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Abstract

Background: Although Myanmar has made good progress in family planning by increased contraceptive prevalence rate (CPR) from 41% in 2007 to 52.2% in 2016, it remains lower than the target of 60% by 2020. There are also huge disparities sub-nationally, ranging from 25% to 60%. While there is a strong need to monitor the progress of family planning program regularly at the national and sub-national level, Myanmar has limited surveys, data quality and methodological issues in its Health Management Information System (HMIS), and a scattered rollout of the Logistic Management Information System (LMIS).

Methods: To identify viable options for annual monitoring, four data sources: modelled contraceptive prevalence rate for modern methods (mCPR) estimates from Track20’s Family Planning Estimation Tool (FPET); method-specific prevalence from the 2015-16 Myanmar Demographic and Health Survey (DHS); mCPR estimates and method prevalence from HMIS and estimates of modern method use (EMU) based on commodity consumption data from LMIS, were compared for the years 2015-2017. Estimates of mCPR from HMIS were tested for accuracy based on whether they fell within the 95% confidence interval of mCPR estimates from the FPET for the corresponding years. EMU from LMIS was also tested for those years and states/regions where available.

Results: For annual tracking of mCPR, direct estimates of HMIS were considered carefully, as they were much higher than those of the DHS survey and were not matched by FPET results, except in Chin and Kayin. To monitor the method mix, HMIS data can be used as these are similar pattern with DHS in both national and State/Regional level except Chin and Kayin. LMIS could be used in annual tracking when there are high reporting rates and valid information of consumption.

Conclusions: Track20's FPET is the method of choice to get valid information for annual monitoring of family planning program.
Introduction
According to UN interagency estimates, the Myanmar maternal mortality ratio (MMR) has reduced from 453 per 100,000 live births in 1990 to 178 per 100,000 live births in 2015; however, this was the second highest among ASEAN countries and did not meet the 2015 Millennium Development Goal\(^1\). As of the 2014 census, the MMR in Myanmar was 282 deaths per 100,000 live births\(^2\).

Aiming to reduce maternal, newborn and child morbidity and mortality according to the Sustainable Development Goals: Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health (RMNCAH), care has been accorded as a priority issue in the action plan of National Health Plan (2017–21)\(^3\). In addition, Myanmar has also committed to the ICPD goals, United Nations Secretary General’s Global Strategy for Women’s and Children’s Health, as well as Family Planning 2020 commitment to improve women and children’s health\(^4,5\).

As family planning is an evidence-based intervention for improving the maternal and newborn health, as well as a cost-effective powerful tool for development, Myanmar has been endeavoring to increase access to quality family planning services through strong coordinated efforts among public private, UN and donor agencies, INGOs and NGOs. The family planning program was implemented under the guidance of Reproductive Health policy (2002), Five years Reproductive Health Strategic Plans (RHSP) and Costed Implementation Plan for FP 2020\(^4,5\).

Myanmar’s family planning programme started in 1991 as a public sector pilot in one township, and then progressively extended to 163 out of 330 townships in 2014. Before 2011, the government had no specific financial allocation for reproductive health commodities, including contraception, and heavily relied on UNFPA supplies. From 2011, the government increased the health budget, allocated a budget for contraceptive commodities and invested more in the family planning program, to allow it to provide more contraceptives, both short- and long-term, free of charge in all public facilities since 2012\(^6\).

Although various inputs have been used in the Myanmar Family Planning program and the contraceptive prevalence rate (CPR) has increased from 41% in 2007 to 52.2% in 2016\(^6\), it is estimated to be slightly lower than the target of 60% by 2020\(^1\). At the same time, an unmet need for family planning has been reduced from 19% in 2007 to 16% in 2016\(^6\), still falling short of the 2020 target of an unmet need of less than 10%\(^6\).

Rationale
According to the Myanmar Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) (2015–16), contraceptive use is growing nationally, but there are disparities in use among different states and regions, from the lowest prevalence in Chin State (25%) up to 60% in Yangon and Bago region\(^6\). Given the wide variability in contraceptive use and the performance of the FP program by state/region, there is a strong need for valid information about contraceptive use for better annual tracking. Currently, there is limited information on contraceptive use available for the regular monitoring and evaluation as Myanmar has had limited surveys, data quality and methodology issues exist in the Health Management Information System (HMIS), and slow and scattered rollout of the Logistic Management Information System (LMIS) means these service statistics data have limited application for state/regional routine monitoring. The national estimates of mCPR for same period, 2016, are quite different among DHS survey (51.3%)\(^6\), result from the Family Planning Estimation Tool (FPET); a web application developed by Track 20 project/Avenir Health that uses all available survey data to produce annual estimates for key family planning indicators, (50.8%)\(^7\) and HMIS (61.3%)\(^8\) (Figure 1). This discrepancy between the different data sources led the program to consider the which were most reliable data source for both national and subnational annual monitoring on family planning.

Objectives
The objective of this study is to review existing sources of data on the modern contraceptive prevalence rate (mCPR) and method-specific prevalence in Myanmar to identify viable options for...
annual monitoring of the family planning program at the national and state/regional level.

Methods

Data sources

In order to understand what data may best serve annual monitoring of the performance of the family planning program in Myanmar, both at the national and state/regional level, four data sources of modern contraceptive use were compared:

1. Modelled mCPR estimates (and confidence intervals) from Track20’s FPET tool (requires free registration), based on nationally and state/regionally representative surveys.

2. Method-specific prevalence from the 2015–16 Myanmar DHS.

3. mCPR estimates and contraceptive method prevalence from Myanmar’s HMIS system, based on local annual census conducted by midwives on contraceptive use among married women in their catchment area, and

4. Estimates of modern method use (EMU) based on contraceptive commodity consumption data from Myanmar’s LMIS system were compared (Table 1).

While DHS data is the gold standard for monitoring of FP indicators, it does not provide information for annual monitoring. Between the years of surveys, only FPET can be used to test the reliability of service statistic data, since FPET uses all available survey data and gives almost the same result as the DHS (Figure 1). Therefore, it is the most reliable data source for annual estimates so far.

These four data sources, along with the confidence intervals from FPET, were compared for three consecutive years from 2015 to 2017. If the specific data were within the 95% of confidence interval of FPET, it was considered as the accurate data in this study to be used for annual monitoring of family planning. Firstly, estimates of mCPR from the HMIS at both the national and state/regional level were tested for accuracy based on whether they fell within the 95% confidence interval of mCPR estimates of FPET for the corresponding years. The consistency between two sources was matched for each three years. Then, the method-specific prevalence data for both national and state/regional level from HMIS were compared with DHS data for 2016 only. As the FPET could not provide the method mix data, this data could be compared with DHS. Finally, the method mixture of method use (EMU) was also tested. EMU data was extracted by converting the inputs of commodity consumption data from LMIS using the EMU excel tool; a tool developed by Track 20 team. It was tested for those years and in states/regions where the LMIS was available. This tool was developed by the Track 20 team, by converting the inputs data of commodity consumption data from LMIS; it was also tested for those years and in states/regions where the LMIS system was available.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

This paper is a secondary analysis of the four different sources of data: contraceptive prevalence rate from Family Planning Estimation Tool of Track 20, 2015–16 Myanmar Demographic and Health Survey (MDHS), Health Management Information System (HMIS) data of Department of Public Health and Logistic Management Information System (LMIS) data of RH commodities from Maternal Reproductive Health Unit of Department of Public Health. Ethics approval for Myanmar DHS was obtained from the Ethics Review Committee of the Department of Medical Research, Ministry of Health and Sports, Myanmar and the secondary data analysis for this study was done after obtaining the permission from the Department of Public Health, Ministry of Health and Sports, Myanmar.

Results

Comparing mCPR from HMIS and FPET

In comparing HMIS estimates to the estimates and confidence intervals from FPET, among the total 17 State and Region, only two States (Chin and Kayin) produced HMIS-based estimates consistent with FPET results for three consecutive years (e.g. fell within the 95% CI of FPET estimates). Another two (Ayeyawaddy and Kayah) were consistent with FPET for two of the three years of available HMIS data. Only one year of matching HMIS and FPET results were found in Mandalay, Sagaing, Tanintharyi and Yangon regions (Figure 2). In the other ten states/regions, estimates of mCPR from HMIS were not within the CI of FPET results for any of the years available (Figure 3). In general, the HMIS results were most consistent with FPET results in 2015, with six of 17 regions falling within the CI; this dropped to five in 2016 and three in 2017.

At the national level, only 2015 estimates from HMIS fell within the CI of the FPET mCPR estimates. In general, as at the national level, the HMIS estimates of mCPR appear to over-estimate prevalence when compared to FPET and DHS (Figure 4).

Comparing the method prevalence/mix from HMIS and DHS

In comparing method prevalence, HMIS data were compared with the DHS. Although the HMIS data showed consistently higher prevalence compared to the DHS, the same pattern in method mix is observed between the two, with the exception of female sterilization, which appears to be under-reported in the HMIS system. Across both data sources, injectables were indicated as the most common method in use, making up more than half of all use, followed by pills, used by about a quarter of all married users of modern contraception (Figure 5).

Table 1. Data sources for comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>mCPR</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Method use</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FPET</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2015–2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMIS</td>
<td>Limited regional and time trend availability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was observed that there were similar patterns of method mixes at the national level and most of the 17 states/regions, except Chin and Kayin State. In Chin, rates of use of the long-term methods IUD implants, and sterilization were considerably higher than the other areas in DHS data. In HMIS data, only IUD and implant were found as higher proportion than that of other State/Regions. Also in Kayin, the higher use of pills than injections was found only in the DHS, while the injection method was the highest proportion in national and other areas in both DHS and HMIS data.

Comparing the data of LMIS with HMIS data and FEPET results

Regarding estimates of modern method use (EMU, comparable to mCPR) from LMIS commodity consumption data, the LMIS data were found to be quite low in comparison to the HMIS and FEPET estimates, except in Southern Shan State. For 2017, in Southern Shan State, while there was a >90% reporting rate, EMU from LMIS data were nearly identical to the mCPR of HMIS (63% vs 64%); however, both values are not within 95% CI of FEPET estimates.

Discussion and conclusion

DHS is the gold standard method of tracking the family planning program; however, annually tracking the national and subnational progress level for equitable access to family planning services is required. When it was considered the data source for the annual tracking of mCPR, either estimates from FEPET or routine service statistics, direct estimates of HMIS were needed to consider carefully to use as it is much higher than the DHS survey and not matched with FEPET results except in Chin and Kayin states. It might be due to data quality issue and related with performance of data collectors. Therefore, it should be explored in detail why HMIS shows a high result with 5% annual growth, through reviewing the methodology and validating the data quality.
Figure 4. Comparing National mCPR of HMIS and FEPT estimates.

Figure 5. Comparing the modern contraceptive method mix.
For the monitoring of the methods mix, as the series of HMIS data are similar pattern with DHS at both national and state/regional level, except Chin and Kayin. Therefore, HMIS data can be used for monitoring of the method mix, except in Chin and Kayin. The LMIS data could be used for annual tracking when there are high reporting rates and valid information of consumption. Thus, LMIS should be strengthened in data validity as well as area coverage.

Recommendations
In order to get valid information for annual monitoring of Myanmar’s family planning program, Track20’s FPET is the method of choice for now. In future, there is a need to:
- strengthen of HMIS data through reviewing the methodology and validating the data quality;
- establish the Family Planning register and integrate in DHIS tool;
- strengthen the LMIS for reproductive health commodity in terms of data quality as well as area coverage.

Data availability
Underlying data
The Demographic and Health Surveys dataset analyzed during the current study (Myanmar 2015–16) is available in the MEASURE DHS repository (http://www.measuredhs.com). Access to the dataset requires registration, and is granted to those that wish to use the data for legitimate research purposes. A guide for how to apply for dataset access is available at: https://dhsprogram.com/data/Access-Instructions.cfm.
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Overview

This manuscript aims to describe progress with family planning trends in Myanmar. Despite a long legacy of isolation of this country from externally supported programs and research, monitoring systems are in place that provide basic information on trends in contraceptive use. Four data sources are marshalled for this investigation, providing a basis for comparative analysis. A Demographic and Health Survey is available, permitting comparison of Myanmar with other countries. Service statistics data are adjusted with modeling tools to permit assessment of trends at the regional level. Results based on service statistics data contrast with survey results, in that levels of contraceptive use are consistently higher than DHS estimates. The analysis is mainly focused on comparison of data sources and results, with results that lead the authors to conclude that a tool known as “Track20 Family Planning Estimation Tool” is the method of choice.

This manuscript addresses a gap in the regional literature. While much is known about contraceptive use levels and trends in neighboring countries, Myanmar has had relatively little systematic attention. I found the rendition of the history of family planning program development in Myanmar to be helpful, as this information is somewhat difficult to locate elsewhere in the social and demographic literature. Also, the description of data limitations that appears in the Rationale section is useful background information.

Comments on the Methods section

This paper is more focused on the comparison of tools rather than the analysis of family planning, per se. A tool referred to as FPET and another tool LMIS are compared with DHS data, but the methods section is limited to a discussion of the logic of comparison rather than the logic that underlies each tool. The key objective concerns the need for a credible basis for assessing annual progress with family planning program functioning. It is critical to the paper for the reader to understand how results could be affected by methodological differences in the tools employed. Therefore, it is important for the text to clarify how these assessment tools work, either through citation of explanatory articles or through descriptive analysis of the methodologies that they employ. However, tools are cited in the Rationale section without citations or clarification of how they are similar and how they differ. As a consequence, the reader is left to wonder if
the differences portrayed are actually significant. This rather simple addition to the paper would
substantially strengthen the presentation. This reviewer recommends application of statistical procedures
that compare cross-sectional time series data. By employing a method for statistical comparison, the
conclusions and recommendations that are reached would have the credibility that is associated with the
comparison of trends with confidence intervals.

Comparisons of method mix suggest that different tools produce similar use profiles but contrasting levels
of use with health management information system (HMIS) data generating higher use estimates than
corresponding DHS data. Under-estimation of the denominators for HMIS or over-estimation of continuity
of use may explain these estimation differences. How such differences could arise is not adequately
discussed.

The Recommendations section
The paper reads as if the different results that are observed are the end of the research process rather
than an indication that further research is needed. Recommendations to strengthen the HMIS through
reviewing the methodology is not likely to have much practical meaning. Nor are the other
recommendations actionable. Exhortations to strengthen something in general does not convey practical
guidance on what the program should actually do.

This reviewer has not had access to the data, but an illustrative example merits consideration by the
authors, either by proposing some other adjustment procedure or by pursuing a version of what I
recommend. Consider the following: At one point in the paper, the DHS is alluded to as the “gold
standard” for mCPR estimation. The FPET and DHS estimates are similar (Figure 1), but HMIS data
appear to be over-estimating the mCPR. If the DHS is considered the gold standard, then a plausible
proposition is that its data can be used to develop areal adjustment factors. A regression analysis, with
DHS data employed as the dependent variable, HMIS data as an independent variable, with direct and
interaction effects for population characteristics and locality indicators could be used to develop
regression weights that estimate the discrepancies associated with a set of indicators. The regression
weights would define adjustment factors for correcting data to a DHS standard. The correspondence of
FPET with the DHS invites an approach that would use the FPET as the “silver standard” for HMIS
adjustment. While the paper might not take this up as a technical task, it should include discussion of
methods of data adjustment that results appear to invite. This would be a more cogent set of
recommendations than the text that now appears in the Recommendations section.

The figures
Figures 2 and 3 are hard to read and needlessly complex to interpret. There are many regions with
pronounced variance between regions. Are there take home messages from these data that could be
summarized more simply? For example, it is possible that the magnitude of discrepancies is associated
with the level of the estimated mCPR. If HMIS level were on the Y axis and FPET were the X axis a simple
regression line would simulate correspondence between the data sources, and the scatter around that
line would show the pattern of discrepancy by level of mCPR.

The title of Figure 3 is confusing. I think that Figure 3 could be dropped.
Figure 4 is a largely empty depiction of a few data points. This could be replaced with a table.
Figure 5 is visually confusing. For some reason, data correspondence in Chin is very different from the
other regions. Coloration might help, but tabular data might be more interpretable to a reader.

Minor comments and suggestions
The text of this paper begins with a reference to the maternal mortality rate, but the paper is on a different
topic. This reviewer suggests that the authors open the paper with a statement that is a more direct reference to topic of the article and the lack of systematic attention to family planning research in Myanmar and the rationale for the paper. At some point in the discussion, reference to the relationship of family planning with the maternal mortality rate would be informative.
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