Global Journals IATEX JournalKaleidoscopeTM Artificial Intelligence formulated this projection for compatibility purposes from the original article published at Global Journals. However, this technology is currently in beta. *Therefore, kindly ignore odd layouts, missed formulae, text, tables, or figures.*

1	Comparison of Binary Models for the Associated Factors
2	Affecting Recovery Status of Vesicovaginal Obstetrics Fistula
3	Patients: A Case of Mettu Hamlin Fistula Center, South West
4	Ethiopian
5	Aboma Temesgen ¹
5	
6	¹ Haramaya University
7	Received: 6 December 2015 Accepted: 4 January 2016 Published: 15 January 2016

9 Abstract

Back ground: Obstetric fistula or vaginal fistula is a medical condition in which a fistula (hole) 10 develops between either the rectum and vagina or between the bladder and vagina after severe 11 or failed childbirth, when adequate medical care is not available. It is the most tragic of 12 preventable childbirth complications in the developing world, as affected women are often 13 abandoned by their husbands and family, and forced to live in shame. Objective: The main 14 objective the study was to determine an appropriate binary model for the recovery status of 15 the vesicovaginal patients. Further more, the study explores factors affecting the recovery 16 status of the patients during the time period of the study. Methods: The study consists of 206 17 vesicovaginal fistula patients having all required information who were taking treatment at 18 Metu Hamlin Fistula center from November 2010 to June 2014. The chi-square test of 19 association were employed to explore the association between the recovery status and 20 categorical independent variables. Objective: The main objective the study was to determine 21 an appropriate binary model for the recovery status of the vesicovaginal patients. Further 22 more, the study explores factors affecting the recovery status of the patients during the time 23 period of the study. Methods: The study consists of 206 vesicovaginal fistula patients having 24 all required information who were taking treatment at Metu Hamlin Fistula center from 25 November 2010 to June 2014. The chi-square test of association were employed to explore the 26 association between the recovery status and categorical independent variables. 27

28

29 Index terms— binary data modeling, akaki information criteria, link function, vesicovaginal fistula.

30 1 I. Introduction

bstetric fistula or vaginal fistula is a medical condition in which a fistula (hole) develops between either the rectum and vagina or between the bladder and vagina after severe or failed childbirth, when adequate medical care is not available. It is considered a disease of poverty because of its tendency to occur in women in poor countries who do not have health resources comparable to developed nations [1].

It is classically regarded as an accident of childbirth in which prolonged obstructed labor leads to destruction of the vesicovaginal/rectovaginal septum with consequent loss of urinary and/or fecal control. Obstetric fistula is highly stigmatizing and afflicted women often become social outcasts. Although obstetric fistula has been eliminated from advanced industrialized nations, it remains a major public health problem in the worlds poorest countries. Several million cases of obstetric fistula are currently thought to exist in sub-Saharan Africa and south

40 Asia [2].

4 . VARIABLES OF THE STUDY

Immediate causes for vesicovaginal fistula may be obstructed labor, pelvic surgery, and sexual abuse before reaching physical maturity, malignancy, radiotherapy or a combination of these. In most third world countries over 90% of fistulas are of obstetric nature and usually caused by obstructed labor [3]. Whereas Primary risk factors include early or closely spaced pregnancies and lack of access to emergency obstetric care Women affected with Crohn's disease also have a higher risk of developing obstetric fistulas. It mainly occurring amongst the illiterate farmers after prolonged obstructed labor. Public enlightenment and appropriate ante-natal care and delivery would reduce the incidence [4].

Obstetric fistula is the most tragic of preventable childbirth complications in the developing world, as affected 48 women are often abandoned by their husbands and family, and forced to live in shame. They occur almost 49 entirely in the developing world and their incidence is poorly studied. As obstetric fistula is a serious preventable 50 public health issue in developing countries, national and international organizations should launch a campaign 51 to end fistula by increasing the resources and skilled staff available locally to treat obstetric fistula for improving 52 the lives of women currently living with this condition. Moreover, effective preventive strategies for obstetric 53 fistula such as better education to women and provision of improved obstetric care and searching for the best 54 approaches to both prevention and treatment should be the priority [5]. 55

Besides physical treatment, mental health services are also needed to rehabilitate fistula patients, who 56 57 experience a great deal of psychological trauma from being ostracized by her community and from fear of 58 developing fistula again. A study on the first formal counseling program for fistula survivors in Eritrea shows 59 positive results, whereby counseling significantly improved the women's self-esteem, knowledge about fistula and fistula prevention, and behavioral intentions for health maintenance and social reintegration following surgery 60 [6]. Cross-sectional study in Ethiopia also showed fistula prevalence of the disease among 19,153 households with 61 97,765 inhabitants surveyed fifty-five women with fistula were identified, of which 39 untreated. The overall 62 estimated prevalence of fistula was 2.2 per 1000 women [7]. 63

⁶⁴ 2 a) Binary data modeling

The binary model is among generalized linear models in which the outcome variables are measured on a binary scale that is the responses may be form of recovered or not recovered, alive or dead and present or absent. This binary data modeling is widely used in medical literature especially for correlating the dichotomous outcomes with the predictor variables that include different physiological data. In case of binary logistic regression, the predicted odd ratio of positive outcome is expressed as a sum of product. Product is formed by multiplying the values of independent variable and its coefficients. The probability of positive outcome is obtained from the odd ratio through a simple transformation [8,9].

A logistic regression model is the result of nonlinear transformation of the linear regression model. The difference between logistic regression and linear regression is that the outcome variable in logistic regression is dichotomous [10]. Many medical research problems call for the analysis and prediction of a dichotomous outcome: whether smokers will have a chance of developing lung cancer, hyperuricemia patients have the risk of getting cardio vascular disease. Traditionally, these research questions were addressed by either ordinary least squares (OLS) regression or linear discriminant function analysis [11].

The recovery status of the patient from the vesicovaginal obstetrics fistula was also one of the binary outcome variables that is the patients recovered or not recovered from the disease after getting treatment during the study period. How ever, the previous studies conducted on vesicovaginal fistula was on the measures of prevalence the diseases in Ethiopian context rather than modeling to determine factors related to the prevalence of fistula. Therefore, the main aim of this study was to investigated an appropriate binary model for the recovery status of the vesicovaginal patients in the study area. Further-more, the study also explores factors that determine the recovery status of the patients.

⁸⁵ 3 II. Methodology a) Data sources

Data for this study was obtained from the retrospective institutional based study conducted on mothers came for fistula repair at Mettu Hamlin fistula center from November 2010 to June 2014 G.C. The study considered all women who visited at the center having vesicovaginal fistula case only during the time period as study population. Among the total of 585 women patients visited from the year November 2010 to June 2014 G.C 206 having complete information were considered in the study.

91

i

⁹² 4 . Variables of the study

93 The outcome variable of the study was the recover status from vesicovaginal fistula patients which indicates 94 wether the patient was recovered from the vesicovaginal fistula or not recovered during the time period. A 95 patient is said to be recovered if she physically cured from her sickness and no requirement for intervention of 96 health care professionals otherwise we call it the patient is not recovered during the study period.

The study also considered 19 independent variables to know their significant effects on the recover status of the patients. The list of this independent variables with respective of their categories was given on the table one below. It is common to have binary outcome variables in many medical cases that is a patient get cured or not, recovered or not and died or not from their disease after getting certain treatments. This study also deals with recovery status of the vesicovaginal patient after getting treatment to know whether the patient is recovered or not during the study period. That is the outcome variable considered for the study was binary in nature as stated under the variables of the study section of the methodology part. Therefore, the outcome variable takes the value of 1 if the patients recovered from vesicovaginal fistula after getting treatment during the time period and 0 if the patient is note recovered from the vesicovaginal fistula obstetrics after having treatments during specified time period.

¹⁰⁷ 5 Volume XVI Issue III Version I

As the principal objective of this study was to investigate an appropriate binary model data in order to determine the relationship between the outcome variable with different predictor variables. This help us to know the effect of this predictor on probability of recovering from vesicovaginal fistula. That is the out come variable have binomial distribution with recovery from fistula obstetrics as success and not recovering from specified disease as failure event which can be expresses as follows:

Where; Yi is the treatment outcome for the patient i. Chi-square test of association Before proceeding to the binary data modeling the study explored the association between the outcome variable and different categorical covariates using chisquare test of association. This test statistic was considered for the study to verify whether the categorical covariates and the outcome variable are independent or not.

Hypothesis to be tested for the study was expressed as: Null hypothesis which states as the recovery status of 117 the patients and the independent categorical variables are independent versus the alternative hypothesis which 118 states the recovery status and categorical independent variables are dependent (not the null hypothesis) where 119 the test statistics to test the hypothesis was expresses as: (1) Where; Oij is observed value in jthrow and 120 ithcolumn where as which have chi-square distribution. Moreover, it can be verified as there is an association 121 if the computed chisquare value is greater than the critical value of chisquare or if the computed probability of 122 123 observing greater computed chi-square value (p-value) is less than the level of significance (alpha value). Meaning 124 that the categorical outcome variable and the categorical independent variables were dependent.

ii. Modeling the recovering status from vesicovaginal fistula After identifying the associations between the predictors (independent variables) and the outcome variable using the chi-square test of independency the next step is to model the recovery status of the patients. This fitted model helps us to know the effects of the i th ? 2 = r j=1 c i=1 (0 ij ? E ij) 2 E ij ? ? (r?1)(c?1) (?) E ij = rowtotal * columntotal grandtotal

predictors which have an association on the probability(2)

Where; ? is the logit link functions that associate the outcome variables with predictor variables as linear relation, X is nxp matrices of predictors and ? is px1 vectors of coefficients for the predictor variables. Furthermore, there are also alternative way of modeling probability of recovering from the diseases in case of using probit and logit link functions where they can be expressed as: (3) Where; here ? is the probit link functions that associate the outcome variables with predictor variables as linear relation using the inverse of cumulative standardized normal distribution whereas the complementary log log link function is expressed as follows:

137 (4)

¹³⁸ 6 iii. Model estimation techniques

The outcome variable which represents the treatment outcome of the patients are assumed to be the observed 139 values of independent Bernoulli random variables such that has the binomial distribution since it is observed from 140 the Bernoulli process randomly. When these binary data are grouped by covariate class, the outcome variable 141 have the form, where, is the number of successes out of the m, subjects in the ith covariate class. The vector of 142 covariate class sizes m = is called the binomial index vector or binomial denominator vector. Therefore, indexed 143 by mi with parameter probability of recovering from VVF where its log likelihood functions is expressed as: (5) 144 Where the log likelihood function has the following forms: (6) The constant function of not involving, that is has 145 no role in the estimation of we remove from the log likelihood function is reduced to: (7) But here we consider 146 the three systematic parts (link function) of the model specifies the relation between the and the matrices nxp 147 of covariates X. consider the case of logil link function where; in which (8) which obtained by substituting the 148 value of probability of recovery from the logit link function where rx1 vectors of the coefficient for the covariates 149 which is obtained by maximizing the log likely hood function with respect to values. Similarly the loglikely 150 hood function for the probit and complement lo-log link function is obtained by substituting the value of the 151 probability of recovery from the given link function to estimate the parameters of the model. 152

¹⁵³ 7 iv. Model adequacy tests

To have appropriate predictors as well as appropriate link function for the recovery probability from Volume XVI Issue III Version I ? $i = \exp(X T ?) 1 + \exp(X T ?) ? = Log(?i 1 ? ? i) = X T ?$

of recovering from the diseases. Therefore, to have an appropriate model that represents recovery probability of the patients the study considered probit, complementary log-log and logistic regression models. Whereas the probability of recovering from the diseases was expressed as follows in case of logistic regression with probit link function:? $i = ? = X T ? ?? 1 ? 2? \exp(? 1 2 z 2) dz ? = ??1 (? i) = X T ? L(y i, ? i) = n$ i=1 P (y i) = n i=1 m i y i ? yi (1 ?? i) mi?yi = n i=1 m i i (? i 1 ?? i) yi (1 ?? i) mi l(y i, ? i) = ni=1 (m i y i + y i log(? i 1 ?? i) + m i log(1 ?? i)) yi ? i mi yi ? i l(y i, ? i) = n i=1 (y i log(? i 1 ?? i) + m i log(1 ?? i)) yi ? i mi yi ? i l(y i, ? i) = n i=1 (y i log(? i 1 ?? i) + m i log(1 ?? i)) l(?, y j) = n i=1 r j=1 y i X ij ? j? n i=1 m i (1 + exp(r j=1 X ij ? j)) ? i = exp(X T reference) Y = log(? i 1?? i) ? i ? j? j y 1, y 2, ..., y n y i yi mi, ..., yn mn 0 < yi < m i (mi, ..., m n) Y i ? i n th

Visco Vaginal fistula various model selection criteria was considered which was discussed here under the following The Wald test: TheWald test was considered to test the significance of individual parameter in the estimated (9) Alternatively, we can treat the square of this statistic as approximately a chi-squared with one degree of freedom which has the following form that is Depending on the wald test statistics if the covariates do not have significant on the recovery status of the patients that covariate was removed from the model depending on the values of computed Wald test statistics.

Deviance: deviance value is another selection criteria considered for the model selection where it values is based on log likelihood and the model with minimum values of deviance statistics was considered as an appropriate model. The deviance value is used to compare nested models where the deviance value of a model expressed as: (10) Where, represent the scale parameter the loglikelihood of the current fitted model and lfull is the loglikelihood of the saturated model.

¹⁷⁶ 8 The Akaike information criterion (AIC):

Akaike information is also another model selection criteria considered for the selection of appropriate model as 177 well as appropriate predictor covariates for probability of recover from VVF in the study area. Where the values 178 of AIC is expressed as: (11) Where, log(likelihood) is the log likelihood function which measures the goodness 179 of the fitted model where as p is the number of estimated parameter in the model which measures the how 180 complexity of fitted model. We model with minimum values of AIC was considered as an appropriate model. 181 model to identify whether the covariate have significant effect on the recovery visco vaginal fistula or not. The 182 fore the wald test statistics was expresses as: Similarly the place of delivery of patients shows for both recovered 183 and none recovered patients most 26(53.1%) of the none recovered patients and most 104(66.2%) among the 184 recovered patients give the delivery at their home which represents the larger proportion of the patients in both 185 cases in comparison with patient group who gave delivery at health institution. 186

187 9 III. Results

188 Z = ? j SE(? j) N (0, 1) Z 2 ? 2 1 D = 2?(l f ull ? l current) ? l current AIC = ?2log(likelyhood) + 2p(

It can be also observed from the table 2 that among none recovered patients most 32(65.3%) of and among the recovered patients 138(87.9%) of them have length of fistula less than or equal to two centimeter which is larger proportion in comparison with remaining fistula length patients groups. Similarly as observed from the urethra status of the patients more than half of the urethra of none recovered patients were partially damaged whereas larger 97(61.8%) proportion of recovered patients urethra was intact in comparison with the remaining status of urethra groups.

¹⁹⁵ 10 b) Exploring association between the recovery status and ¹⁹⁶ independent variables

Before proceeding to the binary modeling first of all chi-square test of association were employed to explore 197 whether the independent covariates have an association with treatment outcome or not. Therefore, the chi-198 square test result of table 3 showed that among all covariate considered in the study length of fistula, bladder 199 size and width fistula categories have significant association with the recovery status of the patients at 5% level 200 of significance since the probability of getting larger computed chi-square value for these covariates were smaller 201 than 5% level of significance. Similarly, weight categories and place of delivery were of significance since of the 202 probability of observing larger computed value of chi-square for these covariates were lesser than 10% level of 203 significance. After exploring the association between the recovery status and independent variables the three 204 commonly used link function were considered for the binomial distribution model. Therefore; all the three model 205 were fitted with length of fistula, bladder size, weight of the patients, place of delivery and width of fistula as 206 independent covariate since they have significant association with outcome variable the result of the model was 207 also follows. 208

²⁰⁹ 11 Volume XVI Issue III Version I

As it can be observed from the log likelihood function and AIC of the three fitted models there is no this much bigger model criteria difference between the three fitted model results. But when we compare them the model with logit link function have smaller negative values of log likelihood and AIC value than probit and complementary log-log link functions. Therefore, logit link function was considered as an appropriate link function to fit data in the study area than the probit and complementary log-log link functions.

Table 4 : Comparison of the models d) Factors affecting the recovery status of the patients

The logistic model was fitted with an appropriate covariates and weight of the patients were removed from the model because of it do not have significant effects on the model. This model was fitted with width of fistula, length of fistula, bladder size and place of delivery as independent covariates. Among all the covariate considered in the model only place of delivery categories do not have significant effects on the recovery status at 5% level of significance.

The estimated coefficient of logit model for the width of fistula category group three up to five centimeter -0.774 indicates that log of odd ratio of recovery was 0.774 lower in this category group in comparison with patient group with fistula width less than or equal to two centimeter. Similarly, the estimated logit coefficient of bladder size with small category group -0.245 shows the log f odd ratio of patient group with bladder size small was 0.245 lower where as estimated coefficient -1.622 for fair bladder size shows the log of odd ratio of patient group in this category group have 1.622 lower in comparison with none bladder size patient category.

The estimated odd ratio for three up to five width fistula 0.461 shows the odds recovery in this category group was 0.461 times less likely than the patient group with width of fistula less than or equal to two centimeter. Similarly, the estimated odd ratio for fair bladder size patients 0.197 also show that the odds of recovery in this category group group was 0.197 time that of none bladder size patient groups that is the fair bladder size patient groups are less likely to recover than none bladder size patient groups.

²³³ 13 IV. Conclusion

Among all patient considered in the study during the time period the prevalence of recovery from visco vaginal fistula was 76.21%. Whereas width of fistula, length of fistula and bladder size categories were significantly associated with recovery status of the patients where weight and place of delivery of the patients associated with recovery status at 10% level of significance.

The logistic binary model was an appropriate in fitting the recovery status of the patients in comparison binary model with probit and complementary lo-log link function. Furthermore, the fitted model showed that width and length of fistula category group between three up to five centimeter and bladder size fair category group have significant effect on the recovery status of the patients.

The study also revealed that vesicovaginal fistula patients with width and length category group between three up to five centimeter were less likely to be recovered in comparison with less than or equal to two centimeter width and length of fistula category group patients.



Figure 1: Table 1 :

Variable	Categories of variables with their codes
Age at first marriage	$0 = \geq 15, 1 = 16 - 19, 2 = \geq 20$ years
Age at occurrence of VVF	$0 = \le 20, 1 = 21 - 29, 2 = \ge 30$ years
Weight of patient at arrival in MHFC	$0 = < 50, 1 = \ge 50 \text{kg}$
Parity	0 =primipara,1 =multipara,2 =Grandmultipara,3 =Nuli para
Educational status	0 = illiterate, $1 =$ literate
Marital status	0 =single,1 =married,2 =divorced,3 =widowed, 4 =separated
Accompanying person	0 =self,1 =husband,2 =relatives,3 =husband and relatives, 4 =others
Antenatal care	0 =yes, 1 =no
Place of delivery	0 =home, 1 =health institution,2 =other
Mode of delivery	0=vaginal, 1=others
Duration of incontinence	$0 = \leq 3, 1 = 4-6, 2 = \geq 7$ month
Duration of labor	$0 = \le 2, 1 = 3, 2 = \ge 4 \text{ day}$
Fetal outcome	0 =still birth, 1 =alive,2 = early neonatal, 3 = dead
Width of fistula hole	$0 = \le 2, 1 = 3-5, 2 = 5$ cm
Length of fistula hole	$0 = \le 2, 1 = 3-5, 2 = >5$ cm
Status of urethra	0 =intact, 1 =partially damaged, 2 =complete destructed)
Bladder size	0 =none, 1 =small, 2 =fair, 3 =good, 4 =no information)

Figure 2: F



Figure 3: F

$$\pi_i = 1 - exp(-exp(\mathbf{X}^T \beta))$$
$$\eta = log(-log(1 - \pi_i)) = \mathbf{X}^T \beta$$

Figure 4: F

Link function	DF	Log likelihood function	AIC
Logit	6	-100.771	213.541
Probit	6	-101.029	214.058
Clog-log	6	-101.140	214.280

Figure 5: F

Logit estimates			Odds ratio estimates	
covaraites	Estimated coeff(SE)	95 % confidence	Exp(coeff)	95% confidence
Intercept	2.092(0.332)	[1.477,2.784]**	8.100	[4.379,16.187]**
Width of fistula				
<= 2centimeter				
3-5 centimeter	[-0.774(0.379)	[-1.517,-0.025]**	0.461	[0.219,0.975]**
Length of fistula				
<= 2centimeter				
3-5 centimeter	-1.060(0.424)	[-1.892,-0.223]**	0.346	[0.151,0.800]**
Bladder size				
None				
Small	-0.245(0.373)	[-0.974,0.497]	0.783	[0.378,1.644]
Fair	-1.622(0.718)	[-3.107,-0.223]**	0.197	[0.045,0.800]**
Place of delivery				
Health institution				
Home	-0.561(0.362)	[-1.274,0.152]	0.571	[0.280,1.164]
** Indicates significance at 5% level of significance				

Figure 6:

Among the total patients considered in the study 30(61.2%) among the none recovered patients and 93(59.2%) among the recovered patients gets antenatal care which represents larger proportion of the patients in both groups in comparison with patients who had no antenatal care. Duration of lasting inconsistence description also indicates 29(59.2%) among the none recovered patients and 88(56.1%) recovered patients lasted duration of inconsistency between four up to six months in comparison with remaining periods of inconsistency groups. Similarly, 30(61.2%) among the none recovered fistula patients and 8(51.6%) among the recovered patients lasted duration of labor up to greater than four days which represents larger proportion in comparison with other categories of duration of labor. 76.21%)) of the patients were recovered whereas only 49(23.79%) were not recovered during the follow up

[Note: period. The age at occurrence of fistula category with the recovery status of patients also shows most of (63(40.1%)) were the patients infected with the disease at an age of less than or equal to 15 years whereas most none recovered patients (21(42.9%)) also belongs to this age category group.]

Figure 7:

n	
4	

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Covariates	Categories	Recovery status Not recovered n(%)	Recovered n(%)	Total $n(\%)$
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Age at oc- currence of fistula	$\leq = 15$ years	21(42.9)	63(40.1)	84(40.78)
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		16-19 years	18(36.7)	56(35.7)	74(35.92)
Age at <= 15 years		≥ 20 years	10(20.4)	38(24.2)	48(23.30)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Age at	≤ 15 years	26(53.1)	72(45.9)	98(47.57)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	marriage		20(0011)	(10.0)	
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		16-19 years	12(24.5)	35(22.3)	47(22.82)
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		>= 20 years	11(22.4)	50(31.8)	61(29.61)
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Height	$\leq = 150$ Centimeter	44(89.8)	129(82.2)	173(83.98)
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$		> 150 Centimeter	5(10.2)	28(17.8)	32(15.53)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Weight	< 50 kilogram	43(87.8)	117(74.5)	160(77.67)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	1101010	>=50 kilogram	6(12.2)	40(25.5)	46(22.33)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	narity	Priminara	4(8.2)	21(13.4)	25(12.00)
$\begin{array}{c cccccc} & \operatorname{Hutpata} & 28(37.1) & 104(36.4) & 104(30.49) \\ & \operatorname{Grandmultipara} & 17(34.7) & 60(38.2) & 77(37.38) \\ & \operatorname{Educational} & \operatorname{Illiterate} & 10(20.4) & 50(31.8) & 60(29.13) \\ & \operatorname{status} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	parity	1 IIIIipara Multipara	4(0.2) 28(57.1)	21(13.4) 76(49.4)	20(12.14) 104(50.40)
Grandmultipara $17(34.7)$ $00(38.2)$ $77(37.38)$ EducationalIlliterate $10(20.4)$ $50(31.8)$ $60(29.13)$ statusLiterate $39(79.6)$ $107(68.2)$ $146(70.87)$ MaritalSingle $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ status $11(22.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $50(24.27)$ Separated $6(12.2)$ $8(5.1)$ $14(6.80)$ AccompanyingSelf $2(4.1)$ $6(3.8)$ $8(3.88)$ person $11(20.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $49(23.79)$ Husband $15(30.6)$ $47(29.9)$ $62(30.10)$ Relative $10(20.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $49(23.79)$ Husband and rela- $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ tives $10(20.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $49(23.79)$ Husband and rela- $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ tivesothers $18(36.7)$ $59(37.6)$ $77(37.38)$ AntenatalYes $30(61.2)$ $93(59.2)$ $123(59.71)$ care $29(59.2)$ $88(56.1)$ $117(56.80)$ $>= 7$ month $12(24.5)$ $45(28.7)$ $57(27.67)$ Duration<= 2 days		Munipara	20(07.1) 17(04.7)	(0(40.4))	104(30.49)
Educational Interate $10(20.4)$ $50(31.8)$ $60(29.13)$ status Literate $39(79.6)$ $107(68.2)$ $146(70.87)$ Marital Single $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ status Married $28(57.1)$ $104(66.2)$ $132(64.08)$ Divorced $11(22.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $50(24.27)$ Separated $6(12.2)$ $8(5.1)$ $14(6.80)$ Accompanyingle f $2(4.1)$ $6(3.8)$ $8(3.88)$ person Husband $15(30.6)$ $47(29.9)$ $62(30.10)$ Relative $10(20.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $49(23.79)$ Husband and rela- $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ tives Others $18(36.7)$ $59(37.6)$ $77(37.38)$ Antenatal Yes $30(61.2)$ $93(59.2)$ $123(59.71)$ care No $19(38.8)$ $64(40.8)$ $83(40.29)$ Duration $<=3month$ $8(16.3)$ $24(15.3)$ $32(15.53)$ of inconti- nence 4-6 month $29(59.2)$ $88(56.1)$ $117(56.80)>=7 month$ $12(24.5)$ $45(28.7)$ $57(27.67)Duration of <=2 days 14(28.6) 52(33.1) 66(32.04)labor3-4$ days $5(10.2)$ $24(15.3)$ $29(14.08)>= 4$ days $30(61.2)$ $8(51.6)$ $38(18.45)Place of de-Home 26(53.1) 104(66.2) 130(63.11)liveryHealth institu- 23(46.9) 53(33.8) 76(36.89)tions$		Grandmultipara	17(34.7)	60(38.2)	77(37.38)
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} \mbox{Literate} & 39(79.6) & 107(68.2) & 146(70.87) \\ \mbox{Marital} & Single & 4(8.2) & 6(3.8) & 10(4.85) \\ \mbox{status} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Educational status	Illiterate	10(20.4)	50(31.8)	60(29.13)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Literate	39(79.6)	107(68.2)	146(70.87)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Marital status	Single	4(8.2)	6(3.8)	10(4.85)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Married	28(57.1)	104(66.2)	132(64.08)
Shored Separated $11(2.4)$ $50(24.5)$ $50(24.5)$ Accompanyingself $2(4.1)$ $6(3.8)$ $8(3.8)$ personHusband $15(30.6)$ $47(29.9)$ $62(30.10)$ Relative $10(20.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $49(23.79)$ Husband and rela- $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ tives 0 0 $93(59.2)$ $123(59.71)$ careNo $19(38.8)$ $64(40.8)$ $83(40.29)$ Duration<= 3month		Divorced	11(22.4)	30(24.8)	50(24, 27)
AccompanyingSelf $0(12.2)$ $5(3.1)$ $14(0.30)$ AccompanyingSelf $2(4.1)$ $6(3.8)$ $8(3.88)$ personHusband $15(30.6)$ $47(29.9)$ $62(30.10)$ Relative $10(20.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $49(23.79)$ Husband and rela- $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ tives 0 $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ tives 0 $93(59.2)$ $123(59.71)$ careNo $19(38.8)$ $64(40.8)$ $83(40.29)$ Duration<= 3month		Separated	6(12.2)	8(5.1)	14(6.80)
Accompanyinger $2(4.1)$ $6(3.8)$ $8(3.88)$ personHusband $15(30.6)$ $47(29.9)$ $62(30.10)$ Relative $10(20.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $49(23.79)$ Husband and rela- $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ tives 0 $18(36.7)$ $59(37.6)$ $77(37.38)$ AntenatalYes $30(61.2)$ $93(59.2)$ $123(59.71)$ care No $19(38.8)$ $64(40.8)$ $83(40.29)$ Duration $<=$ 3month $8(16.3)$ $24(15.3)$ $32(15.53)$ ofincontinence $29(59.2)$ $88(56.1)$ $117(56.80)$ $>= 7$ month $12(24.5)$ $45(28.7)$ $57(27.67)$ Duration of $<= 2$ days $14(28.6)$ $52(33.1)$ $66(32.04)$ labor 34 days $5(10.2)$ $24(15.3)$ $29(14.08)$ $>= 4$ days $30(61.2)$ $8(51.6)$ $38(18.45)$ Place of de-Home $26(53.1)$ $104(66.2)$ $130(63.11)$ liveryHealthinstitu- $23(46.9)$ $53(33.8)$ $76(36.89)$ tions $Mode$ ofVarinal $16(32.7)$ $68(43.3)$ $84(40.78)$	۰	Separated	0(12.2)	O(0.1)	14(0.00)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Accompanyir	igen	2(4.1)	0(3.8)	8(3.88)
Husband $15(30.6)$ $47(29.9)$ $62(30.10)$ Relative $10(20.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $49(23.79)$ Husband and rela- $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ tives 0 thers $18(36.7)$ $59(37.6)$ $77(37.38)$ AntenatalYes $30(61.2)$ $93(59.2)$ $123(59.71)$ careNo $19(38.8)$ $64(40.8)$ $83(40.29)$ Duration $<= 3$ month $8(16.3)$ $24(15.3)$ $32(15.53)$ of incontinence $= 7$ month $12(24.5)$ $45(28.7)$ $57(27.67)$ Duration of $<= 2$ days $14(28.6)$ $52(33.1)$ $66(32.04)$ labor $= 4$ days $30(61.2)$ $8(51.6)$ $38(18.45)$ Place of de-Home $26(53.1)$ $104(66.2)$ $130(63.11)$ liveryHealthinstitu- $23(46.9)$ $53(33.8)$ $76(36.89)$ ModeofVarinal $16(32.7)$ $68(43.3)$ $84(40.78)$	person				(20,10)
Relative $10(20.4)$ $39(24.8)$ $49(23.79)$ Husband and rela- $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ tivesOthers $18(36.7)$ $59(37.6)$ $77(37.38)$ AntenatalYes $30(61.2)$ $93(59.2)$ $123(59.71)$ careNo $19(38.8)$ $64(40.8)$ $83(40.29)$ Duration $<=$ 3month $8(16.3)$ $24(15.3)$ $32(15.53)$ of incontinence $=$		Husband	15(30.6)	47(29.9)	62(30.10)
Husband and rela- tives $4(8.2)$ $6(3.8)$ $10(4.85)$ No $18(36.7)$ $59(37.6)$ $77(37.38)$ Antenatal careYes $30(61.2)$ $93(59.2)$ $123(59.71)$ careNo $19(38.8)$ $64(40.8)$ $83(40.29)$ Duration of inconti- nence $<=$ 3month $8(16.3)$ $24(15.3)$ $32(15.53)$ of inconti- nence $<=$ 4-6 month $>=$ 7 month $29(59.2)$ $88(56.1)$ $117(56.80)$ $>= 7 month$ $12(24.5)$ $45(28.7)$ $57(27.67)$ Duration of labor $<=$ 2 days $14(28.6)$ $52(33.1)$ $66(32.04)$ labor $=$ 4 days $30(61.2)$ $8(51.6)$ $38(18.45)$ Place of de- liveryHealth institu- $26(53.1)$ $104(66.2)$ $130(63.11)$ liveryHealth institu- tions $23(46.9)$ $53(33.8)$ $76(36.89)$		Relative	10(20.4)	39(24.8)	49(23.79)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		Husband and rela- tives	4(8.2)	6(3.8)	10(4.85)
Antenatal careYes $30(61.2)$ $93(59.2)$ $123(59.71)$ careNo $19(38.8)$ $64(40.8)$ $83(40.29)$ Duration of inconti- nence $\langle = 3 \mod h$ $8(16.3)$ $24(15.3)$ $32(15.53)$ of inconti- nence $4-6 \mod h$ $29(59.2)$ $88(56.1)$ $117(56.80)$ $\geq = 7 \mod h$ $12(24.5)$ $45(28.7)$ $57(27.67)$ Duration of labor $\langle = 2 \text{ days}$ $14(28.6)$ $52(33.1)$ $66(32.04)$ labor $3-4 \text{ days}$ $5(10.2)$ $24(15.3)$ $29(14.08)$ $\geq = 4 \text{ days}$ $30(61.2)$ $8(51.6)$ $38(18.45)$ Place of de- lowerHome $26(53.1)$ $104(66.2)$ $130(63.11)$ liveryHealth institu- $23(46.9)$ $53(33.8)$ $76(36.89)$ tions $4(40.78)$ $5(16.2)$ $53(33.3)$ $84(40.78)$		Others	18(36.7)	59(37.6)	77(37.38)
No $19(38.8)$ $64(40.8)$ $83(40.29)$ Duration $<= 3 \text{month}$ $8(16.3)$ $24(15.3)$ $32(15.53)$ of inconti- nence $4-6 \text{ month}$ $29(59.2)$ $88(56.1)$ $117(56.80)$ $>= 7 \text{ month}$ $12(24.5)$ $45(28.7)$ $57(27.67)$ Duration of labor $<= 2 \text{ days}$ $14(28.6)$ $52(33.1)$ $66(32.04)$ $8bor$ $= 4 \text{ days}$ $30(61.2)$ $8(51.6)$ $38(18.45)$ Place of de- liveryHome $26(53.1)$ $104(66.2)$ $130(63.11)$ livery $= 4 \text{ lath}$ $15(32.7)$ $68(43.3)$ $84(40.78)$	Antenatal care	Yes	30(61.2)	93(59.2)	123(59.71)
Duration<= 3month $8(16.3)$ $24(15.3)$ $32(15.20)$ of incontinence4-6 month $29(59.2)$ $88(56.1)$ $117(56.80)$ >= 7 month $12(24.5)$ $45(28.7)$ $57(27.67)$ Duration of<= 2 days		No	19(38 8)	64(40.8)	83(40.29)
$\begin{array}{c} \text{of incontin} & (= \text{offortin} & 0(10.6)) & 24(10.6)) & 02(10.60) \\ \text{of incontinence} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Duration	$\leq = 3$ month	8(16.3)	24(15.3)	32(15,53)
hence4-6 month $29(59.2)$ $88(56.1)$ $117(56.80)$ >= 7 month $12(24.5)$ $45(28.7)$ $57(27.67)$ Duration of<= 2 days	of inconti-		0(10.0)	21(10.0)	02(10.00)
4-6 month $25(35.2)$ $36(30.1)$ $117(30.80)$ >= 7 month $12(24.5)$ $45(28.7)$ $57(27.67)$ Duration of<= 2 days		1-6 month	20(50.2)	88(56.1)	117(56 20)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			29(39.2) 19(34.5)	00(00.1)	117(50.60)
Duration of labor $\langle = 2 \text{ days}$ $14(28.6)$ $52(33.1)$ $66(32.04)$ labor3-4 days $5(10.2)$ $24(15.3)$ $29(14.08)$ $\geq = 4 \text{ days}$ $30(61.2)$ $8(51.6)$ $38(18.45)$ Place of de-Home $26(53.1)$ $104(66.2)$ $130(63.11)$ liveryHealth institu- $23(46.9)$ $53(33.8)$ $76(36.89)$ ModeofVaginal $16(32.7)$ $68(43.3)$ $84(40.78)$		>= 7 month	12(24.5)	45(28.7)	57(27.67)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Duration of labor	$\leq = 2$ days	14(28.6)	52(33.1)	66(32.04)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		3-4 days	5(10.2)	24(15.3)	29(14.08)
Place of de- livery Home $26(53.1)$ $104(66.2)$ $130(63.11)$ livery Health institu- $23(46.9)$ $53(33.8)$ $76(36.89)$ tions 16(32.7) $68(43.3)$ $84(40.78)$		>= 4 days	30(61.2)	8(51.6)	38(18.45)
Healthinstitu- $23(46.9)$ $53(33.8)$ $76(36.89)$ tions16(32.7)68(43.3) $84(40.78)$	Place of de- livery	Home	26(53.1)	104(66.2)	130(63.11)
Mode of Vaginal $16(32.7)$ $68(43.3)$ $84(40.78)$	J	Health institu-	23(46.9)	53(33.8)	76(36.89)
delivery	Mode of delivery	Vaginal	16(32.7)	68(43.3)	84(40.78)
Others $33(67.3)$ 8 $80(56.7)$ $122(50.22)$	aonitory	Others	33(67.3) 8	89(56.7)	122(59.22)
Fetal out Still birth $43(87.8)$ $139(88.5)$ $182(88.35)$ come	Fetal out	Still birth	43(87.8)	139(88.5)	122(05.22) 182(88.35)

Figure 9: Table 3 :

 $\mathbf{5}$

3

Medical Research Global Journal of

[Note: 43 Volume XVI Issue III Version I © 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US)]

Figure 10: Table 5 :

 $^{^{1}}$ © 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US)

²Comparison of Binary Models for the Associated Factors Affecting Recovery Status of Vesicovaginal Obstetrics Fistula Patients: A Case of Mettu Hamlin Fistula Center, South West Ethiopian

13 IV. CONCLUSION

- [Dobson ()] 'An introduction to generalized linear models Second edition'. J Dobson . Texts in Statistical Science
 Series 2002.
- [Hosmer and Lemeshow ()] Applied Logistic Regression, D Hosmer , S Lemeshow . 2000. New York: Wiley Interscience Publication.
- 248 [Browning ()] 'Obstetric fistula in Ilorin'. A Browning . PLoS Med 2004. 8 p. .
- [Muleta et al. ()] 'Obstetric fistula in rural Ethiopia'. M Muleta , M Fantahun , B Tafesse , E Hamlin , R Kennedy
 East Afr Med J 2007. 84 p. 52533.
- [Dangal et al. ()] 'Obstetric fistula in the developing World: An Agonising Tragedy'. G Dangal , K Thapa , K
 Yangzom , Karki . NJOG 2013. 8 p. .
- 253 [Samanta et al. ()] 'Prediction of proventricular leukoplakia: Selection of hemodynamic features using logistic
- regression and decision tree algorithms'. B Samanta , L Bird , M Kuijpers , A Zimmerman , G Jarvik . Journal
 of Artificial Intelligence in Medicine 2009. 46 p. .
- 256 [Lippincott and Wilkins ()] 'Preventing obstetric fistulas in low-resource countries'. W Lippincott , Wilkins . 257 http://women:webmd:com/tc/vaginal-fistula-topic-overview> women health 2012. 67 (2) .
- [Brijesh ()] 'Reporting dichotomous data using logistic regression in medical research'. S Brijesh . Journal of
 Epidemiology 2011. 1 p. .
- [Mikah et al. ()] 'The burden of vesicovaginal fistula in north central Nigeria'. S Mikah , H Daru , A Karshima
 , NyangoD . J West Afr Coll Surg 2011. 1 p. 5062.
- [Khaliah et al. ()] 'The role of counseling for obstetric fistula patients. Lessons learned from Eritrea'. A Khaliah
 M Janet , H Letu , M Elsa , Dirk Jena . Patient Education and Counseling 2010. 80 p. .
- [Hilton ()] 'Vesicovaginal fistula new perspectives'. P Hilton . International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics
 2001. 82 p. .