Perceptions of long-term impact and change following a midwife-led biomass smoke education programme for mothers in rural Uganda: a qualitative study

Abstract

Introduction

Women and children in Uganda and other low- and middle-income countries are exposed to disproportionately high levels of household air pollution from biomass smoke generated by smoke-producing cookstoves, especially in rural areas. This population is therefore particularly vulnerable to the negative health effects caused by household air pollution, including negative pregnancy outcomes and other health issues throughout life. The Midwife Project, a collaboration between research and health teams in the UK and Uganda, began in 2016 to implement an education programme on lung health for mothers in Uganda, to reduce the health risks to women and children. Education materials were produced to guide midwives in the delivery of health messages across four rural Health Centres and mixed-methods results of knowledge questionnaires and interviews demonstrated knowledge acquisition, acceptability and feasibility. This qualitative follow-up study aimed to improve understanding of the longer-term impact of this education programme from the perspective of midwives, Village Health Team members and mothers, in consideration of rolling the programme out more widely in rural Uganda.

Methods

Purposive sampling was carried out to recruit consenting antenatal or postnatal women, midwives and Village Health Team members who had been involved in an education session. Individual interviews were conducted with twelve mothers and four Village Health Team
members, and four focus groups were conducted with ten midwives in total. Interviews and
focus groups were conducted across all four Health Centres by two researchers and six
translators as appropriate depending on language spoken (English or Lusoga). These were
semi-structured and directed by topic guides. Reflective and observational notes were also
made. A thematic analysis was carried out by two researchers, along with production of a
narrative for each mother to enrich understanding of each individual story.

Findings

Midwives and Village Health Teams had continued with the programme well past the project
end date and all mothers expressed making, or intending to make, changes, suggesting long-
term feasibility and acceptability. Main themes generated were: ability to change and changes
made, ability to change dictated by money, importance of practical education, perceived
health improvements, and passing on knowledge. Additional findings were that some
education topics appeared overlooked, and there was a lack of clarity about the Village
Health Team role for the purposes of this programme. Some mothers had been motivated to
overcome financial barriers, for example, by reconstructing cooking areas cheaply
themselves. However, information given in the programme about building advice and
potential financial gains was inconsistent.

Conclusions

Recommendations for future biomass smoke education should include explicit building
advice, emphasis on financial gains, encouragement to share the knowledge acquired, and
clarification of the Village Health Team role. These programme changes will improve focus
and relevancy, optimise impact, and with behaviour change and implementation strategy in
mind, could be used for widespread roll-out in rural Uganda. Future research should include
quantitative data collection to objectively examine surprising perceived health benefits,
including reduction in malaria and burns, and further qualitative work on why some education content appears neglected.
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**Introduction**

Globally, household air pollution is responsible for 3.8 million deaths per year, over 700,000 of which are in Africa[1,2]. Three billion people, mostly in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) like Uganda, use biomass fuel (any organic matter, such as wood and dung), for cooking, using cookstoves that create household air pollution and lead to adverse health outcomes. Household air pollution is linked to three of the top five causes of death in Uganda: neonatal death, respiratory infection and tuberculosis[3,4], as well as negative pregnancy outcomes (e.g. low birth weight)[5] and other non-communicable diseases like chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), heart disease, lung cancer, stroke, and a twofold increase in risk of childhood pneumonia[1]. The negative health impacts of air pollution have implications for babies in utero and onwards throughout life[6].

Eighty-four percent of the Ugandan population live ruraly[7] where on average, women work a disproportionately higher number of hours per day compared to men (15:8), as women carry out most of the family responsibilities, including cooking, in addition to agricultural work[8]. Ninety percent of Ugandans rely on wood for cooking fires, and women and children can spend up to 9 hours a day in small, smoky, poorly-ventilated kitchens burning biomass fuels as well as being exposed to other sources of air pollution, such as burning rubbish. Women and children are therefore particularly vulnerable to the negative health effects caused by air pollution[9-11].
The Midwife Project, a novel implementation study, began in 2016 in response to these health risks[12]. It was felt that midwives were in an ideal position to reach women and children, with the aim of targeting health from in utero onwards to reduce lifelong risks, in an attempt to alter health behaviours from childhood onwards. Researchers from the UK and Uganda collaborated with midwives from the Jinja region of southern rural Uganda to produce educational materials in the form of a flipchart, poster and leaflet (see Appendix A) for midwives and Village Health Teams (VHTs, voluntary members of the community who assist with health education and care outside of the Health Centre environment) to deliver to antenatal and postnatal women with the aim of reducing exposure to biomass smoke. These materials were approved by the Ministry of Health in Uganda.

Midwives were recruited from four randomly-selected Health Centre IIIIs (rural facilities that provide outpatient and maternity care) in Jinja: Busede, Lukolo, Mpambwa and Wakitaka, and VHTs from the four corresponding villages were educated by midwives to reinforce topics in the community. Delivery was intended to be as often as healthcare workers (midwives and VHTs) felt able to, and to as many mothers as possible, between April and June 2018. Topics included: sources of biomass smoke, health risks, cookstove improvement and placement, improving kitchen ventilation, improving fuels, and avoiding other sources of smoke (e.g. smoking, burning rubbish).

The Midwife Project originally aimed to examine: i) feasibility and acceptability; and ii) whether knowledge, attitudes and behaviours were changed. This was assessed with mixed methods: quantitatively with a before-and-after knowledge questionnaire for midwives, VHTs and mothers, and qualitatively, with 21 mothers interviewed. The qualitative assessment focused on education session content, and barriers and facilitators to attendance and engagement. Mothers found the intervention to be acceptable, although the main barrier was lack of money, which prevented them from being able to afford transport to attend the
Health Centre and to buy materials for making changes. The education programme was assessed as feasible, and knowledge was increased across all topics for healthcare workers and mothers alike[12].

The overall objective of The Midwife Project was to design a health-improving education programme suitable for wider roll-out across Uganda. A 2015 systematic review of improved cookstove interventions concluded that longer-term follow-up periods are necessary to assess sustainability[13], but impact and viability past the end date of the original Midwife Project had not been examined, including if and how educational content had been shared between communities, outside of the Health Centre setting. Therefore, this follow-up study aimed to address the following research questions:

- What is the ongoing impact of this education programme on behaviour change from the perspective of women and healthcare workers involved in this programme?
- How has the programme affected health from their perspective?
- Is programme content being shared amongst the community, how is it being shared, and what is the impact of this?
- Are any changes to programme content required in consideration of widespread roll-out?

In the original study, only mothers had been interviewed. For this follow-up study, it was essential to assess the views of healthcare workers as well to understand the impact on healthcare delivery in this context.

**Methods**

The Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research guidelines[14] were used to guide reporting (See Appendix B).

**Sample**
To enable pragmatic recruitment, purposive sampling was carried out by the research team at the Makerere University Lung Institute in Kampala and the District Health Office in Jinja. Eligible participants were consenting antenatal or postnatal women, midwives, and VHTs who had previously attended or delivered an education session on biomass smoke. As the UK team could not easily return to collect more data, it was agreed beforehand between researchers that 3 mothers, 2-3 midwives and 1 VHT per Health Centre would be a sufficient number to balance practical considerations (e.g. time limitation) with the need to assess a range of experience and perspectives.

**Data collection**

Whilst it was originally intended to carry out interviews only, focus groups were conducted with midwives to minimise the impact on their time, as they had high patient caseloads at the time of data collection. Due to these time and access constraints, it was not possible to recruit off-duty midwives. All other participants were interviewed individually. All interviews and focus groups took place over two days in February 2019 at the Health Centres in Lukolo, Wakitaka, Busede and Mpambwa in Jinja by two researchers and with the assistance of six translators as per availability. Translation was not necessary for midwives as they all spoke English. For translated interviews, questions were asked in English, then translated into Lusoga, the local dialect. The answer was given in Lusoga and then translated back to English. Attempts were made during interviews with mothers to encourage rapport with more familiar body language[15]. Interviews and focus groups were semi-structured and directed by topic guides tailored for each group (see Appendix C). They were recorded with a password-protected audio-recorder, saved onto a password-protected laptop at the end of each day and then deleted from the audio-recorder. Reflective and observational notes were made by both researchers at the end of each day.
Twelve mothers who had attended the education programme were interviewed, 3 per Health Centre. The time between first session attendance and interview ranged between 3 and 16 months. Four focus groups were conducted with 10 midwives in total, 2-4 per Health Centre (all female), and interviews with 4 VHTs (2 male, 2 female), one per Health Centre.

Interviews and focus groups took similar times to conduct, with a range between 17 and 36 minutes and an average of 27 minutes.

A second opportunistic visit to all four Health Centres was made in October 2019, while researchers were visiting for another research project. Informal discussions were held with combined groups of 12-14 midwives and VHTs, during which similar topics were covered to further examine similarities and differences in views, and changes to practice. Notes from these meetings were incorporated into the analysis.

**Analysis**

A qualitative thematic analysis approach was adopted following Braun & Clarke’s suggested 6 stages of thematic analysis: reading and familiarisation, coding across entire dataset, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and writing/finalising analysis[16]. Constant comparison was utilised throughout analysis by comparing new concepts with existing ones[17].

Verbatim transcription and familiarisation of interviews and focus groups was carried out by the lead author, and coded thematically using NVivo 12 Pro. There were two coding groups, one for mothers and another for healthcare workers, to separate out the different perspectives. Transcripts were initially coded in NVivo, then codes were refined into more coherent themes and sub-themes. Where questions appeared to deviate from the topic guide in a leading way, a judgement was made about whether the response seemed unbiased, but responses to these questions were largely omitted. From each transcript, a narrative ‘story’ for each mother was also summarised separately, which provided context and a coherent picture for each woman,
to aid understanding of their individual motivations, thus further supplementing concept development.

A second researcher independently generated themes from a sample of transcripts, and this aided in corroboration of the thematic framework. The visit notes made during both trips in February and October 2019 were cross-referenced to identify any thematic corroboration or contrast. Illustrative quotes for this manuscript were chosen and anonymised for reporting by the lead author.

**Ethics approval**

Primary ethical approval was obtained in 2016 from the Mulago Hospital Research and Ethics Committee, Kampala as part of the FRESH AIR giant protocol (MREC 971, trial ID: NTR5759). A renewal of this approval was obtained for this study in February 2019. All participants provided written informed consent before participation.

**Findings**

Whilst the education programme was originally intended to be delivered between April and June 2018, midwives and VHTs reported in both February and October 2019 that they were continuing to deliver it frequently. However, only one mother mentioned VHT input during the February interviews and this was because they had directed her to an education session but not provided education themselves. Although there was a very wide range of topics learned, some aspects were not mentioned at all by mothers or healthcare workers: COPD, using a kitchen hood, more efficient cooking methods (e.g. using a lid to reduce cooking time and thus reduce the amount of smoke produced), tobacco-smoking, burning leaves as an insect repellent, not burying plastic in the ground, and adding eves space for ventilation.

Thematic[16] and narrative analysis generated five broad themes as reported below.
Illustrative quotes appear in the third person for mothers and VHTs, as interviews were translated in this way.

ABILITY TO CHANGE AND CHANGES MADE

Most women reported being able to make changes, the most common of which were to the cooking area itself (reconstructing the ‘traditional’ cooking place of a cooking pot balanced on three large stones, to a more stable and efficient construction), changes to kitchen ventilation (increasing window space and installing chimneys), and staying away from smoke for both themselves and their children:

Now what she has learnt, or ever since she had knowledge about the smoke from the midwives, she now has improved on her cooking place, she has now learnt she should not sit with her children in the kitchen while cooking, as well as she should also not sit in there while cooking ... that she has to get out, get fresh air and only check on what she’s cooking ... She has constructed her cooking facilities with an improved stove. Instead of the ordinary three stones.

Some women also reported no longer burning rubbish, and changes to lighting from candles or kerosene to solar-powered. Some expressed wanting to make further changes if possible, although there were financial barriers that had prevented them from doing so yet, as reported below.

ABILITY TO CHANGE DICTATED BY MONEY
Most mothers reported crop-growing as their main livelihood, with some acquiring additional money by other means in order to pay for suggested kitchen improvements. This included selling snacks or firewood, obtaining crop money from their husband, growing additional crops to sell, and borrowing from the bank. However, some mothers had specific business ideas (e.g. selling clothes) but no money to move this forward.

Money as a barrier to change was also expressed by most healthcare workers, particularly with regard to the unaffordability of charcoal and gas as substitutes for firewood, something also mentioned by mothers. However, some mothers reported that by improving their cookstove, money was actually saved by buying less firewood and reducing medical costs to treat negative health impacts caused by smoke exposure:

She says that she now rarely goes to seek medical treatment as it used to be because there is great improvement ... not as much as she used to do. She says that it has cut on the costs and it has made her see, even when it comes to maybe buying firewood. Because this modern stove requires little firewood compared to the other one whereby one has to keep lots of firewood.

[MMo3]

**Importance of practical education**

Some mothers reported attending multiple education sessions, up to four times, an unexpected finding and something that was not an intended outcome. This mostly appeared to be in an attempt to gain practical information about how to make changes, for instance, how to build a different cookstove, an element that is missing from the education material:
But she has heard it twice. They were first given information, then they came and they were told how to improve on their cooking places.

The mothers who did report being given practical information had been able to make changes themselves or even educate others practically, in a resourceful, cost-effective way:

She has told her friends, her neighbours. But some of them have requested her to go and construct for them. Because she has the knowledge and has constructed her place. She teaches them how to prepare, for example, the mud where they get bricks from. And then, when they are prepared, she goes and constructs for them. And tells them how to look after it.

She says that she didn’t put in anything like money but it is only the knowledge that she got together with her friends because they were taught how to do it. And together with her friends set up a group, they went and used local materials to construct. They did it themselves because she didn’t bring in anybody to make it for her, she did it herself. Because she had no money, so she used the local materials and she constructed it there herself. They had groups of five. So they would construct one home and then when it was sorted they go to another home and another home after that.
However, whilst there were consistent reports that some people were setting up groups and using cheap, local materials to construct, healthcare workers also acknowledged that others did not have the practical understanding to be able to do this:

*In addition to telling people what to do, we need to take action. We need to teach them exactly what the stoves look like. Because some of them don’t know the techniques.*

Furthermore, healthcare workers recognised that there was misunderstanding about the importance of having two windows for ventilation[18] (as per programme content) rather than one, and this is reflected in the interviews with mothers:

*But she says that, maybe what she did, she put in there only one window but it is wide... she has no specific reason. She just wanted one big window. Maybe she needs to be educated more about the need for two windows.*

Perceived health improvements

Most women interviewed either had no knowledge of the dangers of biomass smoke exposure prior to attending an education session, or had heard from their community about the health risks associated with it, but didn’t believe it. Some stated that they believed the health risks after attending an education session with the midwives, and others reported that they themselves or others had only taken it seriously after experiencing the negative health consequences they had heard about:
There is one she used to tell and she refuses and refuses. But when she [mother] fainted, that very person has said now ‘I will stop’.

[LMo3]

One midwife reported that she had noticed differences in pregnancy outcomes for the same women, before and after education, and other midwives stated that once they had the knowledge, they realised the link between smoke and specific health problems in patients:

It was interesting, we are getting knowledge of which we are not aware. Because we are getting abortions [miscarriages], when you do investigation, you don’t see the cause of that. So now we are getting some abortion [miscarriage], this is biomass smoke. We’ve got that information. That knowledge.

[MMi1]

For healthcare workers, perceived health improvements for both mothers and themselves included reduced coughing, tuberculosis, pneumonia, pregnancy- and baby-related illness, asthma, rash and breathing difficulties. Mothers reported perceived health improvements in breathing, respiratory infections, bleeding during pregnancy, fainting, coughing and flu. More surprising findings included healthcare workers’ perceived reduction in burns for children, and in malaria by both mothers and healthcare workers.

Passing on knowledge

Eleven of the 12 mothers reported educating others about biomass smoke (with the 12th intending to now that she had taken the content seriously), and whilst it was reported that
most people had reacted positively to this and had made changes, some had again
experienced a financial barrier. Some mothers seemed unsure about passing the knowledge
on more widely:

*She has passed on the information to her immediate relatives. And she says that if she
gets anything new and if she learns more, she is going to start telling the community.*

*She says that she could, but maybe when we come back just as you’ve now come, you
could give them more information before she is able to go out into the community.*

Several healthcare workers stated that they had encouraged mothers to share knowledge from
this project with their community and that they had seen evidence of this happening. Both
midwives and VHTs stated that obtaining money for transport was the biggest barrier to them
sharing the education more widely, with the local community areas being geographically very
large. However, this may differ between Health Centres, with one VHT conversely stating
they felt in a good position to communicate with ‘masses’ of people. Healthcare workers
expressed a desire to spread the message to other healthcare workers, communities, schools
and churches.

**Discussion**

**Main findings**

**Themes:** The altered behaviours of healthcare workers and mothers suggest that this
programme was successful in delivering its key messages of: (i) the health risks associated
with household air pollution and; (ii) how to improve the home environment or avoid smoke
to reduce air pollution exposure. Healthcare workers had continued to deliver this education
long past the project end date, which was not a set expectation, suggesting acceptability and feasibility for sustained implementation. All mothers described their ability and desire to make changes to avoid biomass smoke in order to prioritise their health and the health of their families, even if lack of money had prevented them from changing everything they would have liked to. This included construction changes to cooking areas and housing ventilation, no longer burning rubbish, and change to solar power for lighting.

There were some inspiringly resourceful stories from mothers about the ways in which they had overcome financial barriers, by making additional funds and/or together as a community, using cheap, local materials to construct new cooking areas themselves. Significantly, this shows that changes can be made in this context without the need to spend much money, and some experiences reflect actual financial benefits from using less firewood and spending less on medical bills. Many women also reported staying away from smoke, a completely free option. However, not all mothers had been given practical information, and it would seem that those making changes had only been able to do so by having explicit building advice, including how to do it cheaply or for free, suggesting inconsistency in healthcare worker knowledge.

There was some suggestion of health improvements, and it is interesting to note that some mothers reported only taking biomass smoke education seriously after experiencing or witnessing health effects. However, quantitative research would be needed to explore the validity of these subjective views. The repeated mention of malaria reduction was surprising as it was not an expected health improvement in relation to reduction in biomass smoke exposure. There are several possible explanations for this:

1. There could have been a misconception regarding what constitutes malaria and perhaps the opportunity to clarify this was missed.
2. The use of mosquito coils, which produce smoke, is one of the education topics. Several mothers stated that they had changed from using a coil to mosquito net and it could be that this provides better protection.

3. Malaria incidence is reducing in this population regardless[19].

4. It is possible that a reduction in biomass smoke exposure improves health generally and, in turn, malaria resistance.

5. Malaria is one of the leading causes of death in Uganda[20] and is therefore well-recognised; it could be that mothers mentioned it due to social desirability bias - reporting what they assumed they should (discussed further below).

There were also unexpected reports from midwives of fewer burns in children, which was attributed by them to improved cooking areas. Traditionally, the three-stone cookstove is located in a small, dark kitchen and can be very unstable and dangerous. With changes in construction and location, it is possible that children were being burned less.

Analysis of how education was shared demonstrated that not all mothers felt empowered to pass information on to others; midwives and VHTs could encourage communities to share education with as many people as possible and thus reduce unnecessary Health Centre attendance. There is, however, a risk of messages becoming distorted, and it is therefore important that the education being given is clear and consistent, and that VHTs reinforce the correct messages in the community. Despite healthcare workers being keen to share information more widely in places like schools and churches, there was already possible miscommunication evident, such as the misunderstanding of the need for two windows rather than one[18]. There further seemed to be misunderstanding of the VHT role in sharing education for this project, with midwives stating that they would like to go into the villages to educate people and one woman reporting that a midwife had visited her at home to ‘supervise’ changes. Whilst this demonstrates enthusiasm and could be useful, this should be
the remit of the VHTs. It is interesting that mothers did not really mention VHTs as having an educational role; this may not have been made clear, or could highlight a gap in VHT training.

Implications: Whilst money was perceived by some as a barrier to change, we suggest that the simple option of staying away from smoke, along with potential financial benefits, could be emphasised more to alter this perception. The inclusion of practical information in all education sessions could reduce the need for multiple session attendance, which was not an original intention of the programme, thus reducing the time and cost burden for both mothers and midwives. Together, this would ensure all participants are given the same message and equal opportunity to make changes and would be invaluable for future implementation of this programme and possibly other similar public health interventions in low-resource settings.

A further adaptation to programme content could be a review of education topics. There was a consistent focus on some education topics, while others were not mentioned at all; further qualitative interviews with healthcare staff and mothers could help to establish why this has happened. It could be that there are too many topics to focus on, understanding is limited in certain areas, the least useful topics as perceived by midwives are left out, or that mothers are not receptive to some ideas. Adaptation could therefore be warranted to make the education as focused and useful as possible. To optimise reach and impact, it is further important that women are empowered to share what they have learned and that the educational role of VHTs is clear to all.

The Midwife Project is a novel education programme; as stated by the researchers involved, it is the first of its kind to utilise midwives in delivering health education on biomass smoke[12]. There is a knowledge and literature gap for examining implementation of this type of public health education programme in Uganda, and indeed across Africa and in other LMICs. This follow-up study therefore informs understanding of how co-produced health
education can be implemented and replicated in similar settings and for other health topics. A recent scoping review of health screening interventions in sub-Saharan Africa concluded that more effective interventions included those utilising community health educators and those targeting financial barriers[21]. The Midwife Project has included VHTs to educate the community, and this follow-up study has demonstrated how financial barriers can be overcome in this context.

Other studies aiming to reduce biomass smoke seem to focus only on the outcomes of providing improved cookstoves. However, two recent studies suggest that more needs to be done than simply introducing ‘cleaner’ cookstoves, by taking behaviour change into consideration and improving implementation strategy, aspects that have been neglected in previous interventions, and which can help to improve sustained change[22,23]. A 2018 systematic review and meta-analysis demonstrated varying effectiveness for health improvement following cookstove improvement, but did not examine the behaviour change and implementation implications behind this; inconsistent effectiveness of alternative cookstoves could be due to neglect of these important factors[24]. The Midwife Project therefore benefits both from taking behaviour change into account, by allowing women the autonomy of making adaptable and resourceful changes for themselves rather than just providing a different cookstove, and by employing an iterative implementation strategy involving midwives, VHTs and local communities at every stage.

Michie et al.’s COM-B framework for understanding behaviour (see Figure 1)[25] suggests that behaviour is influenced by capability, motivation and opportunity. It could be argued that the mothers making the most impactful changes were motivated by the education session(s) they attended, had capability by having the knowledge and skills to make changes, and opportunity by making additional money and/or having access to local materials.
The Midwife Project did provide evidence of increased knowledge in the original study, as did another awareness-raising education project for healthcare workers in rural Uganda in 2014[26]. However, a recent review of education programmes for midwives in LMICs showed lack of evidence that knowledge acquisition alone correlated with behaviour change or improved outcomes for women and children[27]. By taking behaviour change and implementation strategy into account, this follow-up study has demonstrated a different outcome in that behaviours have changed for those with capability, motivation and opportunity, and therefore there is additional potential for improved health outcomes. Utilising midwives to deliver other health-related messages in this way could be an impactful method for other public health interventions in Uganda and beyond.

**Strengths and limitations of this study**

Participants were interviewed from four Health Centres spanning a large area of Jinja. The sample therefore represented a diversity of experiences in this region, a strength of this follow-up study that potentially optimises transferability for widespread roll-out. It is possible that there was some sampling bias in that mothers may have been chosen because of their enthusiasm to take part, and therefore they were more likely to express positivity. It was not feasible for the UK team to organise recruitment and so this is a
potential limitation that we were aware of from the start; attempts were therefore made to
minimise sampling bias through liaison with the Ugandan research and healthcare teams
responsible for recruitment. There is also the possibility of social desirability bias in that
mothers and healthcare workers alike may have stated what they felt we wanted to hear in
order to gain approval, especially due to our differences in socioeconomic backgrounds; there
was some evidence of recitation of education topics rather than answering the questions. One
translator was the District Health Officer for women’s services in the region, whose presence
may have increased this bias further by being a figure of authority. However, the topics
recited were the same for both mothers and healthcare workers, at least demonstrating a
consistency in the topics being taught and received. Attempts were made during interviews to
balance encouragement with not praising responses too much in order to minimise this bias.

Recommendations for future research and practice

Based on the findings of this research, the following recommendations are made for
amendments to the programme:

1. Inclusion of affordable, practical building information in education sessions,
   including an emphasis of the importance of having two windows.

2. More emphasis during education on overcoming financial barriers: for example, (i)
   staying away from smoke is free; (ii) it is cheaper overall to improve the kitchen than
   pay for ongoing firewood and medical costs.

3. Emphasis on the benefits of (consistent) dissemination of learning to others.

4. The role of VHTs to be made clearer to midwives, mothers, and VHTs themselves.

Additionally, further research is recommended in the followings areas:

1. Further qualitative work to review why some topics are being neglected and whether
   some items need clarification, or removal altogether.
2. Whilst the health benefits of improved cooking conditions have been evidenced elsewhere[28], the experience of health benefits in this study is subjective and cannot be relied upon alone; this would need to be triangulated with objective pre- and post-education quantitative data collection related to health impacts and outcomes, including malaria and burns. The District Health Office in Jinja has been contacted to assist in obtaining this data, although this is currently on hold due to COVID-19.

Conclusions

In an area for which there is very limited literature, this follow-up study has improved knowledge and understanding of the longer-term impact of a midwife-led health education intervention and has shown that behaviour change and implementation strategy are important factors in enabling change in this context. Based on our findings, adaptation to educational messages for this programme would optimise impact for women in rural Uganda and could be used for widespread roll-out. The Midwife Project strategy could have impact both for reducing biomass smoke exposure and therefore improving health, but also be used for other health-related interventions in low-resource settings. Further research is needed to enable refinement of education topics and to examine health benefits.
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**Figure Legends**

Figure 1. The COM-B (Capability Opportunity Motivation-Behaviour) system – a framework for understanding behaviour
Appendices

Appendix A. Education materials

Flipchart
THE IMPORTANCE OF HOUSEHOLD AIR POLLUTION EXPOSURE REDUCTION

FLIP CHART FOR HEALTH WORKERS (MIDWIVES)

TIPS

- Best used in a clinic setting for one or two small (5-12 people) community outreach.
- Make sure that the client can see the images while you explain.
- Point to the illustrations as you talk while you read the text behind.

ADVICE ON DELIVERING THE MESSAGE

- Make the client feel welcome and relaxed to talk to you openly.
- Face your clients while talking.
- Ask questions and encourage discussion—especially about their desires and experiences.
- Keep checking that the clients understand you (e.g., ask if they can repeat what you previously told them).
- Ask the clients if they have any questions to ask you.

HOW TO USE THIS FLIP CHART

1. Your client may ask you questions. Use the frequently asked questions section to guide your answers.
2. Remember to always refer them to nearby facilities in case you have conducted the health education in the community.

INTRODUCTION.

Research has shown a relationship between pregnancy-related complications (pre-eclampsia, pre-mature labour, antepartum haemorrhage), poor newborn (low birth weight, and neonatal death), and exposure to biomass smoke. In addition, the high levels of particulate matter, carbon monoxide, and other pollutants in the environment have been associated with increased occurrence of acute respiratory tract infections, pneumonia, asthma attacks, and poor lung function in young children. Thus there is evidence that people of all ages are at risk from biomass smoke exposure. The greatest damage to a child’s lungs occurs during pregnancy and infancy.

In order to ensure proper lung growth and reduce infant mortality from respiratory tract problems, interventions to reduce exposure to biomass smoke during pregnancy and early childhood are needed. Furthermore, reduction of exposure to biomass smoke among pregnant mothers leads to other benefits such as reduced exposure in children because, in many communities, the children are always in close contact with their mothers as they (mothers) do their household chores including cooking.

In a study in Uganda we have shown that many people are widely exposed to biomass smoke throughout their lifetime, and this has been associated with many respiratory diseases and impaired lung function, especially in younger women. Midwives have untapped access to pregnant women and already have dedicated education sessions which are very well attended. However, they currently do not offer any education sessions on biomass smoke mainly due to lack of awareness about the effects of biomass exposure and its impact on pregnancy outcomes and child health.

This flip chart is therefore to be used by midwives to conduct health education sessions during ANC and PNC clinics with clients.

WHAT IS HOUSEHOLD AIR POLLUTION?

Household Air Pollution refers to chemical, biological, and physical contamination of the air inside the house, including kitchens, indoor air. It can lead to adverse health effects in people of all age groups. Household Air Pollution (HAP) from biomass smoke is a major public health challenge, especially in low-income countries, where more than 90% of households use biomass for cooking, lighting, and heating.

Household air pollution is a major public health problem.

KEY MESSAGES

Note: Always remember to give these take-away messages to the audience after every session.

- Always attend ANC appointments for monitoring of your pregnancy.
- Avoid staying in the kitchen for long hours while cooking.
- Keep babies and young children away from the smoke/kitchen.
- The effects of the smoke may not be immediately visible but are very harmful/irreversible to the baby/mother’s health.

WHAT IS BIOMASS SMOKE?

Biomass is any organics - wood, charcoal, etc. fuels that can be used as source of energy.
**Sources of Biomass Smoke.**

The main sources of biomass smoke are:
- Poultry.
- Firewood.
- Charcoal.
- Crop residues.
- Livestock manure.

**Other Sources of Household Air Pollution.**

Apart from the sources above, household air pollution includes substances emitted by:
- Gas stoves.
- Incinerators.
- Diesel engines.
- Combustion processes.

**Who is Most Affected by Biomass Smoke.**

Women and young children are most affected by biomass smoke, as they are more likely to be exposed when cooking and cleaning.

**Effect of Household Air Pollution/Biomass Smoke.**

- **In pregnancy:** Increased risk of miscarriage, stillbirth, and low birth weight.
- **In children:** Increased risk of upper respiratory infections, asthma, and low birth weight.
- **In adults:** Increased risk of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), heart disease, and stroke.
- **In all ages:** Increased risk of pneumonia, COPD, and lung cancer.
- **In children:** Increased risk of respiratory infections, asthma, and low birth weight.
- **In adults:** Increased risk of COPD, heart disease, and stroke.
- **In all ages:** Increased risk of respiratory infections, asthma, and low birth weight.
You Can Reduce Exposure To Biomass Smoke During Pregnancy, After Delivery And Among Young Children By;

1. Spending less time by the fire while cooking.  
2. Using dry firewood to cook to reduce smoke.

3. Avoiding burning rubbish and leaves; instead, recycle plastics and dispose of leaves and organic rubbish by burying into the soil.  
4. Having two windows adjacent to each other and eave spaces.

5. Using locally built cooking stoves that produce less smoke.
COMMON TYPES OF COOKING METHODS, FUELS, AND ALTERNATIVES THAT PREVENT SMOKE.

- Coal or charcoal
- Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)
- Alcohol
- Kerosene
- Solar
- Gas
- Electric

KEY POINTS TO NOTE:
- Always aim to aim for mistake-free cooking.
- Avoid using it in the kitchen for long hours.
- Make sure the room is well ventilated.
- The smoke should not be harmful to the body in the long run.

BEHAVIORS TO REDUCE EMISSIONS TO BIOLOGICAL SMOKE HOUSEHOLD AIR POLLUTION:

- Keeping your windows and doors open.
- Avoid burning unnecessary items.
- Mix the smoke with different materials.
- Use smoke-absorbing materials.

INTRODUCTION

An estimated 3.4 billion people (about half the world’s population) have household fuel wood, charcoal, and animal dung as their primary energy source. This exposes large populations, especially women and children, to high levels of indoor air pollution. Because wood and charcoal are major contributors to indoor air pollution, the health impacts of the debris and ash generated during cooking and heating activities are of concern. The main benefits of reducing household air pollution include improved health outcomes, increased crop yields, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions.

WHAT IS BIOMASS SMOKE?

Biomass smoke is a mixture of gases and particles released when solid biomass (wood, charcoal, dung) is burned. It is produced when wood, charcoal, and other organic materials are heated in a confined space without sufficient oxygen.

WHAT ARE THE SOURCES OF BIOMASS SMOKE?

Common sources of biomass smoke include:

- Traditional stoves and fireplaces
- Open fires
- Charcoal grills
- Wood stoves
- Animal dung

OTHER SOURCES OF HOUSEHOLD AIR POLLUTION

Apart from the mentioned sources of biomass smoke pollution, there are other sources of air pollution in households, such as:

- Human activities
- Animal husbandry
- Agricultural activities
- Transportation

HOW IS SMOKE HARMFUL?

Biomass smoke can cause a range of health problems, including:

- Respiratory problems (coughing, wheezing, shortness of breath)
- Cardiovascular disease
- Eye irritation
- Skin irritation
- Cancer

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF BIOMASS SMOKE ON HEALTH?

Biomass smoke has significant health implications, especially in children and women. It can lead to:

- Increased respiratory infections
- Increased risk of asthma and bronchitis
- Increased risk of lung cancer
- Increased risk of heart disease
- Reduced lung function

HOW CAN WE REDUCE BIOMASS SMOKE?

To reduce biomass smoke, consider:

- Using improved cookstoves
- Switching to cleaner fuels (gas, electricity)
- Implementing smokeless cooking technologies
- Promoting clean fuel use

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON REDUCING THE IMPACT OF BIOMASS SMOKE, PLEASE VISIT:

- Local health centers
- Government health websites
- Non-governmental organizations

WHAT ARE THE SYMPTOMS OF BIOMASS SMOKE?

Symptoms of biomass smoke exposure include:

- Coughing
- Wheezing
- Shortness of breath
- Eye irritation
- Skin irritation

WHAT SHOULD I DO IF I SUSPECT I AM EXPERIENCING BIOMASS SMOKE?

If you suspect biomass smoke exposure, seek medical attention immediately. Follow these steps:

- Move to a well-ventilated area
- Avoid physical activity
- Call emergency services
- Allow fresh air to enter the room

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON REDUCING BIOMASS SMOKE, PLEASE CONTACT:

- Local health authorities
- Governmental health departments
- Non-governmental organizations

RESOURCES FOR MORE INFORMATION:

- World Health Organization: http://www.who.int

FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH ON BIOMASS SMOKE AND HEALTH:


FOR ACTIVITIES AND PROJECTS TO REDUCE BIOMASS SMOKE:

- Local community groups
- Non-governmental organizations
- Local governments

FOR FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES TO TAKE ACTION:

- Promote clean cooking technologies
- Implement smokeless cooking practices
- Increase awareness of the health impacts of biomass smoke

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON REDUCING BIOMASS SMOKE, PLEASE VISIT:

- Local health centers
- Government health websites
- Non-governmental organizations

FOR ADDITIONAL RESOURCES ON REDUCING BIOMASS SMOKE:

- World Health Organization: http://www.who.int
**Appendix B. Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Title and abstract</td>
<td>Concise description of the nature and topic of the study, identifying the study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results, and conclusions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Introduction**

| 53 | Problem formulation | Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement. |
| 54 | Purpose or research question | Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions. |

**Methods**

| 55 | Qualitative approach and research paradigm | Qualitative approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g., postpositivist, constructivist/interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale. |
| 56 | Researcher characteristics and reflexivity | Researchers’ characteristics that may influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications, expertise, relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or actual interaction between researchers’ characteristics and the research questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability. |
| 57 | Context | Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale. |
| 58 | Sampling strategy | How and why research participants, documents, or events were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g., sampling saturation); rationale. |
| 59 | Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects | Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues. |
| 60 | Data collection methods | Types of data collected; details of data collection procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale. |
| 61 | Data collection instruments and technologies | Description of instruments (e.g., interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study. |
| 62 | Units of study | Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents, or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results). |
| 63 | Data processing | Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/identification of excerpts. |
| 64 | Data analysis | Procedures by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis, usually references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale. |
| 65 | Techniques to enhance trustworthiness | Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation); rationale. |

**Results/findings**

| 66 | Synthesis and interpretation | Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with prior research or theory. |
| 67 | Links to empirical data | Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts, photographs) to substantiate analytic findings. |

**Discussion**

| 68 | Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and contribution(s) to the field | Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings and conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclusions of earlier scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generализability; identification of unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field. |
| 69 | Limitations | Trustworthiness and limitations of findings. |

**Other**

| 70 | Conflicts of interest | Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed. |
| 71 | Funding | Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection, interpretation, and reporting. |

---

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.*

*The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available; the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices; and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.*
Appendix C. Topic guides

TOPIC GUIDE FOR MOTHERS

1. What made you decide to attend the education session on biomass smoke?

2. What did you learn from the education sessions that you didn’t know before?

3. What changes did you make based on what you learned?

4. What helped you to maintain these changes?

5. Were there any changes that you wanted to make that you were not able to?
   What were they?
   Why?

6. Did you make any changes initially that were not maintained?
   What were they?
   Why?

7. What health improvements do you hope to achieve, or have already achieved?

8. Do you have any future plans for reducing exposure to biomass smoke?
   What are they?
9. Were you able to share what you learned with other people?
   How did they react to what you told them?
   OR
   Why not?

10. Is there anything else that we haven’t covered, about your experience of the education session and what you’ve done since, that you’d like to share with me?

TOPIC GUIDE FOR MIDWIVES

1. What made you decide to take part in delivering the education sessions on biomass smoke?

2. How have you incorporated the education sessions into your usual, regular midwifery practice?

3. What has helped or hindered you to continue delivering sessions?

4. What positive feedback have you received from mothers or other community members about the sessions?
5. What negative feedback have you received from mothers or other community members about the sessions?

6. Have you noticed any health improvements in women and/or community members? If so, what have they been? Have there been any unexpected benefits?

7. What changes would you say that women are able to implement based on the education you deliver?

8. To what extent are you delivering the sessions in the original format? What adaptations have you made? Why?

9. What are your future plans for educating people in this subject?

10. Is there anything else that we haven’t covered about the sessions that you’d like to share with me?

TOPIC GUIDE FOR VHTs

1. What made you decide to take part in providing education on biomass smoke to the community?
2. How have you incorporated the education into your usual practice as a VHT?

3. What has helped or hindered you to continue delivering education?

4. What positive feedback have you received from mothers or other community members about the education?

5. What negative feedback have you received from mothers or other community members about the education?

6. Have you noticed any health improvements in women and/or community members? If so, what have they been? Have there been any unexpected benefits?

7. What changes would you say that women are able to implement based on the education you deliver?

8. To what extent are you delivering the education as you were in the beginning? What adaptations have you made? Why?

9. What are your future plans for educating people in this subject?

10. Is there anything else that we haven’t covered about education on biomass smoke that you’d like to share with me?