

Prevalence and predictor factor of lifetime abortion in female sex workers in Iran: results of the national rapid assessment and response in 2017

Payam Roshanfekr^A , Leila Moftakhar^{B,*} , Sakineh Narouee^{C,D} , Delaram Ali^A  and Meroe Vameghi^A 

For full list of author affiliations and declarations see end of paper

***Correspondence to:**

Leila Moftakhar
Student Research Committee, Shiraz
University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran
Email: Moftakhar_p@yahoo.com

Handling Editor:

Christopher Fairley

Received: 7 October 2022

Accepted: 31 March 2023

Published: 24 April 2023

Cite this:

Roshanfekr P *et al.* (2023)
Sexual Health, **20**(4), 366–369.
doi:[10.1071/SH22169](https://doi.org/10.1071/SH22169)

© 2023 The Author(s) (or their employer(s)). Published by CSIRO Publishing.

ABSTRACT

Female sex workers are at a high risk of abortion. This cross-sectional study included 855 female sex workers to determine the prevalence of lifetime abortion and its related factors. Logistic regression models were used to identify the factors related to lifetime abortion. The prevalence of lifetime abortion was reported at 40.8%. The chance of having a lifetime abortion was 7.8 times higher in women aged >35 years and 2.4 times higher in financially dependent women. The high prevalence of lifetime abortion indicates that these women's health and fertility needs are not met.

Keywords: cross sectional, FSWs, Iran, lifetime abortion, predictor, pregnancy, prevalence, risk factor.

Introduction

Female sex workers (FSWs) have high rates of morbidity, mortality,^{1,2} and unintended pregnancy.³ Condomless sex, limited access to family planning services, and having multiple sex partners are factors that increase the risk of unintended pregnancy in FSW.^{4,5} One of the unfavourable results of unintended pregnancy is abortion.⁶ There are no reliable data on the rate of abortions among Iranian sex workers.⁷ This study examines the prevalence of lifetime abortion and its related factors in FSW in Iran.

Materials and methods

This is a cross-sectional study that included 855 street-based FSWs from October 2016 to March 2017 in 21 provinces in Iran. Inclusion criteria included women aged >15 years who had commercial sex within 12 months prior to the interview. Informed verbal consent was obtained from all participants. The questionnaire for this study included questions about demographic characteristics, history of sex work, and related risks of sex. Trained female interviewers met with FSW participants privately and individually. The prevalence of lifetime abortion was calculated by 95% confidence interval (CI). Simple and multiple logistic regression models were conducted to identify the factors affecting lifetime abortion in FSWs. Stata version 12 was used for all analyses, and the significance statistically level was considered less than 0.05.

Ethical considerations

Participants were informed about the purpose of the survey, the voluntary nature of their participation, incentives, and anonymity of all collected data. The study protocol and procedures were reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee (IR.UEWR.REC.1394.392) and the Research Review Board at University of social welfare and rehabilitation Sciences (USWRS).

Table 1. Lifetime self-reported abortion in female sex workers in Iran (2017).

Variable	N	Lifetime abortion			Simple logistic regression		Multiple logistic regression		
		Prevalence	(95% CI)		OR (95% CI)	P-value	OR _{adj} (95% CI)	P-value	
Ever abortion									
Yes	349	40.8	56.1	62.3	–	–	–	–	–
Age (years)									
18–24	107	23.4	15.7	32.5	0.0001	1	–	–	–
25–34	374	38.6	33.5	43.8		2.05 (1.25–3.37)	0.0001	5.80 (1.25–26.89)	0.02
>35	364	48.1	42.8	53.5		3.04 (1.85–4.99)	0.0001	7.81 (1.60–38.08)	0.01
Educational level									
Illiterate	62	56.7	43.2	69.4	0.0001	1	–	–	–
Primary school	221	48.6	41.7	55.5		0.72 (0.40–1.28)	0.1	–	–
Guidance school	241	47.6	41.0	54.3		0.69 (0.39–1.23)	0.21	–	–
High school	356	29.0	24.3	34.2		0.31 (0.17–0.54)	0.00	–	–
Age at first marriage (years)									
≤18	449	48.3	43.5	53.1	0.03	1	–	1	–
>18	206	39.1	32.3	46.2		0.68 (0.49–0.96)	0.03	1.16 (0.38–2.54)	0.78
Dependency burden									
No	323	35.8	30.6	41.4	0.01	1	–	–	–
Yes	377	45.5	40.2	50.7		1.49 (1.09–2.03)	0.01	2.42 (1.2–4.48)	0.01
Length of sex work (years)									
≤5	164	34.4	27.1	42.3	0.007	1	–	1	–
>5	534	46.5	42.1	50.8		1.65 (1.14–2.39)	0.0001	0.89 (0.35–2.27)	0.82
HIV test result									
Negative	417	45.8	40.8	50.8	0.17	1	–	1	–
Positive	48	37.0	23.2	52.5		0.69 (0.36–1.30)	0.25	0.15 (0.02–0.98)	0.04
Age at first sex (years)									
≤18	575	45.4	41.2	49.7	0.01	1	–	1	–
>18	244	36.0	29.9	42.4		0.67 (0.49–0.92)	0.01	1.42 (0.61–3.27)	0.4
Age at sex work debut (years)									
≤18	224	38.4	31.9	45.3	0.05	1	–	1	–
>18	502	46.2	41.8	50.8		1.37 (0.99–1.91)	0.05	0.66 (0.20–2.17)	0.50
Ever worked in brothels									
No	316	34.3	29.0	40.0	0.001	1	–	1	–
Yes	539	45.7	41.4	50.1		1.61 (1.20–2.15)	0.0001	2.08 (0.99–4.38)	0.05
Group sex (ever)									
No	581	35.6	31.7	39.7	0.001	1	–	1	–
Yes	278	50.7	44.6	56.8		1.86 (1.38–2.49)	0.0001	1.77 (0.79–3.95)	0.16
Sexual violence									
No	661	37.2	33.4	41.1	0.001	1	–	1	–
Yes	237	50.7	44.0	57.3		1.73 (1.27–2.35)	0.0001	–	–
STIs (last year)									
No	661	36.0	31.7	40.4	0.001	1	–	1	–
Yes	237	47.3	42.1	52.5		1.59 (1.20–2.10)	0.0001	0.86 (0.43–1.70)	0.67

(Continued on next page)

Table 1. (Continued).

Variable	N	Lifetime abortion			Simple logistic regression		Multiple logistic regression		
		Prevalence	(95% CI)		P-value	OR (95% CI)	P-value	OR _{adj} (95% CI)	P-value
Self-perceived risk of HIV									
No	388	35.7	28.2	43.7	0.001		–		–
Yes	185	44.9	39.9	49.9		1.46 (1.00–2.15)	0.04	0.63 (0.26–1.53)	0.31
Ever consumed alcohol									
No	400	34.8	29.9	39.9	0.002		–		–
Yes	498	45.5	41.0	50.0		1.59 (1.18–2.06)	0.0001	1.49 (0.73–3.04)	0.26
Ever used drugs									
No	356	31.9	26.9	37.3	0.001		–		–
Yes	542	46.4	42.1	50.8		1.84 (1.38–2.46)	0.0001	1.81 (0.79–4.11)	0.15
Ever injected drugs									
No	820	38.9	35.5	42.4	0.007		–		–
Yes	78	60.5	48.6	71.6		2.40 (1.48–3.90)	0.0001	1.18 (0.38–3.69)	0.76

Results

The prevalence of lifetime abortion in FSWs was 40.8% (95% CI 37.7–43.9). The mean (s.d.) of age was 33.07 (7.94) years.

The results of multiple regression analysis showed that the chance of having a lifetime abortion was significantly 5.8 times higher in women aged 24 to 35 years and 7.8 times higher in women aged >35 years compared to women aged <24 years. This chance was 2.42 times higher in women with dependency burden compared to women without dependency burden, and 2.08 times higher in women who worked in brothels compared to those who never worked in a brothel. In addition, the chance of having a lifetime abortion was significantly 85% lower in women who had a positive HIV test result compared to those who had a negative HIV test result (Table 1).

The dependency burden means the number of people from the household whose living expenses are covered by sex workers.

Discussion

Our study, in accordance with the findings of previous studies,^{8,9} showed that the prevalence of lifetime abortion among FSW is high, especially in women aged >35 years, women who worked in brothels, and women with high financial dependence which causes more work pressure, such as long working hours and increased demand from customers. In Iran, the relationship between having worked in a brothel and the risk of abortion in FSW may be influenced by the cultural, legal, and socio-economic context of the country.

Despite the high prevalence of abortion in these women, we should note that in Iran, there are many obstacles that reduce access to healthcare, and there is limited access to safe

and legal abortion services for FSW. These obstacles include traditional norms and laws regarding sex work, stigma and discrimination, financial inability to care for their babies, and the sexual partner's refusal to accept responsibility for the care of the baby, and unfair treatment of health care providers to these women.^{3,8,10,11} One of the essential points recommended by the World Health Organization is the integration of health and fertility centres in HIV and sexually transmitted diseases programs to reduce unwanted pregnancies. For this reason, health policymakers should take the necessary measures to develop these centres and create safe abortion centres.

Limitations

Our study is a cross-sectional study that, cannot properly estimate the causal relationship in terms of time. Under-reporting of sensitive information may have led to biased results. Self-reported data may have caused recall bias.

References

- 1 Ampt FH, Willenberg L, Agius PA, Chersich M, Luchters S, Lim MS. Incidence of unintended pregnancy among female sex workers in low-income and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2018; 8(9): e021779. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-021779
- 2 Phrasisombath K, Faxelid E, Sychareun V, Thomsen S. Risks, benefits and survival strategies-views from female sex workers in Savannakhet, Laos. *BMC Public Health* 2012; 12(1): 1004. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-1004
- 3 Wahed T, Alam A, Sultana S, Alam N, Somrongthong R. Sexual and reproductive health behaviors of female sex workers in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *PLoS One* 2017; 12(4): e0174540. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0174540
- 4 Hakim AJ, Callahan T, Benech I, Patel M, Adler M, Modi S, et al. Addressing vulnerable population needs in the last mile to the elimination of mother to child transmission of HIV: (Re) Claiming the HIV response for female sex workers and their children. *BMC Public Health* 2020; 20(1): 1015. doi:10.1186/s12889-020-09114-5

- 5 Rolon ML, Syvertsen JL, Robertson AM, Rangel MG, Martinez G, Ulibarri MD, *et al*. The influence of having children on HIV-related risk behaviors of female sex workers and their intimate male partners in two Mexico–US border cities. *J Trop Pediatr* 2013; 59(3): 214–9. doi:10.1093/tropej/fmt009
- 6 Martin CE, Wirtz AL, Mogilniy V, Peryshkina A, Beyrer C, Decker MR. Contraceptive use among female sex workers in three Russian cities. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2015; 131(2): 156–60. doi:10.1016/j.ijgo.2015.06.026
- 7 Jalali R, Mohammadi M, Vaisi-Raygani A, Ghobadi A, Salari N. Prevalence of unwanted pregnancy in Iranian women: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Reprod Health* 2019; 16(1): 133. doi:10.1186/s12978-019-0804-8
- 8 Karamouzian M, Mirzazadeh A, Shokoohi M, Khajehkazemi R, Sedaghat A, Haghdoost AA, *et al*. Lifetime abortion of female sex workers in Iran: findings of a national bio-behavioural survey in 2010. *PLoS One* 2016; 11(11): e0166042. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0166042
- 9 Moradinazar M, Najafi F, Nazar ZM, Hamzeh B, Pasdar Y, Shakiba E. Lifetime prevalence of abortion and risk factors in women: evidence from a cohort study. *J Pregnancy* 2020; 2020: 4871494. doi:10.1155/2020/4871494
- 10 Asadi-Aliabadi M, Abolghasemi J, Rimaz S, Majdzadeh R, Rostami-Maskopae F, Merghati-Khoei E. Barriers to health service utilization among Iranian female sex workers: a qualitative study. *J Prev Med Public Health* 2018; 51(2): 64–70. doi:10.3961/jpmph.17.174
- 11 Sullivan GP, Guédou FA, Batona G, Kintin F, Béhanzin L, Avery L, *et al*. Overview and factors associated with pregnancies and abortions occurring in sex workers in Benin. *BMC Womens Health* 2020; 20(1): 248. doi:10.1186/s12905-020-01091-6

Data availability. Data sharing is not applicable as no new data were generated or analysed during this study.

Conflicts of interest. No conflict of interest is declared by all authors.

Declaration of funding. None declared.

Acknowledgements. This research was supported by the state welfare organisation of Iran (SWO). We thank all of our colleagues in this study, including members of the National Advisory Committee and Provincial Advisory Committees, independent observers, Provincial Liaison Officers (Focal Points), Executive Officers, and collaborative non-governmental organisations, including the Rebirth Charity (Tavlod_e dobare-h) and the Future Health Promotion and Prevention Foundation (FHPPF) and the Social Welfare Management Research Center of the University of Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences, which participated in various parts of the implementation of this project.

Author contributions. Study concept and design: PR and MV. Analysis and interpretation of data: PR. Drafting the manuscript: PR, LM and SN. Writing–review and editing: PR, SN and LM. Critical revision of the manuscript: LM and SN.

Author affiliations

^ASocial Welfare Management Research Center, University of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Sciences, Tehran, Iran.

^BStudent Research Committee, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran.

^CEpidemiology and Biostatistic Group, Faculty of Health, Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran.

^DDepartment of Health, Iranshahr University of Medical Sciences, Sistan and Baluchestan, Iran.