# **GÖBEKLİTEPE**

International Journal Of Health Sciences

e-ISSN: 2757-6221

Arrival Date : 26.06.2022 Published Date : 30.09.2022 **2022, Vol:5, Issue:9 pp: 42-49** DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.55433/gsbd.235

# THE PREVALENCE OF CESAREAN AND THE EFFECTING FACTORS DURING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

#### Fatma KORUK

Assoc. Prof., Harran University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology Nursing, fgozukara18@gmail.com, Sanliurfa/Turkey, http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2984-3776

#### Ruken TUNÇ

Research Assist., Antalya Bilim University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department Midwifery, rukenntnc@gmail.com, Antalya/Turkey, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8790-5405

#### Melisa UYSAL

Midwife, Sanliurfa Training and Research Hospital, Pandemic Service, melisauysall2015@gmail.com, Sanliurfa/Turkey, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2829-0495

#### **Zeliha TURAN**

Lecturer, Harran University, Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology Nursing, zeliha028444@gmail.com, Sanliurfa/Turkey, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8209-8894

#### İbrahim KORUK

Professor, Harran University Faculty of Medicine, Public Health Department, ibrahimkoruk@yahoo.com, Sanliurfa/Turkey, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9564-2214

#### **Abstract**

In terms of the clinical picture during pregnancy and perinatal outcomes, there is an insufficient amount of data in the literature regarding the effects of COVID-19 infection, which is spreading rapidly worldwide. In this study, we aimed to determine the frequency of cesarean deliveries in during the pandemic, as well as to show the effect of COVID-19 positivity and certain other variables on cesarean section delivery. The sample of this cross-sectional study consists of 956 women who gave birth in a state hospital. In this study, the prevalence of cesarean section was found to be 33.2%. Also, compared to the general population the rate of cesarean delivery was found to be 2.1 times higher in women whose incomes were less than their expenses, 2.2 times higher in those with health insurance, 13.6 times higher in those who were COVID-19 positive, and 1.6 times higher in those who did not receive regular prenatal care. This study showed that COVID-19 infection and negativities related to the social determinants of well-being significantly increased the prevalence of cesarean section during the pandemic period. Governments should take more serious steps toward reducing healthcare inequalities, especially in terms of maternal and infant health.

Keywords: Cesarean Section, COVID-19, Prevalence, Turkey.

# COVID-19 PANDEMİSİ SIRASINDA SEZARYEN PREVALANSI VE ETKİLEYEN FAKTÖRLER

Öz

Tüm dünyada hızla yayılan COVID-19 enfeksiyonun gebelikte klinik tablo ve perinatal sonuçlarına ilişkin literatürde yetersiz miktarda veri bulunmaktadır. Bu çalışmada pandemi döneminde sezaryen doğum sıklığını belirlemeyi, aynı zamanda COVID-19 pozitifliği ve diğer bazı değişkenlerin sezaryen doğumlar üzerindeki etkisini göstermeyi amaçladık. Kesitsel tipteki çalışmanın örneklemini bir devlet hastanesinde doğum yapan 956 kadın oluşturdu. Çalışmada, sezaryen prevalansı %33.2 olarak belirlendi. Sezaryenle doğum yapma, geliri giderinden az olan kadınlarda 2.1 kat, sağlık güvencesi olanlarda 2.2 kat, COVID-19 pozitif olanlarda 13.6 kat ve düzenli DÖB almayanlarda 1.6 kat daha fazlaydı. Çalışma sonuçları, pandemi döneminde COVID-19 enfeksiyonu ve sağlığın sosyal belirleyicilerine ilişkin olumsuzlukların sezaryen prevalansını önemli ölçüde artırdığını göstermiştir. Hükümetler, özellikle anne ve bebek sağlığı açısından sağlık hizmetlerindeki eşitsizliklerin azaltılmasına yönelik daha ciddi adımlar atmalıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sezaryen, COVID-19, Prevalans, Türkiye.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

A pneumonia outbreak of unknown etiology was detected on December 31st, 2019 in the Wuhan province of China. On January 7, 2020, it was announced that the pathogen causing this epidemic was the virus called the novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) (1). The disease spread rapidly, first to other provinces of China, and from there to the whole world (2). Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) was reported by the World Health Organization (WHO) as an urgent public health problem on 30<sup>th</sup> February 2020, and was declared as a pandemic on March 11, 2020 (3).

According to the data of WHO-dated February 01, 2021-102,399,513 people became infected and 2,217,005 people died globally in this epidemic. In Turkey, 2,470,901 people became infected and 25,865 died due to coronavirus (4).

In their statement on the risk groups during the pandemic, the WHO and UNFPA (United Nations Population Fund) reported that women who were pregnant or women who had given birth were not in the high-risk group for COVID-19 infection. In the same statement, it was reported that the COVID-19 infection had no effect on the delivery method, and the delivery method should be determined according to obstetric indications and preferences of the woman. However, in the same technical brief, it is also emphasized that the risk of complications increases due to physiological changes, such as immunity and increase in oxygen demand, among others, during pregnancy and postpartum period. Accordingly, it is necessary to show cautiousness in maternal aspects during gestation and parturition and the postpartum period (5,6).

Data on the clinical picture and perinatal consequences of COVID-19 during pregnancy are limited. The evidence that this infection increases serious maternal or neonatal outcomes is currently insufficient. However, there is an increasing number of studies explaining that complications such as premature membrane rupture, fetal distress, and preterm labor develop more frequently in these cases (7,8) and that most of the cases undergo a cesarean delivery (9-11). In this regard, further cross-sectional studies in regions with high COVID-19 incidence are warranted to acquire better results in a shorter time.

For this reason, this cross-sectional study was conducted to determine the frequency of cesarean delivery in during the pandemic, as well as to show the effect of COVID-19 positivity and certain other variables on cesarean section delivery.

#### 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

## 2.1. Study Design and Ethical Issues

This cross-sectional study was conducted in Sanliurfa, a province located in Southeast Anatolia Region in Turkey. In a study conducted by the State Planning Organization, Şanliurfa is ranked 73rd out of 81 cities in terms of its socio-economic development (12). Sanliurfa also is the province with the highest fertility rate in Turkey. According to the 2019 data of the Turkish Statistical Institute, Turkey had a total fertility rate of 1.88, whereas the rate recorded in Sanliurfa region was 3.89 (13).

The research was conducted in a state hospital in the province where approximately 40% of births occur. In this hospital, approximately 60 to 80 births occur in a day. According to the records of the hospital where the study was conducted, 23,891 births took place between January 01, 2020 and December 31, 2020.

To conduct the study, written permission (dated 21.12.2020 and numbered E-76244175-050.04.04-1078) was obtained from the Ministry of Health, the hospital where the study was

#### GÖBEKLİTEPE International Journal Of Health Sciences

conducted, and the ethics committee of the university. Informed consents were obtained from the women participating in the study.

#### 2.1. Sampling

The study population included women who gave birth in a state hospital in the center of Sanliurfa province. In 95.0% confidence interval, the estimated cesarean prevalence was taken as 33.8% (calculated according to hospital records), and the sample size required for the study was calculated as 956 with a 3.0% margin of error.

#### 2.2. Procedures

Data were collected through face-to-face interviews at postpartum and pandemic clinics between December 22, 2020 and January 11, 2021.

No one refused to participate in the study. In order for the women to be able to answer the questions comfortably, a suitable environment was provided.

#### 2.3. Instrumentation

Consist of questions about the socio-demographic characteristics and fertility characteristics Personal Information Form was used as a data collection tool.

#### 2.4. Defination

In the research, the variable "spoken language in family" was used to describe different cultures. The research population includes people from different cultures who speak Kurdish, Turkish and Arabic. While these people speak their native language in their families, they can also speak Turkish, which is the official language.

## 2.5. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (percentage, median, minimum, and maximum), Chi-square test and Mann-Whitney U test from univariate analysis, and logistic regression from multivariate analysis. Analyses were performed with SPSS 20.0 package program.

The dependent variable of the research was that the parturition will be through cesarean section.

The independent variables of the research were as follows: sociodemographic characteristics of women, fertility characteristics, and presence of COVID 19.

In univariate analysis, the logistic regression model (enter model) was created by using variables responsible for significant differences. Perceived income (income<expense/income>expense), health insurance (present/absent), COVID-19 diagnosis (positive/negative), regular prenatal care status, number of live births (<3 children/>3 children) were taken as independent variables in the logistic regression analysis.

Findings were interpreted at 95.0% confidence interval and p<0.05 was considered significant.

#### 3. RESULTS

Table 1. Distribution of some socio-demographic characteristics of women by type of delivery.

Normal Vaginal   Cesarean	•
Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   Number   N	0.280 p
Number         %*         Number         %*         %*         %**         X²           Education status         Illiterate         326         65.6         171         34.4         52.0         3.07           Literate         169         65.3         90         34.7         27.1           Primary education         83         71.6         33         28.4         12.1           Secondary education         40         72.7         15         27.3         5.8           University and above         21         72.4         8         27.6         3.0           Employment status         Employed         54         77.1         16         22.9         7.3         3.13           Unemployed         585         66.0         301         34.0         92.7           Location         585         66.0         301         34.0         92.7	p
Education status           Illiterate         326         65.6         171         34.4         52.0         3.07           Literate         169         65.3         90         34.7         27.1           Primary education         83         71.6         33         28.4         12.1           Secondary education         40         72.7         15         27.3         5.8           University and above         21         72.4         8         27.6         3.0           Employment status           Employed         54         77.1         16         22.9         7.3         3.13           Unemployed         585         66.0         301         34.0         92.7           Location         585         66.0         301         34.0         92.7	
Illiterate       326       65.6       171       34.4       52.0       3.07         Literate       169       65.3       90       34.7       27.1         Primary education       83       71.6       33       28.4       12.1         Secondary education       40       72.7       15       27.3       5.8         University and above       21       72.4       8       27.6       3.0         Employment status         Employed       54       77.1       16       22.9       7.3       3.13         Unemployed       585       66.0       301       34.0       92.7         Location	0.54
Literate       169       65.3       90       34.7       27.1         Primary education       83       71.6       33       28.4       12.1         Secondary education       40       72.7       15       27.3       5.8         University and above       21       72.4       8       27.6       3.0         Employment status         Employed       54       77.1       16       22.9       7.3       3.13         Unemployed       585       66.0       301       34.0       92.7         Location	0.54
Primary education       83       71.6       33       28.4       12.1         Secondary education       40       72.7       15       27.3       5.8         University and above       21       72.4       8       27.6       3.0         Employment status         Employed       54       77.1       16       22.9       7.3       3.13         Unemployed       585       66.0       301       34.0       92.7         Location	
Secondary education         40         72.7         15         27.3         5.8           University and above         21         72.4         8         27.6         3.0           Employment status           Employed         54         77.1         16         22.9         7.3         3.13           Unemployed         585         66.0         301         34.0         92.7           Location         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301         301	
Secondary education         40         72.7         15         27.3         5.8           University and above         21         72.4         8         27.6         3.0           Employment status           Employed         54         77.1         16         22.9         7.3         3.13           Unemployed         585         66.0         301         34.0         92.7           Location         301         301         301         301         301	
University and above 21 72.4 8 27.6 3.0  Employment status  Employed 54 77.1 16 22.9 7.3 3.13  Unemployed 585 66.0 301 34.0 92.7  Location 3.0	
Employment status         Employed       54       77.1       16       22.9       7.3       3.13         Unemployed       585       66.0       301       34.0       92.7         Location	
Employed       54       77.1       16       22.9       7.3       3.13         Unemployed       585       66.0       301       34.0       92.7         Location	
Unemployed 585 66.0 301 34.0 92.7 <b>Location</b>	0.07
Location	
City center 142 68.9 64 31.1 21.5 2.45	0.29
District 328 68.0 154 32.0 50.4	
Town / Village 169 63.1 99 36.9 28.1	
Spoken language in family	
Turkish 65 70.8 35 29.2 12.6 1.23	0.53
Kurdish 289 67.1 142 32.9 45.1	
Arabic 265 65.4 140 34.6 42.3	
Income status	
Income less than expenses *** 503 64.7 275 35.3 81.3 <b>10.88</b>	0.004
Income equal to expenses 123 75.0 41 25.0 17.2	
Income more than expenses 13 92.9 1 7.1 1.5	
Health insurance	
Available 476 64.3 264 35.7 77.4 <b>8.86</b>	0.002
Not available 163 75.5 53 24.5 22.6	
Chronic illness	
Available 34 75.6 11 24.4 4.7 1.23	0.26
Not available 605 66.4 306 33.6 95.3	
COVID-19	
Positive 4 18.2 18 81.8 2.3 <b>21.86</b>	<0.00 1
Negative 635 68.0 299 32.0 97.7	•
Total 639 66.8 317 33.2 100.0	

<sup>\*</sup> row median/row percentage, \*\* column median/ column percentage, \*\*\* group making differenc

The average age of the women was  $27.87 \pm 6.5$  years, and the median was 27 (17-55) years. In total, 79.1% of the women had no formal education, 7.3% had no income-generating job, and 22.6% had no health insurance. Furthermore, 81.3% of the women evaluated their income as less than their expenses. Total 28.1% of the women lived in the countryside and 87.4% spoke mostly Arabic and Kurdish in the family. At least one chronic disease was diagnosed 4.7% of women (2.2% had hypertension, 1.5% had diabetes mellitus, 0.1% had heart disease, 0.7% had asthma bronchiale, 0.2% had renal failure, and 0.2% had epilepsy). Additionally, 2.3% of women were positive for COVID-19 (Table 1).

Table 2. Distribution of women's number of births and certain features of pregnancy by type of delivery.

	Delivery type						
	Normal vaginal  Median* (min-max)		Cesarean				
Features			Median <sup>*</sup> (min-max)		Median** (min-max)	M-W-U	p
Gestational period (weeks)	39 (32–42)		36 (26–42)		38 (26–42)	38332.0	< 0.001
	Number	<b>%</b> *	Number	<b>%</b> *	<b>%</b> **	$X^2$	p
Pregnancy-related problems							
Occurred	26	59.1	18	40.9	4.6	0.91	0.34
Not occurred	613	67.2	299	32.8	95.4		
Receiving regular prenatal care							
Received	403	70.0	173	30.0	60.3	6.03	0.01
Not received	236	62.1	144	37.9	39.7		
<b>Number of live births</b>							
< 3	235	69.1	105	30.9	35.6	1.08	0.29
≥3	404	65.6	212	34.4	64.4		
Total	639	66.8	317	33.2	100.0		

<sup>\*</sup> row median/ row percentage, \*\* column median/ column percentage

In total, 4.6% of the women reported that they experienced pregnancy-related problems, 39.7% did not receive regular prenatal care, and 64.4% gave 3 or more live births. The mean duration of gestation was  $37.7 \pm 2.0$  weeks, the median duration was 38 (26-42) weeks (Table 2).

The total prevalence of cesarean section in the hospital was 33.2%. The prevalence of cesarean section was found to be 32.0% in COVID-19 negative women and 81.8% in COVID-19 positive women (Table 1).

Women with lower income who have health insurance and were positive for COVID-19 tended to undergo cesarean delivery levels and this difference was statistically significant (p <0.05). However, there was no statistically significant difference between the groups in terms of the women's education level, employment status, place of residence, the language they spoke the most in the family, and the variables of having chronic diseases (p> 0.05) (Table 1).

The duration of the gestational period in weeks for the women gave birth by cesarean section was lower than that for the women who gave a normal vaginal birth and this difference was statistically significant (p < 0.05). Also, the cesarean delivery levels of women who did not receive regular prenatal care were higher than the levels of those who did, and this difference was statistically significant (p < 0.05). However, there was no statistically significant difference between the ages of the women who gave birth by cesarean section and women who had normal vaginal delivery (p > 0.05). Also, there was no statistically significant difference between the groups in terms of having problems related to pregnancy and the number of live births (p > 0.05) (Table 2).

Table 3. Logistic regression model of certain variables affecting cesarean delivery.

Affecting factors	В	p	Odds ratio	%95 Confidence interval	
Income status (income < expenses)	0.74	< 0.001	2.1	1.3-3.1	
Health insurance (available)	0.80	< 0.001	2.2	1.5–3.2	

#### GÖBEKLİTEPE International Journal Of Health Sciences

COVID-19 (positive)	2.61	<0.001	13.6	4.4-41.8
Prenatal care (not receiving)	0.52	0.001	1.6	1.2-2.2
Number of live births (<3)	-0.10	0.49	0.9	0.6-1.2
Constant	-2.19	< 0.001		

The combined effect of independent variables on cesarean delivery was evaluated by logistic regression analysis. Logistic regression model was created with variables that make statistically significant difference in univariate analyzes. According to the logistic regression model; it was found that cesarean delivery rate was 2.1 times higher in women whose income was less than expenses, 2.2 times higher in those with health insurance, 13.6 times higher in those who were positive for COVID-19, and 1.6 times higher in those who did not receive regular prenatal care (Table 3).

#### 4. DISCUSSION

Although cesarean delivery is a common surgical intervention worldwide, in terms of complications it may cause in the short and long term, it is a surgical procedure with a higher mortality than normal vaginal delivery. Since 1985, WHO has recommended the ideal ratio of cesarean section as 10%–15% (14). However, cesarean birth rates in many countries including Turkey are much higher than recommended rates. We found that the total prevalence of cesarean section in this study is higher than 10%–15% ratio which was recommended by WHO; however, it was lower than the ratio of cesarean section in Turkey (52%) (15).

In this study, similar to other studies (16-18), health insurance was found to be a factor that increases cesarean delivery. Probably, the presence of health insurance seems to be a factor that facilitates access to this service without requiring an extra payment.

Although it has been shown in the literature that cesarean rates are higher in women with a relatively higher income and those who receive more follow-up prenatal care (16,19); in this study, low income and not receiving regular ANC were found to be factors that increase cesarean delivery rates. It is known that social determinants of well-being such as low income, low education, unemployment, poor working conditions, housing problems, absence of health insurance, gender inequality, and a refugee status are the causes or triggers of many health problems. Furthermore, it is stated that in this pandemic period, disadvantaged groups are more affected by the negative consequences of COVID-19 (20). Adverse social factors increase the risk level during pregnancy and increase the incidence of complications (21). Regular prenatal care follow-up is important in controlling risky situations and preventing complications during pregnancy (22). Considering the characteristics of the research population such as education, health insurance, income level, and working status, it can be said that it is a highly disadvantaged group. Based on the fact that disadvantaged groups have significant problems in accessing healthcare (23), it can be said that pregnant women in this region cannot receive adequate and qualified prenatal care; therefore, complications that require cesarean section cannot be prevented.

The most striking result in our study was that the most important factor that increased cesarean delivery was the presence of COVID-19. Although studies showing the effects of COVID-19, which has affected the whole world for nearly a year, on pregnancy are limited. A meta-analysis of 24 studies stated that the most important perinatal risk is premature and cesarean delivery (11). In this study, the prevalence of cesarean section was very high (81.8%) in women who were positive for COVID-19. Women who were positive for COVID-19 were 13.6 times more likely to deliver by cesarean section. Although the cause has not been fully

elucidated, many studies have reported results pointing to the relationship between COVID-19 and cesarean section. As a matter of fact, in the study conducted by Antoun et al. (2020) in the United Kingdom, the rate of cesarean delivery for COVID-19 positive women is reported as 84%. Similarly, in a systematic review study by Banaei et al. (2020), it is stated that 99 (80.5%) of 123 pregnant women who were examined gave birth by cesarean section. In another study conducted in China, it is stated that the cesarean section rates are relatively higher in regions severely affected by the pandemic (24).

#### 5. CONCLUSIONS

This study showed that COVID-19 infection and negativities related to the social determinants of well-being significantly increased the prevalence of cesarean section during the pandemic period. Governments should take more serious steps toward reducing healthcare inequalities, especially in terms of maternal and infant health.

#### **REFERENCES**

- 1. World Health Organization. Novel coronavirus-China. 2020. Available at: <a href="https://www.who.int/csr/don/12-january-2020-novel-coronavirus-china/en/">https://www.who.int/csr/don/12-january-2020-novel-coronavirus-china/en/</a> (Accessed: 20 January 2021).
- 2. BMJ Best Practice. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)-Epidemiology. 2020. Available at: <a href="https://bestpractice.bmj.com/topics/en-gb/3000168/epidemiology">https://bestpractice.bmj.com/topics/en-gb/3000168/epidemiology</a> (Accessed: 20 January 2021).
- 3. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19)-events as they happen. 2020. Available at: <a href="https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-theyhappen">https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/events-as-theyhappen</a> (Accessed: 8 January 2021).
- 4. World Health Organization. WHO coronavirus disease (COVID-19) dashboard. 2021. Available at: <a href="https://covid19.who.int/table">https://covid19.who.int/table</a> (Accessed: 1 February 2021).
- 5. United Nations Population Fund. COVID-19 technical brief for maternity services: UNFPA. 2020. Available at: <a href="https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/COVID-19\_MNH\_guidance\_04.pdf">https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/resource-pdf/COVID-19\_MNH\_guidance\_04.pdf</a> (Accessed: 8 February 2021).
- 6. United Nations Population Fund. Sexual and reproductive health and rights, maternal and newborn health and COVID-19. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) preparedness and response-UNFPA interim technical brief. 2020. Available at: <a href="https://www.unfpa.org/resources/sexual-and-reproductive-health-and-rights-maternal-and-newborn-health-covid-19-0">https://www.unfpa.org/resources/sexual-and-reproductive-health-and-rights-maternal-and-newborn-health-covid-19-0</a> (Accessed: 2 February 2021).
- 7. Chen H, Guo J, Wang C, et al. Clinical characteristics and intrauterine vertical transmission potential of COVID-19 infection in nine pregnant women: A retrospective review of medical records. Lancet 2020;395(10226):809-15. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30360-3">https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30360-3</a>
- 8. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, et al. A novel coronavirus from patients with pneumonia in China. N Engl J Med 2020;382(8):727-33. 10.1056/NEJMoa2001017
- 9. Antoun L, Taweel NE, Ahmed I, Patni S, Honest H. Maternal COVID-19 infection, clinical characteristics, pregnancy, and neonatal outcome: A prospective cohort study. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol 2020;252:559-62. 10.1016 / j.ejogrb.2020.07.008
- 10. Banaei M, Ghasemi V, Saei Ghare Naz M, et al. Obstetrics and neonatal outcomes in pregnant women with covid-19: A systematic review. Iran J Public Health 2020;49(1):38-47. <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.18502/ijph.v49iS1.3668">http://dx.doi.org/10.18502/ijph.v49iS1.3668</a>
- 11. Matar R, Alrahmani L, Monzer N, et al. Clinical presentation and outcomes of pregnant women with COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Clin Infect Dis 2020;72(3):521-33. 10.1093/cid/ciaa828
- 12. Ministry of Industry and Technology. "Socio-economic development ranking survey of provinces and regions SEDR-2017. Ankara, Turkey: publication of the general directorate of development agencies. 2019. Available from: <a href="https://www.bebka.org.tr/admin/datas/sayfas/89/sege-2017\_1581687211.pdf">https://www.bebka.org.tr/admin/datas/sayfas/89/sege-2017\_1581687211.pdf</a> (Accessed: 24 January 2021).
- 13. Turkish Statistical Institute (TSI). Birth statistics. 2019. Available at: <a href="https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Dogum-Istatistikleri-2019-33706">https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Dogum-Istatistikleri-2019-33706</a> (Accessed: 25 January 2021).
- 14. World Health Organization. WHO statement on caeserean rates. 2015. Available at: <a href="https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/161442/WHO\_RHR\_15.02\_tur.pdf;jsessionid=2CDBE3A740DD6BC28BC070037E83C054?sequence=11">https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/161442/WHO\_RHR\_15.02\_tur.pdf;jsessionid=2CDBE3A740DD6BC28BC070037E83C054?sequence=11</a> (Accessed: 5 February 2021).

#### GÖBEKLİTEPE International Journal Of Health Sciences

- 15. Turkey Demographic and Health Survey. Hacettepe University Institute of Population Studies Ankara, Turkey. 2018. Available at: <a href="http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/tnsa2018/rapor/TDHS2018\_mainReport.pdf">http://www.hips.hacettepe.edu.tr/tnsa2018/rapor/TDHS2018\_mainReport.pdf</a> (Accessed: 25 January 2021).
- 16. Adewuyi EO, Auta A, Khanal V, Tapshak SJ, Zhao Y. Cesarean delivery in Nigeria: Prevalence and associated factors-a population-based cross-sectional study. BMJ Open 2019;9(6):027273. <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027273">http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027273</a>.
- 17. Long Q, Klemetti R, Wang Y, Tao F, Yan H, Hemminki E. High Caesarean section rate in rural China: is it related to health insurance (New Co-operative Medical Scheme)? Soc Sci Med 2012;75(4):733-37. 10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.03.054
- 18. Eufrásio LS, Souza D ED, Fonsêca AMCD, Viana EDSR. Brazilian regional differences and factors associated with the prevalence of cesarean sections. Fisioter Mov 2018;31:003108. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-5918.031.ao08">https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-5918.031.ao08</a>
- 19. Hernández-Vásquez A, Chacón-Torrico H, Bendezu-Quispe G. Differences in the prevalence of cesarean section and associated factors in private and public healthcare systems in Peru. Sex Reprod Healthc 2020;26:100570. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.srhc.2020.100570">10.1016/j.srhc.2020.100570</a>
- 20. Bambra C, Riordan R, Ford J, Matthews F. The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. J Epidemiol Community Health 2020;74 (11):964-68. <u>10.1136/jech-2020-214401</u>
- 21. Balkaya NA, Vural G, Eroğlu K. Investigating problems related to the health of mothers and their babies resulting from risk factors determined during pregnancy. J DU Health Sci Inst 2014;4(1):6-16. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/56562
- 22. WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA and World Bank. Trends in maternal mortality: 1990 to 2008. 2010. Available at: <a href="https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/monitoring/9789241500265/en/">https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/monitoring/9789241500265/en/</a> (Accessed: 25 January 2021).
- 23. Todd A, Copeland A, Husband A, Kasim A, Bambra C. Access all areas? An area-level analysis of accessibility to general practice and community pharmacy services in England by urbanity and social deprivation. BMJ Open 2015;5(5):007328. <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007328">http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007328</a>
- 24. Zhang J, Zhang Y, Ma Y, et al. The associated factors of cesarean section during COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study in nine cities of China. Environ Health Preventive Med 2020;25(1):60. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12199-020-00899-w