.1) 0.6 0.54 0.1-3.0 Health education on EBF $(n = 270)$ Yes 210 28 (88,6) (84,9) No 27 (11,4) 5 (15.1) 0.72 0.53 0.1-2.0 Baby place of birth $(n = 270)$ Hospital 234 32 (98,7) (97.0) Home 3 (1.3) 1 (3.0) 0.4 0.45 0.0-4.1 Mode of delivery $(n = 270)$ Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) (81.0) Caesarean section 45 (19.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 (72.7) Number of children $(n = 270)$ One 85 (35.9) 15 (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time $(n = 270)$ Inmediately 80 (33.8) 11 mediately 80 (33.8) 11 Caesarean section 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-4.2 One 00 (33.0) (42.2) HIV status $(n = 270)$ HIV positive 18 (7.6) 4 (12.1) HIV negative 214 28 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 (42.5) HIV status $(n = 270)$ HIV positive 18 (7.6) 4 (12.1) HIV negative 214 28 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 (42.5) HIV status $(n = 270)$ HIV positive 18 (7.6) 4 (12.1) HIV negative 214 28 1.7 0.37 0.5-5.4 (90.3) (84.9) Not known Choose not 0 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 disclose HIness preventing EBF $(n = 270)$ Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) No 228 32 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 Previous experience on EBF $(n = 270)$ Yes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) No 8 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 (48.5)						
Yes 228 31 (96.2) (93.9) (93.8) 2 (6.1) 0.6 0.54 0.1-3.0 Health education on EBF (n = 270) Yes 28 (88.6) (84.9) (88.7) 0.72 0.53 0.1-2.0 Baby place of birth (n = 270) Hospital 234 32 (98.7) (97.0) 0.4 0.45 0.0-4.1 Mode of delivery (n = 270) Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) (81.0) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Mode of children (n = 270) One 85 (35.9) 15 (45.5) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children (n = 270) One 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation Ime (3.33) 11 (33.3) 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 (42.5) HIV status (n = 270) Immediately 80 (33.8) 11 (33.3) 1.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation Immediately 80 (32.1) 1.4 0.9 0.72 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.1) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I d	More than two	82 (34.6)	5 (15.1)	3.0	0.05	1.0-8.4
Yes 228 31 (96.2) (93.9) (93.8) 2 (6.1) 0.6 0.54 0.1-3.0 Health education on EBF (n = 270) Yes 28 (88.6) (84.9) (88.7) 0.72 0.53 0.1-2.0 Baby place of birth (n = 270) Hospital 234 32 (98.7) (97.0) 0.4 0.45 0.0-4.1 Mode of delivery (n = 270) Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) (81.0) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Mode of children (n = 270) Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) (81.0) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children (n = 270) One 85 (35.9) 15 (45.5) 5 5 Two 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.1) 1.4 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0	ANC attendance duri	ng pregnancy	(n = 270)			
No(96.2) 9 (3.8)(93.9) 2 (6.1)0.60.540.1-3.0Health education or UFF (n = 270) Yes21028 (88.6)(84.9) (86.7)0.720.530.1-2.0Baby place of birth (n = 270) Hospital23432 (97.0)0.40.450.0-4.1Mode of delivery (n = 270) Normal delivery1929 (27.3) (81.0)0.40.450.0-4.1Mode of children (n = 270) Normal delivery1929 (27.3) (81.0)0.60.270.3-1.4Number of children (n = 270) One65.50.65.50.270.3-1.4Number of children (n = 270) One(45.5)0.051.0-10.1Breastfeeding initiation(45.5)0.051.0-10.1Breastfeeding initiation(45.5)0.051.0-10.1Breastfeeding initiation(42.4) (33.3)1.20.051.0-10.1Breastfeeding initiation(42.2)1.10.840.3-3.8I don't remember36 (15.2)4 (12.1)1.20.730.4-4.2(42.5)(42.5)0.720.4-2.0(42.5)HIV status (n = 270) HIV positive18 (7.6)4 (12.1)1.10.930.1-12.3HIV status (n = 270) (90.3)(84.9)0.720.4-2.0HIV positive18 (7.6)4 (12.1)1.10.930.1-12.3HIV positive18 (7.6)4 (12.1)1.10.930.1-12.3HIV status (n = 270) (90.3)(84.9)0.60.830.1-6.5No						
Health education on EBF (n = 270) Yes 210 28 (88.6) (84.9) 0.72 0.53 0.1-2.0 Baby place of birth (n = 270) Hospital 234 32 (98.7) (97.0) Home 3 (1.3) 1 (3.0) 0.4 0.45 0.0-4.1 Mode of delivery (n = 270) Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) (81.0) Caesarean section 45 (19.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 More than two 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 (45.5) (45.5) (42.4) 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) (33.3) 11 (33.3) 11 (33.3) Thirty minutes 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I do		(96.2)	(93.9)			
Yes 210 28 (88.6) (84.9) No 27 (11.4) 5 (15.1) 0.72 0.53 0.1-2.0 Baby place of birth (n = 270) (98.7) (97.0) 0 0.4 0.45 0.0-4.1 Mode of delivery (n = 270) (82.0) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Mode of delivery (n = 270) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) 0.4 0.40 0.99 0.5-2.2 Queen assection 45 (19.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children (n = 270) (42.4) 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 Two 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 Immediately 80 (35.8) 11 (33.3) 1 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2	No	9 (3.8)	2 (6.1)	0.6	0.54	0.1 - 3.0
Yes 210 28 (88.6) (84.9) No 27 (11.4) 5 (15.1) 0.72 0.53 0.1-2.0 Baby place of birth (n = 270) (98.7) (97.0) 0 0.4 0.45 0.0-4.1 Mode of delivery (n = 270) (82.0) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Mode of delivery (n = 270) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) 0.4 0.40 0.99 0.5-2.2 Queen assection 45 (19.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children (n = 270) (42.4) 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 Two 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 Immediately 80 (35.8) 11 (33.3) 1 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2	TT141	EDE (
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
No 27 (11.4) 5 (15.1) 0.72 0.53 0.1-2.0 Baby place of birth ($= = 270$) (98.7) (97.0) (98.7) (97.0) Home 3 (1.3) 1 (3.0) 0.4 0.45 0.0-4.1 Mode of delivery ($n = 270$) Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) (81.0) 0.27 0.3-1.4 Caesarean section 45 (19.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children ($n = 270$) (72.7)	res					
Baby place of birth (n = 270) Hospital 234 32 (98.7) (97.0) Home 3 (1.3) 1 (3.0) 0.4 0.45 0.0-4.1 Mode of delivery (n = 270) Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) (81.0) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Caesarean section 45 (19.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Mumber of children (n = 270) (45.5) (45.5) 10 10 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation tmm (n = 270) (42.4) 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation tmm (n = 270) (33.3) 11 0.99 0.5-2.2 (42.4) 80 (33.8) 11 (33.3) 1.0-10.1 1.0 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation tmm (n = 270) (42.4) 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 Immediately 80 (33.8) 1 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.1) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 <t< td=""><td>No</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.72</td><td>0.53</td><td>0.1_2.0</td></t<>	No			0.72	0.53	0.1_2.0
Hospital234 (98.7)32 (97.0)Home3 (1.3)1 (3.0)0.40.450.0-4.1Mode of delivery (n = 270) Normal delivery192 (192 (81.0)9 (27.3) (72.7)0.60.270.3-1.4Caesarean section45 (19.0)24 (72.7)0.60.270.3-1.4Number of children (n = 270) One $= 270$; (45.5)0.000.5-2.2Two79 (33.3)14 (45.5)1.00.990.5-2.2Two73 (30.8)4 (12.1)3.20.051.0-10.1Breastfeeding initiation $= 270$; (33.3)13 (33.3)0.4-4.20.6Done hour33 (13.9)4 (12.1)1.20.730.4-4.2One hour33 (13.9)4 (12.2)1.10.840.3-3.8I don't remember88 (37.1)140.90.720.4-2.0HIV status (n = 270) (42.5)(42.5)(42.5)0.5-5.40.5-5.4HIV positive18 (7.6)4 (12.1)1.20.370.5-5.4HIV status (n = 270) (42.5)(43.5)1.10.930.1-12.3HIV status (n = 270) (90.3)(84.9)1.10.930.1-12.3HIV status (n = 270) (90.3)(84.9)1.10.930.1-12.3HIV status (n = 270) (90.3)(84.9)1.10.930.1-12.3HIV status (n = 270) (90.3)(84.9)1.10.930.1-12.3Not known (Choose not to (96.2)(97.0)0.80.83			5 (15.1)	0.72	0.55	0.1-2.0
Home(98.7) 3 (1.3)(97.0) 1 (3.0)0.40.450.0-4.1Mode of delivery (n = 270) Normal delivery1929 (27.3) (81.0)0.60.270.3-1.4Caesarean section45 (19.0)240.60.270.3-1.4Number of children (n = 270) One85 (35.9)15 (45.5)100.990.5-2.2Two79 (33.3)141.00.990.5-2.2(42.4)More than two73 (30.8)4 (12.1)3.20.051.0-10.1Breastfeeding initiation10(33.3)11 (33.3)0.4-4.20.60.720.4-4.2One hour33 (13.9)4 (12.2)1.10.840.3-3.80.60.720.4-2.0Hiv status (n = 270) Hiv positive18 (7.6)4 (12.1)1.10.840.3-3.80.4-2.0HiV status (n = 270) Hiv positive18 (7.6)4 (12.1)1.10.840.3-3.8Idon't remember88 (37.1)140.90.720.4-2.0HiV spositive18 (7.6)4 (12.1)1.10.930.1-12.3Mot known choose not to disclose5 (2.1)1 (3.0)1.10.930.1-12.3Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes9(3.8)1(3.0)0.80.830.1-6.5No228320.80.830.1-6.5No63.6.3)160.60.180.3-1.3Mot scope15117171818Not known No<			32			
Home3 (1.3)1 (3.0)0.40.450.0-4.1Mode of delivery (n = 270) Normal delivery1929 (27.3) (81.0)0.60.270.3-1.4Caesarean section45 (19.0)240.60.270.3-1.4Number of children (n = 270) One15 (45.5)	· r · · ·					
Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) (81.0) Caesarean section 45 (19.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Mumber of children (n = 270) (72.7) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children (n = 270) (45.5) (45.5) (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) (33.3) 11 (33.3) Thirty minutes 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) HIV status (n = 270) (90.3) (84.9) (53.6) (51.5) Not known (60.2) (97.0) (51.5) (96.2) (97.0) <tr< td=""><td>Home</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.4</td><td>0.45</td><td>0.0-4.1</td></tr<>	Home			0.4	0.45	0.0-4.1
Normal delivery 192 9 (27.3) (81.0) Caesarean section 45 (19.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Mumber of children (n = 270) (72.7) 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children (n = 270) (45.5) (45.5) (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) (33.3) 11 (33.3) Thirty minutes 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) HIV status (n = 270) (90.3) (84.9) (53.6) (51.5) Not known (60.2) (97.0) (51.5) (96.2) (97.0) <tr< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr<>						
(81.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3–1.4 Number of children (n = 270) (72.7) 0.6 0.27 0.3–1.4 Number of children (n = 270) (45.5) (45.5) (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0–10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5–2.2 More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0–10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) (33.3) 11 0.33(3.3) 0.4 0.4 0.2 Immediately 80 (32.8) 11 (33.3) 0.73 0.4–4.2 0.6 0.72 0.4–2.0 (42.5) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4–4.2 0.4 0.9 0.72 0.4–2.0 HIV status (n = 270) HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) 0.37 0.5–5.4 (90.3) (84.9) 0.37 0.5–5.4 Not known Choose not to 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1–12.3 Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) <t< td=""><td>Mode of delivery (n</td><td>= 270)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Mode of delivery (n	= 270)				
Caesarean section 45 (19.0) 24 0.6 0.27 0.3-1.4 Number of children (n = 270) 0ne 85 (35.9) 15 15 Two 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) (33.3) 11 (33.3) Thirty minutes 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) 0.37 0.5-5.4 HIV status (n = 270) (90.3) (84.9) 0.37 0.5-5.4 (90.3) (84.9) 0.30 (84.9) 0.1-12.3 Not known 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) (96.2) (97.0) 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 0.	Normal delivery	192	9 (27.3)			
Number of children (n = 270) (72.7) number of children (n = 270) Number of children (n = 270) (45.5) Two 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 (42.4) (42.4) (42.4) 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) 1.0 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 Thirty minutes 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) (42.5) 0.37 0.5-5.4 HIV positive 18 (7.6) 4 (12.1) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 disclose 11 (90.3) (84.9) Not known 0.1-12.3 Choose not to 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 Misclose 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 0.83 0.1-6.5 No		(81.0)				
Number of children (n = 270) One 15 (45.5) Two 79 (3.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 Two 79 (3.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) (33.3) 11 (33.3) 11 Immediately 80 (33.8) 11 (33.3) 0.4-4.2 0.4 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) 0.442.0 (42.5) 0.442.0 HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) 0.37 0.5-5.4 0.37 0.5-5.4 More than two 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 Mot sclose (90.3) (34.9) 0.83 0.1-6.5 Not known (96.2) (97.0) <td>Caesarean section</td> <td>45 (19.0)</td> <td></td> <td>0.6</td> <td>0.27</td> <td>0.3–1.4</td>	Caesarean section	45 (19.0)		0.6	0.27	0.3–1.4
One 85 (35.9) 15 (45.5) Two 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5–2.2 (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0–10.1 Breastfeeding initiation (n = 270) Immediately 80 (33.8) 11 (33.3) 1.0–10.1 Breastfeeding initiation immediately 80 (31.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4–4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3–3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4–2.0 HIV status (n = 270)			(72.7)			
One 85 (35.9) 15 (45.5) Two 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5–2.2 (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0–10.1 Breastfeeding initiation (n = 270) Immediately 80 (33.8) 11 (33.3) 1.0–10.1 Breastfeeding initiation immediately 80 (31.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4–4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3–3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4–2.0 HIV status (n = 270)	Number of children (n – 270)				
Two 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5-2.2 (42.4) More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) (33.3) 11 (33.3) 11 Thirty minutes 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) 0.37 0.5-5.4 (90.3) (84.9) 0.37 0.5-5.4 Not known Choose not to 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-6.5 Yes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 Vers 151 17 (48.5) 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3			15			
Two 79 (33.3) 14 1.0 0.99 0.5–2.2 More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0–10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) timediately 80 (33.8) 11 1.32 0.05 1.0–10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) timediately 80 (33.8) 11 0.33.3) 0.4–4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3–3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4–2.0 HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) (42.5) 0.37 0.5–5.4 HIV negative 214 28 1.7 0.37 0.5–5.4 (90.3) (84.9) 0.3 0.1–12.3 0.1–12.3 Mote known 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1–12.3 Choose not to 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1–12.3 Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1–6.5 Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 1.1 0.93 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>						
More than two 73 (30.8) 4 (12.1) 3.2 0.05 1.0-10.1 Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) Immediately 80 (33.8) 11 (33.3) Thirty minutes 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 (42.5) HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) (42.5) 0.37 0.5-5.4 HIV positive 18 (7.6) 4 (12.1) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 Mote known (90.3) (84.9) 0.37 0.5-5.4 (90.3) 0.1-12.3 Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 Previous experience on EBF (n = 270) Yes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 (48.5) 16 0.6 0.18	Two	79 (33.3)		1.0	0.99	0.5-2.2
Breastfeeding initiation time (n = 270) Immediately 80 (33.8) 11 (33.3) (33.3) Thirty minutes 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) 0.37 0.5-5.4 HIV status (n = 270) (90.3) (84.9) 0.37 0.5-5.4 Not known (21.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 disclose 10 (3.8) 1(3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 Yes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3			(42.4)			
Immediately 80 (33.8) 11 (33.3) Thirty minutes 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) 0.37 0.5-5.4 HIV status (n = 270) (90.3) (84.9) 0.9 0.72 0.1-12.3 Not known Choose not to 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-12.3 Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 Yes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 (48.5)	More than two	73 (30.8)	4 (12.1)	3.2	0.05	1.0-10.1
Immediately 80 (33.8) 11 (33.3) Thirty minutes 36 (15.2) 4 (12.1) 1.2 0.73 0.4-4.2 One hour 33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 0.3-3.8 I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 (42.5) (42.5) (42.5) 0.37 0.5-5.4 HIV status (n = 270) (90.3) (84.9) 0.37 0.5-5.4 Not known (90.3) (84.9) 0.93 0.1-12.3 Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1-6.5 Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 Previous experience on EBF (n = 270) Yes (96.2) (97.0) 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 No 228 32 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 Wes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 (48.5)	Dessetfooding initiati	an tima (n	970)			
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	-					
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	inimediately	80 (33.8)				
One hour33 (13.9) 4 (12.2) 1.1 0.84 $0.3-3.8$ I don't remember88 (37.1)14 0.9 0.72 $0.4-2.0$ HIV status (n = 270)(42.5)(42.5) (42.5) 0.72 $0.4-2.0$ HIV negative21428 1.7 0.37 $0.5-5.4$ (90.3)(84.9) 0.3 $0.1-12.3$ $0.1-12.3$ Not known 0.30 $0.1-12.3$ $0.1-12.3$ Choose not to 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 $0.1-12.3$ Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) 13.0 0.8 0.83 $0.1-6.5$ Yes9(3.8) $1(3.0)$ 0.8 0.83 $0.1-6.5$ Previous experience on EBF (n = 270) 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) No86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 $0.3-1.3$ (48.5) 16 0.6 0.18 $0.3-1.3$	Thirty minutes	36 (15.2)		12	0.73	0442
I don't remember 88 (37.1) 14 (42.5) 0.9 0.72 0.4-2.0 HIV status (n = 270) (42.5) 1 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	-					
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccc} \mathrm{HIV} \mbox{ positive} & 18 \ (7.6) & 4 \ (12.1) \\ \mathrm{HIV} \mbox{ negative} & 214 & 28 & 1.7 & 0.37 & 0.5-5.4 \\ & (90.3) & (84.9) \\ \end{array}$ Not known Choose not to 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 & 0.93 & 0.1-12.3 \\ disclose \\ \end{array} Illness preventing EBF $(n=270)$ Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) No 228 32 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 (96.2) (97.0) \\ \end{array} Previous experience $\mbox{ EBF} \ (n=270)$ Yes 151 17 $(63.7) \ (51.5) \\ \mathrm{No}$ 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 $(48.5) \ \end{array}$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccc} HIV \mbox{ positive } & 18 \ (7.6) & 4 \ (12.1) \\ HIV \mbox{ negative } & 214 & 28 & 1.7 & 0.37 & 0.5-5.4 \\ & (90.3) & (84.9) \\ & Not \mbox{ known } \\ Choose \mbox{ not to } & 5 \ (2.1) & 1 \ (3.0) & 1.1 & 0.93 & 0.1-12.3 \\ & & & & & & & & & & \\ Illness \mbox{ preventing EBF } (n = 270) \\ & Yes & 9(3.8) & 1(3.0) \\ & No & 228 & 32 & 0.8 & 0.83 & 0.1-6.5 \\ & (96.2) & (97.0) \\ \end{array}$						
HIV negative 214 28 1.7 0.37 0.5–5.4 (90.3) (84.9) (84.9) 0						
(90.3) (84.9) Not known 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1–12.3 Choose not to 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1–12.3 disclose isclose 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1–12.3 Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 0.8 0.83 0.1–6.5 No 228 32 0.8 0.83 0.1–6.5 Previous experience on EBF (n = 270) Yes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3–1.3 (48.5) (48.5)	-				0.07	
Not known Choose not to disclose 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1–12.3 Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) 0.00	HIV negative			1.7	0.37	0.5–5.4
Choose not to disclose 5 (2.1) 1 (3.0) 1.1 0.93 0.1–12.3 Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) No 228 32 0.8 0.83 0.1–6.5 Previous experience on EBF (n = 270) Yes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3–1.3 (48.5)	Not known	(90.3)	(84.9)			
disclose Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) No 228 32 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 (96.2) (97.0) Previous experience on EBF (n = 270) Yes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 (48.5)		5 (2 1)	1 (2 0)	11	0.02	01 12 2
Illness preventing EBF (n = 270) Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) No 228 32 0.8 0.83 0.1–6.5 (96.2) (97.0) 97.0 0 0 0 0 Previous experience EBF (n = 270) 151 17 151 16 0.6 0.18 0.3–1.3 No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3–1.3 (48.5)		ə (2.1)	1 (3.0)	1.1	0.93	0.1-12.3
Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) No 228 32 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 (96.2) (97.0) 97.0 97.0 97.0 97.0 Previous experience on EBF (n = 270) Yes 151 17 17 17 17 17 163.7) (51.5) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 148.5)	aisciose					
Yes 9(3.8) 1(3.0) No 228 32 0.8 0.83 0.1-6.5 (96.2) (97.0) 97.0 97.0 97.0 97.0 Previous experience on EBF (n = 270) Yes 151 17 17 17 17 17 163.7) (51.5) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3-1.3 148.5)	Illness preventing EB	F (n = 270)				
No 228 32 0.8 0.83 0.1–6.5 (96.2) (97.0) 97.0) 97.0 97.0 97.0 Previous experience on EBF (n = 270) 151 17 17 17 17 17 163.7) 151.5) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3–1.3 148.5)			1(3.0)			
$\begin{array}{cccc} (96.2) & (97.0) \\ \\ Previous experience on EBF (n = 270) \\ Yes & 151 & 17 \\ & (63.7) & (51.5) \\ No & 86 (36.3) & 16 & 0.6 & 0.18 & 0.3-1.3 \\ & & (48.5) \end{array}$				0.8	0.83	0.1-6.5
Yes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3–1.3 (48.5)						
Yes 151 17 (63.7) (51.5) No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3–1.3 (48.5)						
(63.7) (51.5) No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3–1.3 (48.5)						
No 86 (36.3) 16 0.6 0.18 0.3–1.3 (48.5)	res					
(48.5)	No			0.6	0.18	03_13
	110	00 (00.0)		0.0	0.10	0.0-1.0
	Source: Author's tab	10	(10.0)			

Source: Author's table.

4. Discussion

A large majority of participants practised EBF (87.8 %, n = 237), which is much higher than that of a study conducted in Namibia in 2017 (19 %) (Indongo & Mutorwa, 2017) and twice the global rate of 42 %

Table 3

Variable	EBF-yes n (%)	EBF-no n (%)	Odds ratio (OR)	P-value	95 % confidence interval
	et support and nce of exclusiv			care profes	sionals about the
Yes	197 (83.1)	31 (93.9)			
No	40 (16.9)	2 (6.1)	0.3	0.13	0.1–1.4
Did the he	althcare profe	ssional inform	n you about the	e effects of 1	not exclusively
breastfe	eding the baby	? (n = 270)			
Yes	198 (83.5)	28 (84.9)			
No	39 (16.5)	5 (15.1)	0.9	0.85	0.3–2.5
					initiation is very the baby? ($n = 270$
Yes	219 (92.4)	28 (84.9)	st mink) conten	it is good for	the baby: $(II = 270)$
No	18 (7.6)	28 (84.9) 5 (15.1)	2.2	0.15	0.7–0.7
110	10 (7.0)	5 (15.1)	2.2	0.15	0.7-0.7
			ou health educ		e correct attachmer
Yes	198 (83.5)	28 (84.9)	, breastreeding	. (ii – 270)	
No	39 (16.5)		0.9	0.85	0.3–2.5
Did vour p	artner support	vour decision	to breastfeed v	our child e	clusively? (n = 270
Yes	210 (88.6)		····,		
No	27 (11.4)	3 (9.1)	0.8	0.69	0.2–2.7
Did your f	amily support	you during th	e exclusive bre	eastfeeding	period? ($n = 270$)
Yes	214 (90.3)	29 (87.9)		0	
No	23 (9.7)	4 (12.1)	1.3	0.67	0.4–4.0
		mily constrai	nts when you ii	nitiated excl	lusive breastfeeding
(n = 27		10 (55 ()			
Yes No	155 (65.4) 82 (34.6)	19 (57.6) 14 (42.4)	0.7	0.00	0015
			0.7	0.38	0.3–1.5

Source: Author's table.

(UNICEF & WHO, 2018). The differences may be attributed to the selfreported EBF rate in this study, the population included mothers of infants 0–6 months, and the data collection was cross-sectional. The reported EBF rate was the highest amongst mothers with three-month-old babies and the lowest amongst six-month-old babies, suggesting that the practice of EBF is likely to decline over time.

None of the socio-demographic variables in our study was significantly associated with EBF practice. Similarly, mixed findings regarding the influence of age on EBF practice have been reported in the literature (Hossain, Islam, Kamarul, & Hossain, 2018; Indongo & Mutorwa, 2017; Laksono et al., 2021; Mundagowa, Chadambuka, Chimberengwa, & Mukora-Mutseyekwa, 2019). Contrary to our findings, higher levels of education were associated with EBF practice in studies conducted in Somalia, Indonesia and Cameroon (Jama et al., 2020; Laksono et al., 2021; Tambe et al., 2018). In addition, studies conducted in Virginia and Namibia indicated that being married was associated with longer breastfeeding (Indongo & Mutorwa, 2017; Masho, Morris, & Wallenborn, 2016).

In our study, economic status was not significantly associated with EBF practice, but participants with a low family income were more likely to breastfeed exclusively than those with a high family income. This finding is consistent with a study done in Ethiopia where mothers with a high income were less likely to practice EBF because they were more likely to afford formula milk and had busy schedules that kept them away from home (Shifraw, Worku, & Berhane, 2015). On the contrary, in Ghana, mothers with a low income struggled with EBF because they experienced a challenge feeding themselves and therefore struggled to meet the energy demands of practising EBF (Manyeh, Amu, Akpakli, Williams, & Gyapong, 2020). Mothers with low income may have stressful living situations and perceptions of inadequate milk production

Table 4

Cultural factors.

Variable	EBF-Yes n (%)	EBF-No n (%)	Odds ratio (OR)	P value	95 % Confidence interval			
Is exclusive breastfeeding recommended in your culture? ($n = 270$)								
Yes	204 (86.1)	29 (87.9)						
No	33 (13.9)	4 (12.1)	0.9	0.78	0.3–2.6			
Do you perform traditional ceremonies associated with the birth of a baby at the age of $0-6$ months where the baby is fed with any other food besides breast milk? (n = 270)								
Yes	63 (26.6)	10 (30.3)						
No	174 (73.4)	23 (69.7)	0.8	0.65	0.4–1.8			
	Is it common to rub herbs, vaseline or water on the mother's nipple during exclusive							
	eding? ($n = 27$	0)						
Yes	79 (33.3)	10 (30.3)						
No	158 (66.7)	23 (69.7)	1.2	0.73	0.5–2.5			
Is it comm	Is it common to cover a mother's breast when breastfeeding? $(n = 270)$							
Yes	131 (55.3)	17 (51.5)						
No	106 (44.7)	16 (48.5)	1.2	0.69	0.6–2.4			
Do families in your environment have a habit of giving other foods to the baby age of								
0–6 mor	n ths? (n = 270))	Ū.	0				
Yes	85 (35.9)	16 (48.5)						
No	152 (64.1)	17 (51.5)	0.6	0.16	0.3–1.2			
Does your culture prohibit sexual activity while breastfeeding? ($n = 270$)								
Yes	80 (33.8)	12 (36.4)			(
No	157 (66.2)	21 (63.6)	0.9	0.77	0.4–1.9			
Were you guided by any family member on breastfeeding option practice? ($n = 270$)								
Yes	145 (61.2)	22 (66.7)	er om preubliet	Samo Sprior	practice: (ii = 2/0)			
No	92 (38.8)	11 (33.3)	0.8	0.54	0.4–1.7			

Source: Author's table.

that make them initiate mixed infant feeding early (introducing other foods and liquids along with breast milk) (Muchacha & Mtetwa, 2015).

Regarding biophysical factors, having more than two pregnancies and more than two children were the only statistically significant predictors of EBF. It may be because those mothers have experience in breastfeeding exclusively (Hackman, Schaefer, Beiler, Rose, & Paul, 2015; Mundagowa, Chadambuka, Chimberengwa, & Mukora-Mutseyekwa, 2019; Nishimaki, Yamada, Okutani, Hirabayashi, & Tanimura, 2021; Keloglan, Yilmaz, & Gumus, 2018). Confirming this, we found that mothers who practised EBF had a higher frequency of previous breastfeeding experience. Contrary to our findings, a study conducted in Dhaka, Bangladesh, found that the place of birth and mode of delivery were associated with EBF and that mothers who gave birth vaginally were 2.5 times more likely to breastfeed exclusively compared to those who delivered by caesarean section (Hasan, Hassan, Khan, Tareq, & Afroj, 2021). We may not have detected a difference due to the high percentage of hospital-based vaginal deliveries in both the EBF and non-EBF groups.

Although knowledge of EBF did not predict EBF practice in this study, participants had high knowledge scores across both groups (76.5 % and 75.3 %). Similar to our findings, a study in Zimbabwe found that knowledge of EBF does not necessarily translate to EBF practice because, in some African cultures, the mother-in-law discourages EBF, and mixed infant feeding is initiated despite the mothers' knowledge of EBF benefits (Muchacha & Mtetwa, 2015). On the contrary, studies in Congo and India found a positive association between knowledge and EBF practice (Dhakal, Lee, & Nam, 2017; Hasan et al., 2021).

Social factors did not influence EBF practice in this study. Although most participants (84.4 %) received support from health care professionals and families regarding EBF practice, more than half indicated that family constraints prevented breastfeeding initiation. In Ethiopia, mothers who received healthcare support on EBF were more likely to practice EBF (Asemahagn, 2016).

Although cultural factors did not predict EBF practices, participants reported traditional and cultural practices that may hinder EBF, such as providing additional food, herbs and covering the breast. Cultural beliefs strongly influence the practice of breastfeeding; such beliefs include a mother's thoughts of not having enough milk (Anggraeni, Aji, Setiyani, Kartikasari, & Rahmawati, 2018; WHO & UINICEF, 2021) or perceptions that breast milk or colostrum is nutritionally inadequate, 'dirty', sour, and difficult to digest. Cultural beliefs can cause delays in the initiation and contribute to the cessation of breastfeeding (Kimani-Murage et al., 2015).

5. Strengths and limitations

The study's strength was the comprehensive exploration of factors that influence breastfeeding and included all mothers with babies aged 0 to 6 months. The study was conducted at one public health care facility situated in an urban area amongst women who attended postnatal care, thus limiting the degree to which it represents the larger population. In addition, this was a cross-sectional study and relied on data provided at that time. While the data could have been accurate at that time, it does not reflect the practice of EBF of the mothers over a longer period.

6. Conclusions

The current study and literature revealed few factors consistently related to EBF practice, suggesting that current evidence on predictors of EBF is inconclusive. Extensive EBF psychosocial support and encouragement of mothers to attend antenatal care may lead to the achievement of optimal breastfeeding practices. Efforts should be made to eliminate the misconceptions that hinder exclusive breastfeeding, and awareness of EBF benefits must be promoted among mothers.

7. Recommendations

New mothers and those with less than two children should receive particular attention and be encouraged to practice EBF. The health system should expand health promotion activities and promote antenatal care services to all women within the community in urban and rural settings. In addition, healthcare providers should consider integrating sociocultural practices that promote EBF into perinatal care, involve the mothers' families and continuously provide health education and support to mothers during the perinatal period.

8. Funding sources

No external funding was received.

9. Availability of data and materials

The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available due to participant privacy but are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request and approval by the Health Research Ethics Committee of Stellenbosch University.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

The authors highly acknowledge participants of KHC and all individuals involved in providing information on Breastfeeding. The

R.M. Nangolo et al.

author is also acknowledging the Executive Director of the Ministry of Health and Social Services, the Acting Director of Khomas Region and the Acting Chief Medical Superintendent for granting me permission to carry out the study. We acknowledge the Stellenbosch University biostatistician for analyzing the data.

The findings and conclusions of this article are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not represent the official views mentioned above.

References

- Al-Binali, A. (2012). Breastfeeding knowledge, attitude and practice among school teachers in Abha female educational district, southwestern Saudi Arabia. *International Breastfeeding Journal*, 7(10), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1186/1746-4358-7-10
- Anggraeni, M., Aji, B., Setiyani, R., Kartikasari, A., & Rahmawati, E. (2018). How do modern parents deal with cultural beliefs about breastfeeding? A qualitative study. *British Journal of Midwifery*, 26(9), 605–613. https://doi.org/10.12968/ biom.2018.26.9.605
- Asemahagn, M. (2016). Determinants of exclusive breastfeeding practices among mothers in Azezo district, Northwest Ethiopia. *International Breastfeeding Journal*, 11 (1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13006-016-0081-x
- Balogun, O., Dagvadorj, A., Anigo, K., Ota, E., & Sasaki, S. (2015). Factors influencing breastfeeding exclusivity during the first 6 months of life in developing countries: A quantitative and qualitative systematic review. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, 11(4), 433–451. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12180
- Bhattacharjee, N., Schaeffer, L., & Hay, S. (2021). Mapping inequalities in exclusive breastfeeding in low-and middle-income countries, 2000–2018. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 5, 1027–1045. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01108-6
- Chowdhury, R., Sinha, B., Sankar, M., Taneja, S., Bhandari, N., Rollins, N., ... Martines, J. (2015). Breastfeeding and maternal health outcomes: A systematic review and metaanalysis. Acta Paediatrica, 104(467), 96–113. https://doi.org/10.1111/apa.13102
- Dalcastagnê, S., Giugliani, E., Nunes, L., Hauser, L., & Giugliani, C. (2018). Practice of exclusive breastfeeding and its associated factors in a suburban area in Angola: A cross sectional study. Sao Paulo Medical Journal, 136(6), 533–542. https://doi.org/ 10.1590/1516-3180.2018.0262161118
- Dhakal, S., Lee, T., & Nam, E. (2017). Exclusive breastfeeding practice and its association among mothers of under 5 children in Kwango District, DR Congo. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 14(5), 1–8. https://doi.org/ 10.3390/iierph14050455
- Domenici, R., & Vierucci, F. (2022). Exclusive breastfeeding and vitamin D supplementation: A positive synergistic effect on prevention of childhood infections? International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(5), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19052973
- Edwards, R., Cragg, B., Dunn, S., & Peterson, W. (2021). The breastfeeding and early motherhood experiences of older first-time mothers: A constructivist grounded theory study. *Midwifery*, 96, 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2021.102945
- Hackman, N., Schaefer, E., Beiler, J., Rose, C., & Paul, I. (2015). Breastfeeding outcome comparison by parity. *Breastfeeding Medicine*, 10(3), 156–162. https://doi.org/ 10.1089/bfm.2014.0119
- Hasan, M., Hassan, M., Khan, M., Tareq, M., & Afroj, M. (2021). Prevalence, knowledge, attitudes and factors associated with exclusive breastfeeding among mothers in Dhaka, Bangladesh: A cross-sectional study. *Population Medicine*, 3(September), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.18332/popmed/140132
- Hossain, M., Islam, A., Kamarul, T., & Hossain, G. (2018). Exclusive breastfeeding practice during first six months of an infant's life in Bangladesh: A country based cross-sectional study. *BMC Pediatrics*, 18(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12887-018-1076-0
- Indongo, N., & Mutorwa, K. (2017). The practice of exclusive breastfeeding in Namibia. International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR), 36(1), 159–169.
- Jama, A., Gebreyesus, H., Wubayehu, T., Gebregyorgis, T., Teweldemedhin, M., Berhe, T., & Berhe, N. (2020). Exclusive breastfeeding for the first six months of life and its associated factors among children age 6–24 months in Burao district, Somaliland. *International Breastfeeding Journal*, 15(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s13006-020-0252-7
- Laksono, A., Wulandari, R., Ibad, M., & Kusrini, I. (2021). The effects of mother's education on achieving exclusive breastfeeding in Indonesia. *BMC Public Health*, 21, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-10018-7
- Manyeh, A., Amu, A., Akpakli, D., Williams, J., & Gyapong, M. (2020). Estimating the rate and determinants of exclusive breastfeeding practices among rural mothers in Southern Ghana. *International Breastfeeding Journal*, 15(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/ 10.1186/s13006-020-0253-6
- Maonga, A., Mahande, M., Damian, D., & Msuya, S. (2016). Factors affecting exclusive breastfeeding among women in Muheza District Tanga Northeastern Tanzania: A

mixed method community based study. Maternal and Child Health Journal, 20(1), 77–87. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-015-1805-z

- Masho, S., Morris, M., & Wallenborn, J. (2016). Role of marital status in the association between prepregnancy body mass index and breastfeeding duration. *Women's Health Issues*, 26(4), 468–475. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2016.05.004
- Keloglan, S., Yilmaz, A., & Gumus, K. (2018). Factors affecting mothers' breastfeeding. International Journal of Caring Sciences, 11(1), 225–230. Retrieved from http://www. internationaljournalofcaringsciences.org/docs/25_keloglan_original_11_.pdf.
- Kimani-Murage, E., Wekesah, F., Wanjohi, M., Kyobutungi, C., Ezeh, A., Musoke, R. N., Norris, S. A., Madise, N. J., & Griffiths, P. (2015). Factors affecting actualisation of the WHO breastfeeding recommendations in urban poor settings in Kenya. *Maternal* and Child Nutrition, 11(3), 314–332. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12161
- MoHSS, NIP, & NSA. (2013). Namibia Demographic and Health Survey. DHS Final Reports, Windhoek, Namibia. Retrieved from https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/fr298/ fr298.pdf[accessed 20 August 2020].
- MOHSS. (2021). Public Health COVID-19 General Regulations (Government Notice 91 of 2021). (Government Notice 91 of 2021). Retrieved from http://namiblii.org/akn/ na/act/gn/2021/91/eng%402021-07-31.
- Muchacha, M., & Mtetwa, E. (2015). Social and economic barriers to exclusive breast feeding in Rural Zimbabwe. International Journal of MCH and AIDS, 3(1), 16–21.
- Mundagowa, P., Chadambuka, E., Chimberengwa, P., & Mukora-Mutseyekwa, F. (2019). Determinants of exclusive breastfeeding among mothers of infants aged 6 to 12 months in Gwanda District, Zimbabwe. *International Breastfeeding Journal*, 14(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13006-019-0225-x
- NDHS, MOHSS, & ICF. (2014). The Namibia Demographic and Health Survey 2013. WINDHOEK: MoHSS and ICF International. Retrieved from https://dhsprogram. com/pubs/pdf/fr298/fr298.pdf.
- Nguyen, N., Prasopkittikun, T., Payakkaraung, S., & Vongsirimas, N. (2021). Factors predicting six-month exclusive breastfeeding among mothers in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. Journal of Health Research, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1108/JHR-03-2020-0080
- Nishimaki, S., Yamada, M., Okutani, T., Hirabayashi, M., & Tanimura, S. (2021). Breastfeeding rate comparison by parity and delivery age in Japan. *Pediatrics International*, 64(2), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/ped.14943
- Rahman, N., Dewi, N., Fitrasyah, S., Oktaviani, B. V, & Rifai, M. (2017). Factors related to exclusive breastfeeding among mothers in the city of Palu, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Malaysian Journal of Nutrition*, 23(2), 175–185.
- Rollins, N., Bhandari, N., Hajeebhoy, N., Horton, S., Lutter, C., Martines, J., Piwoz, E. G., Richter, L., & Victora, C. G. (2016). Why invest, and what it will take to improve breastfeeding practices? Retrieved from. *The Lancet*, 387(10017), 491–504. https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(15)01044-2 /fulltext.
- Shifraw, T., Worku, A., & Berhane, Y. (2015). Factors associated exclusive breastfeeding practices of urban women in Addis Ababa public health centers, Ethiopia: A cross sectional study. *International Breastfeeding Journal*, 10(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/ 10.1186/s13006-015-0047-4
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2
- Tambe, B., Mimboe, C., Nchung, J., Bakwo, C., Nyobe, E., Pauline, N., & Nzefa, D. (2018). The determinants of exclusive breastfeeding in Cameroon, Sub-Saharan Africa. Trends in General Practice, 1(3), 2-6. doi:10.15761/TGP.1000113.
- Tesfu, A., Beyene, F., Sendeku, F., Wudineh, K., & Azeze, G. (2022). Uptake of postpartum modern family planning and its associated factors among postpartum women in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heliyon*, 8(1), 1-8. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08712.
- UNICEF, & WHO. (2018). Global breastfeeding scorecard 2018 enabling women to breastfeed through better policies and programmes. GENEVA. Retrieved from https://www.who.in t/publications/m/item/global-breastfeeding-scorecard-2018-enabling-women-to-b reastfeed-through-better-policies-and-programmes#:~:text=The%20Global%20Bre astfeeding%20Scorecard%20periodically,compliance%20with%20the%20Baby% 2DFriendly [accessed 12 November 2020].
- Vaz, J., Maia, M., Neves, P., Santos, T., Vidaletti, L., & Victora, C. (2021). Monitoring breastfeeding indicators in high-income countries: Levels, trends and challenges. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, 17(3), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13137
- Wanjohi, M., Griffiths, P., Wekesah, F., Muriuki, P., Muhia, N., Musoke, R. N., Fouts, H. N., Madise, N. J., & Kimani-Murage, E. W. (2016). Sociocultural factors influencing breastfeeding practices in two slums in Nairobi, Kenya. *International Breastfeeding Journal*, 12, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13006-016-0092-7
- WHO/UNICEF. (2014). Global Nutrition Targets 2025: Policy Brief. Geneva. Retrieved from https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/149018.
- WHO&UNICEF. (2021). Infant and young child feeding counselling: An integrated course: participant's manual. GENEVA. Retrieved from https://apps.who.int/iris/rest/bits treams/1360832/retrieve[accessed 20 August 2020].
- WHO. (2021). Infant and young child feeding. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Report. Retrieved from https://apps.who.int/iris/rest/bitstreams/1341846/retrieve.