

CORRECTION

Open Access



Correction: Induced abortion: a cross-sectional study on knowledge of and attitudes toward the new abortion law in Maputo and Quelimane cities, Mozambique

Mónica Frederico^{1,2*}, Carlos Arnaldo¹, Peter Decat³, Adelino Juga^{4,5}, Elizabeth Kemigisha^{2,6}, Olivier Degomme² and Kristien Michiels²

BMC Women's Health (2020) 20:129.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-020-00988-6>.

Following publication of the original article [1], the author noticed the errors in Table 4, and the text part in the Results section.

In Table 4, under Benefit (Bivariate and Multiple logistic regression) column, the values are published incorrectly in Religion sub-headings have been corrected as shown below:

In the *Results* section, under the subheading *Factors associated with knowledge or perceived benefits of the new abortion law in the study site*, the paragraph should read as “Factors associated with perceived benefits of the new

abortion law on bivariate analysis were being Muslims vs Catholic, being at university vs secondary school, having an experience of contraceptives usage, as well as having knowledge about the new status of abortion law. On the multiple logistic regression model, women who were at or completed a university degree, and women who have knowledge about the new status of abortion law, both at the level of (p -value<0.001), were more likely to perceive benefits from the permission to have an abortion at a health facility.

Muslim respondents were significantly more likely (p -value<0.000) to report not seeing the benefits of the abortion law compared to Catholic respondents. This association showed consistence between multiple regression and bivariate analysis. The consistent odds ratio suggests a stable relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable, regardless of the type of analysis approach.

Notably, this significant association was only observed solely among Muslims respondents. This prompts caution in interpretation, considering:

Other intersecting unstudied determinants might explain the correlation between being Muslim and not seeing benefits of the law, such as education, location of the study, socioeconomic status, etc. For example, in our study population, the majority of non-educated women were Muslims and the majority of the Muslim participants resided in Quelimane, which could potentially explain (part of) the association found.

The online version of the original article can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-020-00988-6>.

*Correspondence:

Mónica Frederico
monica.frederico@ugent.be

¹Centro de Estudos Africanos, Eduardo Mondlane University, Maputo, Mozambique

²International Centre for Reproductive Health (ICRH), Department of Public Health and Primary Care, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

³Department of Family Medicine and Primary Health Care, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

⁴Department of Mathematics and Informatics, Faculty of Sciences, Eduardo Mondlane University, Maputo, Mozambique

⁵BioStat, Hasselt University, Diepenbeek, Belgium

⁶Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies, Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Mbarara 1410, Uganda



© The Author(s) 2024. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Table 4 Bivariate and multiple regression analysis: knowledge of new law on abortion, benefits of these services among women of reproductive age in Maputo and Quelimane cities

Categories	Knowledge				Benefit			
	Bivariate		Multiple regression		Bivariate		Multiple regression	
	OR	95% CI	AOR	95% CI	OR	95% CI	AOR	95% CI
City								
Maputo vs. Quelimane ^a	3.05	(1.55–6.00)**	5.04	(2.75–9.24)***	1.46	(0.86–2.48)	1.42	(0.74–2.76)
Ages								
25–34 vs. 15–24 ^a	0.84	(0.49–1.46)	1.13	(0.54–2.35)	0.69	(0.36–1.34)	1.74	(0.85–3.56)
35–49 vs. 15–24	1.75	(0.83–3.69)	0.44	(0.16–1.20)	0.96	(0.39–2.37)	1.51	(0.54–4.23)
Religion								
Muslim vs. Catholic ^a	1.77	(0.52–6.08)	0.6	(0.18–2.04)	0.22	(0.09–0.51)***	0.22	(0.10–0.50)*
Protestant vs. Catholic	0.72	(0.45–1.16)	0.69	(0.43–1.10)	0.94	(0.42–2.10)	0.88	(0.40–1.95)
Others vs. Catholic	0.95	(0.45–2.03)	0.55	(0.29–1.06)	0.82	(0.44–1.60)	0.78	(0.40–1.52)
Marital status								
Unmarried vs. married ^a	1.74	(0.95–3.18)	2.14	(1.05–4.36)*	1.14	(0.65–2.01)	1.08	(0.64–1.80)
Education level								
Non educated vs. Secondary	3.02	(1.03–8.84)*	3.84	(0.73–20.23)	0.53	(0.15–1.85)	0.33	(0.08–1.30)
Primary vs. Secondary	0.92	(0.41–2.06)	1.04	(0.52–2.06)	0.81	(0.40–11.61)	0.78	(0.40–1.52)
University vs. Secondary	1.70	(0.78–3.67)	1.64	(0.61–4.41)	6.75	(3.33–13.69)***	6.07	(2.72–13.53)***
Occupation								
Students vs. Unemployed ^a	0.77	(0.31–1.91)	2.26	(1.12–4.53)*	0.77	(0.35–1.1.68)	1.59	(0.71–3.56)
Employed vs. Unemployed	0.62	(0.32–1.19)	2.02	(1.07–3.83)	0.75	(0.40–1.43)	1.06	(0.55–2.02)
Ever Use contraceptives								
Yes vs. No ^a	2.17	(1.05–4.46)*	1.92	(0.97–3.83)	1.92	(1.08–3.40)*	1.46	(0.74–2.88)
Ever been pregnant								
Yes vs. No ^a	1.64	(0.83–3.23)	3.34	(1.62–6.89)**	1.34	(0.83–2.14)	1.25	(0.61–2.55)
Abortion knowledge								
Yes vs. No ^a					2.89	(1.67–5.01)***	2.54	(1.57–4.10)***

Odds Ratio * $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$; ^aSubcategory of reference

In the survey, women were only asked about their religion and not about their level of religiosity. This could have given the study more depth to better interpret the results. For example, it is possible that the level of religiosity is the key associated factor here, and that the Muslim respondents in our study had a higher level of religiosity than the women of other religions.” instead of “Factors associated with perceived benefits of the new abortion law on bivariate analysis were being Muslims vs Catholic, being at university vs secondary school, having an experience of contraceptives usage, as well as having knowledge about the new status of abortion law. On the multiple logistic regression model, women who were at or completed a university degree, and women who have knowledge about the new status of abortion law, both at the level of (p -value <0.001), were more likely to perceive benefits from the permission to have an abortion at a health facility. Muslim women were less (p -value <0.05)

likely to perceive the benefits of the new abortion law (Table 4).”

The original article has been corrected.

Published online: 21 June 2024

References

- Frederico M, Arnaldo C, Decat P, et al. Induced abortion: a cross-sectional study on knowledge of and attitudes toward the new abortion law in Maputo and Quelimane cities, Mozambique. BMC Womens Health. 2020;20:129. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12905-020-00988-6>

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.