TABLE 1. Selected background characteristics of women with a child younger than 24 months, by region, survey time and study group, Upper and Lower Egypt, 2012-2014

Lower Egypt

Characteristic

Upper Egypt

									
	Baseline		Endline		Baseline		Endline		
	Intervention	Comparison	Intervention	Comparison	Intervention	Comparison	Intervention	Comparison	
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBU	JTIONS								
Age	(N=1,458)	(N=1,453)	(N=1,601)	(N=1,611)	(N=1,462)	(N=1,471)	(N=1,477)	(N=1,582)	
<20	6.1	6.5	4.1	3.5	5.1	7.1	6.0	7.3	
20-29	65.2	62.8	62.6	62.7	71.3	68.0	70.1	66.4	
30-39	27.0	27.0	30.0	30.0	22.7	22.6	22.6	24.1	
40–49	1.8	3.7	3.3	3.7	1.0	2.4	1.2	2.2	
Years of schooling	(N=1,456)	(N=1,493)	(N=1,641)	(N=1,574)	(N=1,347)	(N=1,492)	(N=1,484)	(N=1,580)	
0	15.8	18.4	26.4	34.9	10.8	17.0	9.8	14.4	
1–5	6.9	4.4	5.1	3.0	4.0	5.1	5.2	4.2	
6–10	18.5	15.1	15.7	13.1	10.8	8.6	14.4	8.9	
≥11	58.8	62.2	52.8	49.0	74.4	69.3	70.6	72.5	
No. of living children	na	na	(N=1,641)	(N=1,640)	na	na	(N=1,484)	(N=1,582)	
1–2	na	na	53.3	52.4	na	na	63.5	61.1	
3-4	na	na	34.1	32.7	na	na	33.2	33.9	
5–13	na	na	12.7	14.9	na	na	3.4	5.0	
Age of youngest child	I								
(in mos.)	(N=1,526)	(N=1,529)	(N=1,639)	(N=1,624)	(N=1,499)	(N=1,525)	(N=1,481)	(N=1,518)	
<5	23.0	23.2	26.4	27.9	24.5	21.0	28.5	28.7	
6–11	29.0	31.7	27.0	25.4	29.4	29.3	25.5	25.4	
12-17	22.4	22.6	25.2	24.9	23.5	23.7	25.7	25.5	
18-24	25.6	22.5	21.4	21.8	22.6	26.0	20.4	20.4	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
MEANS									
Age	26.9	26.7	27.6	27.5	26.1	26.3	26.1	26.4	
Years of schooling	8.9	8.9	7.9	7.1**	10.1	9.3**	9.9	9.7	
No. of living children Age of youngest child	na I	na	2.7	2.8	na	na	2.2	2.3*	
(in mos.)	11.6	11.3	10.9	11.0	11.2	12.0**	10.8	10.8	

^{10.9} 11.0 11.2 12.0** 10.8 10.8 (in mos.) 11.6 11.3 *Significantly different from intervention group at p<.05. **Significantly different from intervention group at p<.01. Notes: In this and subsequent tables, for Upper Egypt, total intervention and comparison group sample sizes at baseline were 1,530 and 1,529, respectively, and at endline were 1,641 and 1,640, respectively; for Lower Egypt, total intervention and comparison group sample sizes at baseline were 1,519 and 1,529, respectively, and at endline

were 1,484 and 1,582, respectively. Cell sample size varies because of missing data ("don't know" or did not respond). na=not applicable.

to the endline survey, by participation in SMART project activities, according to region Activity Upper Egypt Lower Egypt Received advice on child spacing (N=1.627)(N=1.477)

11.3

28.6

TABLE 2. Percentage distribution of women in intervention group who responded

Yes	88.7	71.4
Source of child spacing advice† SMART CHW only SMART CHW and other source Other source only	(N=1,439) 62.1 29.3 8.6	(N=1,054) 16.7 35.3 48.0
Received a CHW visit in last six months‡ No Yes	(N=1,562) 3.5 96.5	(N=1,088) 24.7 75.3
No. of CHW visits per month in last six months <1 1 >1	(N=1,507) 18.2 33.8 48.0	(N=819) 19.8 57.6 22.6
Participated in a seminar/group meeting No Yes	(N=1,576) 14.0 86.0	(N=1,103) 37.7 62.3
Level of seminar/group meeting participation§ Once per week Once per month Once every few months ≤once per year Unspecified	(N=1,355) 52.1 35.8 8.9 0.1 3.2	(N=687) 33.5 51.2 11.6 1.5 2.2
Husband participated in a seminar/group meeting No Yes	(N=1,570) 84.2 15.8	(N=1,101) 95.4 4.6
Husband's level of seminar/group meeting participation§ Once per week Once per month	(N=248) 15.7 46.8	(N=51) 9.8 49.0

33.1 21.6 0.4 7.8

Once every few months ≤once per year Unspecified 4.0 11.8

Received services from mobile clinic (N=1,572)(N=1,107)

Nο 20.8

42.7 79.2 57.3

Yes

Total 100.0 100.0

†Among those who reported receiving advice. ‡Among those who reported receiving ≥1 SMART community health worker visit. §Among those who reported that they (or their husband) participated in ≥1 seminar/group meeting. Notes: Sample size varies because of missing data ("don't know" or did

not respond). CHW=community health worker.

TABLE 3. Percentage of women at baseline and endline surveys, and percentage-point change between surveys, by knowledge or behavior indicator and study group; and odds ratios from difference-in-differences logistic regression comparing the odds of change across groups—all according to region

Indicator

Upper Egypt

Lower Egypt

indicator	оррег Едург				Lower Lgypt			
	Baseline	Endline	%-point change	Odds ratio†	Baseline	Endline	%-point change	Odds ratio†
Knowledge of	optimal birthsp	pacing						
Intervention	(N=1,521) 65.7	(N=1,638) 79.7	14.0***	1.68***	(N=1,485) 62.8	(N=1,484) 89.0	26.2***	0.55***
Comparison	(N=1,521) 71.2	(N=1,638) 75.0	3.8*		(N=1,520) 67.4	(N=1,581) 94.5	27.1***	0.55^^^
Does not wan	t another pregn	ancy in next two	years					
Intervention	(N=1,383) 81.7	(N=1,479) 80.5	-1.2	1.12	(N=1,368) 80.8	(N=1,261) 91.4	10.6***	1.70**
Comparison	(N=1,420) 85.1	(N=1,546) 81.8	-3.3*	1.12	(N=1,404) 84.5	(N=1,434) 88.8	4.3**	1.70
Joint contrace	ptive decision n	naking‡						
Intervention	(N=953) 73.6	(N=1,093) 89.9	16.3***	2.19***	(N=1,114) 72.9	(N=1,169) 87.9	15.0***	2.57***
Comparison	(N=995) 78.9	(N=988) 84.4	5.5***		(N=1,079) 83.4	(N=1,165) 83.9	0.5	2.57***
At risk of pre g	ınancy							
Intervention	(N=1,524) 30.1	(N=1,631) 30.2	0.1	0.43777	(N=1,496) 22.3	(N=1,484) 13.4	-8.9***	0.40***
Comparison	(N=1,522) 26.9	(N=1,640) 35.6	8.7***	0.67***	(N=1,517) 23.7	(N=1,582) 28.8	5.1**	0.40***

^{*}p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001. †Difference-in-difference logistic regression adjusted for current age and level of education; the comparison group is the reference group. ‡Among women who reported currently using a contraceptive method. *Note*: Sample size varies because of missing data ("don't know" or did not respond).

TABLE 4. Percentage of women at baseline and endline surveys, and percentage-point change between surveys, by contracentive method use and study aroun; and odds ratios from difference in difference logistic re

Indicator	Upper Egypt		Lower Egypt					
	Baseline	Endline	%-point change	Odds ratio†	Baseline	Endline	%-point change	Odds ratio†
Use of modern	method							
Intervention	(N=1,508) 63.8	(N=1,470) 58.2	-5.6**	1 45***	(N=1,474) 76.1	(N=1,474) 77.5	1.4	1 20*
Comparison	(N=1,519) 65.8	(N=1,480) 51.0	-14.8***	1.45***	(N=1,514) 71.7	(N=1,371) 68.3	-3.3*	1.29*
Use of modern	method by won	nen with childre	en ≤11 months	;				
Intervention	(N=787) 61.6	(N=787) 53.9	-7.7**	1.13	(N=782) 76.5	(N=795) 76.6	0.1	1.20
Comparison	(N=835) 62.9	(N=784) 51.5	-11.4***	1.15	(N=762) 71.3	(N=711) 66.7	-4.6	1.20

66.1

69.3

(N=684)

Comparison

63.1

(N=681)

reference group. Note: Sample size varies because of missing data ("don't know" or did not respond).

50.8

1.94***

*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001. †Difference-in-difference logistic regression adjusted for current age and level of education; the comparison group is the

-18.5***

75.3

72.1

(N=749)

78.6

69.0

(N=599)

-3.1

1.48*

Intervention (N=717)(N=681)-3.0(N=672)(N=676)3.3

time Lower Eavpt Method Upper Egypt

Comparison

Baseline

Endline

limiting the ability to interpret this indicator. Note: LAM=lactational amenorrhea method.

Intervention

Baseline

TABLE 5. Percentage distribution of women, by current contraceptive method, according to region, study group and survey

Sterilization	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
IUD	27.7	15.9	25.4	15.7	39.9	41.8	33.8	18.4
Implant	1.1	0.4	1.3	0.3	2.1	0.5	1.3	1.2
Injectable	10.5	12.6	9.7	11.3	10.5	6.8	11.8	11.2
Pill	24.3	28.6	29.4	23.5	23.3	28.0	24.8	37.2
Foam/jelly	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0

Endline

Intervention

Endline

Baseline

Comparison

Endline

Baseline

Condom 0.1 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.0 0.3 0.0 LAM† 0.6 4.6 0.9 5.5 0.2 1.2 0.7 3.4 Traditional 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.2 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.2

35.6 37.1 23.7 21.0 27.7 28.2 33.4 43.4

Not currently using

Total 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0 100.0

†The study had intended to track LAM use; however the term "LAM" was incorrectly translated in the data collection tools as "breast-feeding method,"