

Travel time to health facilities as a marker of geographical accessibility across heterogeneous land coverage in Peru

1 **Gabriel Carrasco-Escobar^{1,2,*}, Edgar Manrique¹, Kelly Tello-Lizarraga³, J. Jaime**

2 **Miranda^{4,5}**

3 *** Corresponding Author:** Gabriel Carrasco Escobar, MSc, PhD(c): gabriel.carrasco@upch.pe

4

5 ¹ Health Innovation Lab, Institute of Tropical Medicine “Alexander von Humboldt”, Universidad
6 Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Peru

7 ² Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of California San Diego,
8 La Jolla, CA, USA

9 ³ Facultad de Salud Publica y Administración, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima,
10 Peru

11 ⁴ CRONICAS Centre of Excellence in Chronic Diseases, Universidad Peruana Cayetano
12 Heredia, Lima, Peru.

13 ⁵ School of Medicine, Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia, Lima, Peru

14

15 **Keywords:** Travel time, geographic accessibility, health care accesibility

16

17 **ABSTRACT**

18 The geographical accessibility to health facilities is conditioned by the topography and
19 environmental conditions overlapped with different transport facilities between rural and urban
20 areas. To better estimate the travel time to the most proximate health facility infrastructure and
21 determine the differences across heterogeneous land coverage types, this study explored the use
22 of a novel cloud-based geospatial modeling approach and use as a case study the unique
23 geographical and ecological diversity in the Peruvian territory. Geospatial data of 145,134 cities
24 and villages and 8,067 health facilities in Peru were gathered with land coverage types, roads
25 infrastructure, navigable river networks, and digital elevation data to produce high-resolution (30
26 m) estimates of travel time to the most proximate health facility across the country. This study
27 estimated important variations in travel time between urban and rural settings across the 16
28 major land coverage types in Peru, that in turn, overlaps with socio-economic profiles of the
29 villages. The median travel time to primary, secondary, and tertiary healthcare facilities was 1.9,
30 2.3, and 2.2 folds higher in rural than urban settings, respectively. Also, higher travel time values
31 were observed in areas with a high proportion of the population with unsatisfied basic needs. In
32 so doing, this study provides a new methodology to estimate travel time to health facilities as a
33 tool to enhance the understanding and characterization of the profiles of accessibility to health
34 facilities in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC), calling for a service delivery redesign to
35 maximize high quality of care.

36 1. INTRODUCTION

37 Despite growing consensus to combat inequalities in the accessibility to healthcare around the
38 world, large disparities in healthcare accessibility remain as a problem in countries with an
39 ongoing rural-to-urban transition. According to the ‘Tracking Universal Health Coverage: 2017
40 Global Monitoring Report’, half of the worldwide population lacks essential health services
41 (World Health Organization & World Bank, 2017). To overcome the disadvantage of
42 marginalized populations, the international community through the United Nations (UN) have
43 stated 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) targeted by 2030 (UN General Assembly,
44 2015). From these goals, the interface between goal 3, — ‘Good health and well-being’,; and
45 goal 10, — ‘Reduced inequalities’, play an important role to foster and couple endeavors towards
46 ensured access to healthcare services.

47 The broad term ‘accessibility’, when referring to healthcare, focuses on multiple domains such as
48 the provision of healthcare facilities, supply chain, quality and effective services, human
49 resources, and on the demand side, health-seeking behaviors (Agbenyo, Marshall Nunbogu, &
50 Dongzagla, 2017; Peters et al., 2008). All these characteristics pointed to the ability of a
51 population to receive appropriate, affordable and quality medical care when needed (Kanuganti,
52 Sarkar, Singh, & Arkatkar, 2015). Importantly, in rural and high poverty areas the most common
53 reasons that prevents the access to healthcare are the geographical accessibility, availability of
54 the right type of care, financial accessibility, and acceptability of service (Al-Taiar, Clark,
55 Longenecker, & Whitty, 2010; Peters et al., 2008). This study focuses on the travel time to health
56 facilities as an important component of the geographical (or physical) accessibility to healthcare.

57 Several studies in developing countries report that geographical accessibility is the main factor
58 that prevents the use of primary healthcare (Al-Taiar et al., 2010; Kanuganti et al., 2015; Müller,
59 Smith, Mellor, Rare, & Genton, 1998; Noor, Zurovac, Hay, Ochola, & Snow, 2003; Perry &
60 Gesler, 2000; Stock, 1983), and not only conditions the ability of the population for health
61 seeking, but also the capacity of the health system to implement prevention and control strategies
62 with adequate coverage. However, fewer studies have explored the heterogeneity in geographical
63 accessibility across areas with contrasting land coverage (Bashshur, Shannon, & Metzner, 1971;
64 Comber, Brunson, & Radburn, 2011), i.e. the marked variation in the topography and

65 environment conditions overlapped with different transport facilities between rural and urban
66 areas that may influence the geographical accessibility across these areas. The geographical
67 accessibility to health services has a direct impact on health outcomes since determine the timely
68 response to patients that seek care, community-based campaigns (i.e. vaccination, iron
69 supplements to combat anemia, etc.), or deliver first response to accidents or natural disasters.

70 Previous studies highlighted the importance of geographical or physical accessibility using a
71 variety of methods (Comber et al., 2011; Delamater, Messina, Shortridge, & Grady, 2012;
72 Huerta Munoz & Källestål, 2012; Ouko, Gachari, Sichangi, & Alegana, s. f.). The emergence of
73 'Precision Public Health' driven by estimates of a wide range of health indicators at a high
74 spatial resolution is defined as the use of the best available data to target more effectively and
75 efficiently interventions of all kinds to those most in need (Chowkwanyun, Bayer, & Galea,
76 2018; Dowell, Blazes, & Desmond-Hellmann, 2016; Horton, 2018; Tatem, 2018). This approach
77 may be favorable since traditionally government's reports aggregates data at administrative units,
78 in a way that obscure the prioritization of resources. A recent study used a precision public
79 health approach to estimate the geographical accessibility to major cities (Weiss et al., 2018),
80 however, this approach has not yet been used for estimating the geographical accessibility to
81 health facilities in developing countries.

82 This study sought to estimate the travel time to the most proximate health facility in rural and
83 urban areas across heterogeneous land coverage types in Peru as a means to help resources
84 prioritization, disease surveillance, as well as prevention and control strategies. Multiple sources
85 of geospatial data were fitted with a novel cloud-based geospatial modeling approach (Weiss
86 et al., 2018) to produce high-resolution (30 m) estimates of travel time to the most proximate
87 health facility across the country. These estimates were then compared between urban and rural
88 settings and across 16 major land coverage types in Peru.

89 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

90 **2.1. Study design**

91 Ecological study using the Peruvian registry of villages and health facilities to model the travel
92 time required for individuals in each village to reach the most proximate health facility (shortest

93 travel time) in a two-step process. First, a friction surface was computed. Several geospatial
94 datasets (land coverage types, boundaries of restricted areas, roads infrastructure, navigable river
95 networks, and topography) were used to construct a surface (i.e. raster or grid) of a given spatial
96 resolution (i.e. 30m per pixel) where the value of each pixel (or cell) contains the time required
97 to travel one meter in that given area. Secondly, this friction surface and the geolocation of the
98 health facilities were used to infer the travel time to the the most proximate (lowest time) health
99 facility using a cumulative cost function. As a result, the travel time estimate for the most
100 proximate health facility was computed for the entire country. The computed values were then
101 summarized in a 500m-radius from the geolocation of cities and villages; per district, province or
102 department; by urban/rural areas; and across 16 major land coverage types defined by the
103 Ministry of Environment (MEnv).

104 **2.2. Study area**

105 This study was conducted using nationwide data from Peru, located on the Pacific coast of South
106 America. Peru encompasses an area of 1,285,216 Km² and 32,162,184 inhabitants divided in 25
107 departments and 1,722 districts. Major ecological areas in the country are divided into the coast,
108 highlands, and jungle (**Figure 1A**), however this study explore a higher granularity of ecological
109 areas with more than 60 unique land coverage areas (**Supplementary Information 1**) that were
110 officially classified in Peru. This classification was based on ecological, topographic, and climate
111 characteristics, that in turn are important for the calculation of travel time since each category
112 requires a different displacement effort.

113 **2.3. Data Sources**

114 The datasets were divided according to its use in the construction of the friction surface and the
115 travel time map.

116 **a) Friction surface construction**

117 The land coverage types were derived from satellite images from MODIS MCD12Q1 product
118 (Friedl et al., 2010). The MODIS collection includes seventeen land coverage types including
119 urban and rural areas inferred by the spectral signature of the satellite images. The boundaries of

120 the national protected natural areas were included using data provided by the MEnv. The road
121 infrastructure in all districts was provided by the Peruvian Ministry of Transportation (MTrans),
122 and the navigable river network was derived from the HydroSHEDS Flow Accumulation dataset
123 (Lehner, Verdin, & Jarvis, 2006). The estimates of the friction surface (minutes required to travel
124 one meter) were adjusted by the slope of the terrain. This means that, the travel time required to
125 cross an area will be proportionally dependent to the slope of the terrain. The slope for each area
126 was calculated using the SRTM Digital Elevation Data (Jarvis, Reuter, Nelson, & Guevara,
127 2008) produced by NASA.

128 **b) Travel time estimation**

129 The target locations used for the cumulative cost function were the health facilities (clinics) of
130 the Ministry of Health (MH). This data was obtained from the geo-localization registry of health
131 facilities (RENAES in spanish) (**Figure 1B**). The MH organize the health facilities in three
132 categories according to the complexity of services they provide (from primary healthcare to
133 specialized hospitals). The primary level includes basic health facilities with no laboratory, the
134 secondary level includes health facilities with laboratory, and tertiary level includes hospitals and
135 higher complexity services. Finally, travel time estimates were extracted for each city and village
136 (**Figure 1C**). The most updated geo-localization of villages was provided by the Ministry of
137 Education (MEd) in a recent census of cities and villages, and education facilities.

138 **2.4. Data Analysis**

139 **a) Friction surface construction**

140 The estimation of travel time were conducted in Google Earth Engine (GEE) (Gorelick et al.,
141 2017). A surface grid was constructed using the information about land coverage, road
142 infrastructure, and river network. All datasets were converted into aligned grids with a 30-meter
143 resolution. Each dataset contained the information of the speed of movement in each feature. All
144 the layers were then combined with the fastest mode of movement taking precedence (Km h^{-1}).
145 The speed assigned for each category of land cover were obtained from elsewhere (Weiss et al.,
146 2018). A data transformation was conducted, so each pixel within the 2D grid contained the cost
147 (time) to moving through the area encompassed in the pixel, herein referred to as ‘friction

148 surface'. Slope adjustment was carried out using the Tobler's Hiking Function (Tobler, 1993)
149 and the speed was penalized (reduced) in urban and national protected areas to account for
150 vehicular traffic and restricted displacement, respectively.

151 **b) Travel time estimation**

152 To calculate the travel time from the villages to the most proximate health facility, the
153 cumulative cost function was used in GEE to generate the accessibility map. The cumulative cost
154 function is a least-cost-path algorithm, briefly, all possible paths were analyzed iteratively and
155 the weighted cost (in this case, weighted by time) was then minimized. The minimum travel time
156 to the most proximate health facility was computed for each pixel in the grid, then the median
157 travel time was summarized in a 500m-radius from the geolocation of each city or village
158 (**Supplementary Information 2**). Values between the 5% and 95% percentile range were
159 considered to avoid extreme values. Since a health facility could be located in the 30m²
160 corresponding to the pixel spatial resolution of the estimates, a baseline 10-minutes travel time
161 was considered. The analysis was carried out for each health facility category. After GEE
162 processing, all data outputs were imported and analyzed using R v.3.6.0 (R Development Core
163 Team, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Australia).

164 The computed travel time was then summarized per district, province or department; by
165 urban/rural areas; and across 16 major land coverage types defined by the MEnv. Urban/rural
166 status was defined based on the MODIS land coverage satellite images (described previously in
167 2.3 Data Sources). To better detail the large diversity of land coverage types in Peru, a shortlist
168 of 16 eco-regions provided by the MEnv (**Supplementary Information 1**) was used to
169 summarize the travel time in these areas. In addition, the distribution of travel time relative to the
170 proportion of population with unsatisfied basic needs (UBN) — a multidimensional poverty
171 measurement developed by the United Nation's Economic Commission for Latin America and
172 the Caribbean (ECLAC) — per department was computed with data provided by the Ministry of
173 Economy (MEco).

174 **3. RESULTS**

175 *Travel time to health facilities*

176 For this study, we gathered geo-referenced data on 145,134 villages (**Figure 1B**) and 8,067
177 health facilities (**Figure 1C**) across the 1,722 districts in the Peruvian territory. The health
178 facility density (number of health facilities divided by the total population) in Peru was 2.58 per
179 10,000 inhabitants with variations between major ecological areas, from 1.35 in the coast, 4.56 in
180 the highlands, to 5.21 in the jungle.

181 Friction and travel time maps were reconstructed in Google Earth Engine using the described
182 local datasets at a spatial resolution of 30 meters per pixel (**Supplementary Information 2**).
183 Country-wide median travel time from each village to the most proximate health facility varies
184 according to category: primary healthcare = 39 minutes (IQR=20 – 93), secondary healthcare =
185 152 minutes (IQR=75 – 251), and tertiary healthcare = 448 minutes (IQR=302 – 631).
186 Importantly, maximum travel time reached 7,819, 12,429, and 35,753 minutes for primary,
187 secondary, and tertiary levels, respectively (**Figure 2**).

188 *Urban/rural and ecological settings*

189 High heterogeneity was observed in contrasting land coverage areas. The median travel time was
190 5.3 fold higher in rural (85 minutes; IQR=11–7,819) than in urban settings (16 minutes; IQR =
191 11–835) to a primary healthcare facility; 3.2 fold higher in rural (226 minutes; IQR = 11–12,429)
192 than in urban settings (70 minutes; IQR = 11–3,386) to a secondary healthcare facility; and 2.4
193 fold higher in rural (568 minutes; IQR = 11–35,753) than in urban settings (235 minutes; IQR =
194 11–10,048) to a tertiary healthcare facility. A larger variation in travel time to primary healthcare
195 was observed in rural compared to urban areas, and conversely, a larger variation in travel time
196 to tertiary healthcare was observed in urban compared to rural areas (**Figure 3**). The district-
197 level stratified averages in **Figure 2** show that there were also strong heterogeneities within
198 major ecological regions. The north-east part of the Amazon Region, which borders with
199 Colombia and Brazil, presented the largest country-wide travel times to the most proximate
200 health facilities. The largest travel times to the most proximate health facilities within the
201 Highlands Region was observed in the southern areas of the Andes, and in the coast was
202 observed in the southern coast. Contrasting distributions of travel time to the most proximate
203 health facility was observed between the 16 eco-regions defined by the MEnv (**Figure 3**).

204 *Travel time to health facilities relative to UBN*

205 When the travel time to most proximate health facilities was distributed relative to the proportion
206 of the population with unsatisfied basic needs at department level (administrative level 1), a
207 positive trend was observed (**Figure 4**). The slope of this relation was increased in geographical
208 accessibility to tertiary health facilities in comparison to primary or secondary health facilities.

209 **4. DISCUSSION**

210 The present study explored the use of novel cloud-based geospatial modeling approach fitted
211 with detailed local geospatial data to accurately estimate the travel time to the most proximate
212 health facility across a highly diverse geographical and ecological settings as observed in Peru.
213 This study showed the first quantification of heterogeneities in travel time to the most proximate
214 health facility as a surrogate of geographical accessibility in the Latin American region. Most of
215 the differences in travel time arose from heterogeneous land coverage profiles and the contrast
216 between urban and rural areas. This is particularly important due to the fact that in Peru and in
217 most LMIC, the most detailed data is available at a coarse administrative level that deter the
218 resource planning and healthcare provision in these countries. Another direct implication of the
219 utility of this approach is providing yet another angle of disadvantages amongst the most
220 underserved, now in terms of access to healthcare as measured by distance and time, one of
221 multiple aspects of high-quality healthcare.

222 In settings with a scattered distribution of villages, timely access to health facilities is a
223 cornerstone to improve the health status of impoverished populations and a first step to provide
224 high quality care (Kruk et al., 2018; Kruk, Pate, & Mullan, 2017). Although the use of big data
225 and high-detail datasets paves the way for a comprehensive quantification of geographical
226 accessibility in terms of distance and travel time, these technologies were not previously applied
227 to estimate geographical accessibility to health facilities until recently (Tatem, 2018). Using this
228 analytical approach, this study demonstrated that the population in the Jungle area have less
229 accessibility since healthcare services are reachable at longer trajectories and travel time,
230 understood as less geographical accessibility. The dramatic heterogeneity in travel time to the
231 most proximate health facility observed in this study corresponds to the contrasting landscape

232 composition in the coast, highlands, and jungle regions. A dense road network was observed in
233 the Coast, facilitating access to multiple services including healthcare as reported in other studies
234 in India and Africa (Kanuganti et al., 2015; Strano, Viana, Sorichetta, & Tatem, 2018).
235 Conversely, sparse road coverage was observed in the Highlands and only the two major cities in
236 the Jungle region had roads.

237 Consistently with previous studies (Bashshur et al., 1971; Comber et al., 2011), this study
238 determined the heterogeneity in travel time to the most proximate health facility across areas
239 with contrasting land coverage types. Despite that this fact is widely accepted, few attempts have
240 been made to quantify these heterogeneities. In addition, asymmetries were identified when the
241 travel time to the most proximate health facility was compared along socio-economic profiles
242 based on the unsatisfied basic needs index proposed by the United Nations Development
243 Programme (UNDP). Uneven trends of greater travel time to health facilities (lower geographical
244 accessibility) were observed among villages with higher rates of unmet basic needs. These
245 results are consistent with previous reports of negative trends in geographical access to
246 healthcare facilities in low-income populations (Kiwanuka et al., 2008; Meyer, Luong,
247 Mamerow, & Ward, 2013; Peters et al., 2008; Tanser, Gijssbertsen, & Herbst, 2006).

248 It is important to highlight that the analysis conducted in this study did not take into account
249 variability due to climatic factors that may prevent displacement to health facilities (i.e. floods or
250 landslides). However, Highlands and Jungle areas are more prone to this kind of natural disaster,
251 leading to a conservative estimation of travel time in these areas. Traffic, which may greatly
252 influence the estimates in the large cities, was not considered in the analysis and potentially
253 cause an underestimation of the travel time to health facilities. In addition, seasonal variability
254 may greatly affect some displacement routes such as rivers; however, only navigable rivers were
255 considered in this approach and the availability to displace through this rivers are less affected by
256 seasonality. Another important consideration about the least-cost-path algorithm used in this
257 analysis is that we infer the lowest travel time boundary to reach a health facility. This
258 consideration relies on the assumption that the villagers opt for this route despite the cost and
259 danger of the route in addition to its availability, as explained above.

260 In addition, the data reported here was generated at a meso-scale, with a spatial resolution of 30
261 meters. At this scale and resolution, some important details could be lost and affect the travel
262 time estimations. For instance, in some settings the travel time might be increased due to
263 meandering rivers or roads that follow the morphology of the terrain. The model assumes that
264 transit flows in a direct manner, meaning that zigzagging routes may cause our approach
265 underestimate the real travel time to reach a health facility. Despite these possible shortcomings,
266 the proposed approach provided conservative yet useful estimates of travel times to health
267 facilities that are important for planning of prevention and control strategies for multiple health-
268 related events. This approach demonstrates that curation and alignment of geospatial data from
269 multiple governmental institutions are important for national decision-making. In addition, the
270 use of mapping and modeling techniques, and ‘big data’ were recognized as critical for better
271 planning (Buckee et al., 2018; Hay, George, Moyes, & Brownstein, 2013; Tatem, 2018);
272 however, a remaining challenge is the implementation of these approaches into routine disease
273 prevention and control programs (Buckee et al., 2018; Hay et al., 2013).

274 This study acknowledges the relevance of other components of health access that may play an
275 important role in the underlying phenomena. The sole presence of clinic infrastructure does not
276 assure a proper healthcare delivery. Supply chain, human resources, financial accessibility,
277 acceptability of services, and availability of treatment are some remaining barriers once
278 geographical accessibility is overcome (Agbenyo et al., 2017; Al-Taiar et al., 2010; Johar,
279 Soewondo, Pujisubekti, Satrio, & Adji, 2018). Further studies were suggested to get a
280 comprehensive understanding of the accessibility to healthcare in Peru and other LMIC.

281 **5. CONCLUSION**

282 This study used a new methodology to estimate the travel time to most proximate health facilities
283 as a first step to understanding and characterizing the geographical accessibility profiles in Peru.
284 Contrasting patterns were observed across heterogeneous land coverage areas and urban and
285 rural settings. These findings are important as first steps for tailoring strategies to deliver
286 appropriate, affordable and quality healthcare to impoverished populations.

287 **REFERENCES**

- 288 Agbenyo, F., Marshall Nunbogu, A., & Dongzagla, A. (2017). Accessibility mapping of health
289 facilities in rural Ghana. *Journal of Transport & Health*, 6, 73-83.
290 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2017.04.010>
- 291 Al-Taiar, A., Clark, A., Longenecker, J. C., & Whitty, C. J. (2010). Physical accessibility and
292 utilization of health services in Yemen. *International Journal of Health Geographics*,
293 9(1), 38. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-072X-9-38>
- 294 Bashshur, R. L., Shannon, G. W., & Metzner, C. A. (1971). Some Ecological Differentials in the
295 Use of Medical Services. *Health Services Research*, 6(1), 61-75.
- 296 Buckee, C. O., Cardenas, M. I. E., Corpuz, J., Ghosh, A., Haque, F., Karim, J., ... Zaw, W.
297 (2018). Productive disruption: Opportunities and challenges for innovation in infectious
298 disease surveillance. *BMJ Global Health*, 3(1), e000538. [https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2017-000538)
299 [2017-000538](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2017-000538)
- 300 Chowkwanyun, M., Bayer, R., & Galea, S. (2018). «Precision» Public Health—Between Novelty
301 and Hype. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 379(15), 1398-1400.
302 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1806634>
- 303 Comber, A. J., Brunsdon, C., & Radburn, R. (2011). A spatial analysis of variations in health
304 access: Linking geography, socio-economic status and access perceptions. *International*
305 *Journal of Health Geographics*, 10, 44. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-072X-10-44>

- 306 Delamater, P. L., Messina, J. P., Shortridge, A. M., & Grady, S. C. (2012). Measuring
307 geographic access to health care: Raster and network-based methods. *International*
308 *Journal of Health Geographics*, *11*(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-072X-11-15>
- 309 Dowell, S. F., Blazes, D., & Desmond-Hellmann, S. (2016). Four steps to precision public
310 health. *Nature News*, *540*(7632), 189. <https://doi.org/10.1038/540189a>
- 311 Friedl, M. A., Sulla-Menashe, D., Tan, B., Schneider, A., Ramankutty, N., Sibley, A., & Huang,
312 X. (2010). MODIS Collection 5 global land cover: Algorithm refinements and
313 characterization of new datasets. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, *114*(1), 168-182.
314 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2009.08.016>
- 315 Gorelick, N., Hancher, M., Dixon, M., Ilyushchenko, S., Thau, D., & Moore, R. (2017). Google
316 Earth Engine: Planetary-scale geospatial analysis for everyone. *Remote Sensing of*
317 *Environment*, *202*, 18-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2017.06.031>
- 318 Hay, S. I., George, D. B., Moyes, C. L., & Brownstein, J. S. (2013). Big Data Opportunities for
319 Global Infectious Disease Surveillance. *PLOS Medicine*, *10*(4), e1001413.
320 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001413>
- 321 Horton, R. (2018). Offline: In defence of precision public health. *The Lancet*, *392*(10157), 1504.
322 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)32741-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32741-7)
- 323 Huerta Munoz, U., & Källestål, C. (2012). Geographical accessibility and spatial coverage
324 modeling of the primary health care network in the Western Province of Rwanda.

- 325 *International Journal of Health Geographics*, 11(1), 40. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476->
326 072X-11-40
- 327 Jarvis, A., Reuter, H. I., Nelson, A., & Guevara, E. (2008). *Hole-filled SRTM for the globe*
328 *Version 4*.
- 329 Johar, M., Soewondo, P., Pujisubekti, R., Satrio, H. K., & Adji, A. (2018). Inequality in access to
330 health care, health insurance and the role of supply factors. *Social Science & Medicine*,
331 213, 134-145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.07.044>
- 332 Kanuganti, S., Sarkar, A. K., Singh, A. P., & Arkatkar, S. S. (2015). Quantification of
333 accessibility to health facilities in rural areas. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, 3(3),
334 311-320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cstp.2014.08.004>
- 335 Kiwanuka, S. N., Ekirapa, E. K., Peterson, S., Okui, O., Rahman, M. H., Peters, D., & Pariyo, G.
336 W. (2008). Access to and utilisation of health services for the poor in Uganda: A
337 systematic review of available evidence. *Transactions of The Royal Society of Tropical*
338 *Medicine and Hygiene*, 102(11), 1067-1074. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trstmh.2008.04.023>
- 339 Kruk, M. E., Gage, A. D., Arsenault, C., Jordan, K., Leslie, H. H., Roder-DeWan, S., ... Pate, M.
340 (2018). High-quality health systems in the Sustainable Development Goals era: Time for
341 a revolution. *The Lancet Global Health*, 6(11), e1196-e1252.
342 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(18\)30386-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30386-3)

- 343 Kruk, M. E., Pate, M., & Mullan, Z. (2017). Introducing The Lancet Global Health Commission
344 on High-Quality Health Systems in the SDG Era. *The Lancet Global Health*, 5(5), e480-
345 e481. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(17\)30101-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30101-8)
- 346 Lehner, B., Verdin, K., & Jarvis, A. (2006). HydroSHEDS technical documentation, version 1.0.
347 *World Wildlife Fund US, Washington, DC*, 1-27.
- 348 Meyer, S. B., Luong, T. C., Mamerow, L., & Ward, P. R. (2013). Inequities in access to
349 healthcare: Analysis of national survey data across six Asia-Pacific countries. *BMC*
350 *Health Services Research*, 13, 238. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-13-238>
- 351 Müller, I., Smith, T., Mellor, S., Rare, L., & Genton, B. (1998). The effect of distance from home
352 on attendance at a small rural health centre in Papua New Guinea. *International Journal*
353 *of Epidemiology*, 27(5), 878-884.
- 354 Noor, A. M., Zurovac, D., Hay, S. I., Ochola, S. A., & Snow, R. W. (2003). Defining equity in
355 physical access to clinical services using geographical information systems as part of
356 malaria planning and monitoring in Kenya. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*,
357 8(10), 917-926. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-3156.2003.01112.x>
- 358 Ouko, J. J. O., Gachari, M. K., Sichangi, A. W., & Alegana, V. (s. f.). Geographic information
359 system-based evaluation of spatial accessibility to maternal health facilities in Siaya
360 County, Kenya. *Geographical Research*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-5871.12339>
- 361 Perry, B., & Gesler, W. (2000). Physical access to primary health care in Andean Bolivia. *Social*
362 *Science & Medicine*, 50(9), 1177-1188. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(99\)00364-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00364-0)

- 363 Peters, D. H., Garg, A., Bloom, G., Walker, D. G., Brieger, W. R., & Rahman, M. H. (2008).
364 Poverty and access to health care in developing countries. *Annals of the New York*
365 *Academy of Sciences*, 1136, 161-171. <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1425.011>
- 366 Stock, R. (1983). Distance and the utilization of health facilities in rural Nigeria. *Social Science*
367 *& Medicine* (1982), 17(9), 563-570.
- 368 Strano, E., Viana, M. P., Sorichetta, A., & Tatem, A. J. (2018). Mapping road network
369 communities for guiding disease surveillance and control strategies. *Scientific Reports*,
370 8(1), 4744. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-22969-4>
- 371 Tanser, F., Gijsbertsen, B., & Herbst, K. (2006). Modelling and understanding primary health
372 care accessibility and utilization in rural South Africa: An exploration using a
373 geographical information system. *Social Science & Medicine*, 63(3), 691-705.
374 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2006.01.015>
- 375 Tatem, A. J. (2018). Innovation to impact in spatial epidemiology. *BMC Medicine*, 16(1), 209.
376 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-018-1205-5>
- 377 Tobler, W. (1993). *Three Presentations on Geographical Analysis and Modeling: Non- Isotropic*
378 *Geographic Modeling; Speculations on the Geometry of Geography; and Global Spatial*
379 *Analysis (93-1)*. Recuperado de <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/05r820mz>
- 380 UN General Assembly. (2015, octubre 21). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for
381 Sustainable Development. Recuperado 9 de octubre de 2018, de
382 <http://www.refworld.org/docid/57b6e3e44.html>

383 Weiss, D. J., Nelson, A., Gibson, H. S., Temperley, W., Peedell, S., Lieber, A., ... Gething, P.
384 W. (2018). A global map of travel time to cities to assess inequalities in accessibility in
385 2015. *Nature*, 553(7688), 333-336. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25181>

386 World Health Organization, & World Bank. (2017). *Tracking universal health coverage: 2017*
387 *Global Monitoring Report*. Recuperado de
388 http://www.who.int/healthinfo/universal_health_coverage/report/2017/en/

389

390 **Acknowledgements.**

391 We thank the various ministries of Peru for making such useful data freely-available to
392 researchers. Gabriel Carrasco-Escobar was supported by NIH/Fogarty International Center
393 Global Infectious Diseases Training Program (D43 TW007120). J. Jaime Miranda acknowledges
394 having received support from the Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research
395 (HQHSR1206660), the Bernard Lown Scholars in Cardiovascular Health Program at Harvard
396 T.H. Chan School of Public Health (BLSCHP-1902), Bloomberg Philanthropies, FONDECYT
397 via CIENCIACTIVA/CONCYTEC, British Council, British Embassy and the Newton-Paulet
398 Fund (223-2018, 224-2018), DFID/MRC/Wellcome Global Health Trials (MR/M007405/1),
399 Fogarty International Center (R21TW009982, D71TW010877), Grand Challenges Canada
400 (0335-04), International Development Research Center Canada (IDRC 106887, 108167), Inter-
401 American Institute for Global Change Research (IAI CRN3036), Medical Research Council
402 (MR/P008984/1, MR/P024408/1, MR/P02386X/1), National Cancer Institute (1P20CA217231),
403 National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (HHSN268200900033C, 5U01HL114180,
404 1UM1HL134590), National Institute of Mental Health (1U19MH098780), Swiss National

405 Science Foundation (40P740-160366), Wellcome (074833/Z/04/Z, 093541/Z/10/Z,
406 107435/Z/15/Z, 103994/Z/14/Z, 205177/Z/16/Z, 214185/Z/18/Z) and the World Diabetes
407 Foundation (WDF15-1224). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and
408 analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

409

410 **Author's contributions**

411 Conceived and designed the study: G.C.E. and J.J.M. Data collection: G.C.E., K.T.L., and E.M.
412 Analyzed the data: G.C.E., K.T.L., and E.M. Wrote the manuscript: G.C.E. and J.J.M. All
413 authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

414

415 **Competing interests**

416 The authors declare no competing interests.

417


418 **Data Availability**

419 Raw datasets and codes are available at google earth engine repository, details in the
420 Supplementary information section.

421


422 **FIGURES**

423 **Figure 1. Study area.** A) Major ecological areas (coast, andes, and jungle) in Peru. Solid lines
424 represent the 25 Departments (administrative level 1). B) Spatial location of primary, secondary,
425 and tertiary health facilities. C) Spatial location of villages. Maps were produced using QGIS,
426 and the base map was obtained OpenTopoMap (<http://www.opentopomap.org>), under CC BY-
427 SA 3.0.



428


429 **Figure 2. Country-wide map of travel time to health facilities for 2018.** District-level average
430 travel time to each category of healthcare facilities. A) Primary healthcare. B) Secondary
431 healthcare. C) Tertiary healthcare. Color scale in logarithmic scale
432



433


434

435 **Figure 3. Distribution of travel time to most proximate health facility.** Estimates across the
436 16 eco-regions defined by the Peruvian Ministry of environment and rural/urban settings for
437 primary, secondary and tertiary healthcare. Y-axis in logarithmic scale.



438
439
440
441

442 **Figure 4. Median travel time to each health facility category relative to the proportion of**
443 **population with unsatisfied basic needs per department. Y-axis in logarithmic scale**



444