How Previous Epidemics Enable Timelier COVID-19 Responses: A Cross-Sectional Study Using Organizational Memory Theory

Authors:
Sian Tsuei, BSc, BIS, MHSc, MD, CCFP

Affiliations:
Department of Global Health and Populations, Harvard T H Chan School of Public Health; Center for Health Education Scholarship, UBC

Abstract:
Introduction: There has been little systematic exploration of what affects timeliness of epidemic response, despite the potential for earlier responses to be more effective. Speculations have circulated that exposure to major epidemics helped health systems respond more quickly to COVID-19. This study leverages organizational memory theory to test whether health systems with any, more severe, more recent exposure to major epidemics enacted timelier COVID-19 policy responses.
Methods: A dataset was constructed cataloguing 719 policies across 177 health systems in total, 12 of which had major epidemics within the last twenty years. Hypotheses testing used cluster robust regressions with WHO region fixed effects, controlling for several health system expenditure and political variables.
Results: Results show that exposure to any major epidemics was nearly significant ($p = 0.07$) with approximately 20 days earlier response. As the number of total cases from major epidemics increase by one, this was associated with 0.0028 day earlier response ($p < 0.001$). A decrease of one year from last major epidemics was also associated with 0.4020 day earlier response ($p < 0.001$).
Conclusion: This study suggests that health systems do learn from past major epidemics. Policymakers ought to institutionalize lessons from COVID-19 to prevent erosion of organizational memory and learn from other more severely affected health systems.
Future studies can examine specific generalizable lessons and whether timelier responses correlated with lower health and economic impacts.

What is already known? There has been little systematic exploration into what affects the timeliness of response to epidemics. For COVID-19, there has been speculation that previous exposure to major epidemics may have spurred timelier responses.

What are the new findings? Applying organizational memory theory, this study identified policy response timeliness to COVID-19 was significantly associated with the total number of cases and recency of epidemics.

What do the new findings imply? The erosion of the organizational memory over time suggest the need for policymakers to institutionalize the lessons to become more permanent. Policymakers can also take stock of lessons in systems that are more severely affected to improve the capacity to tackle future outbreaks.

Introduction

Background

The drastic consequences of COVID-19 highlight the need to identify tactics that could have mitigated these outcomes. Earlier interventions are particularly worthwhile, as such policies might use simpler techniques such as border control or isolated case finding followed by quarantine. In contrast, interventions once a disease has established a foothold may require expensive life-supporting therapies or aggressive public health measures that might cause significant socioeconomic disruptions. Later interventions may be also less effective. Asymptomatic transmission as is the case for COVID-19 may elude effective containment strategies unless implemented universally, leading to exponential case growth that overwhelm the health system. Therefore, it is particularly important to examine how the pandemic could have been limited to earlier stages.

There has been little rigorous exploration on what drives timeliness of policy response to epidemics. Kandel et al. examined in 2020 the capacity for 182 countries to respond to public health emergencies [1]. They constructed operational readiness index based on select metrics from the domains of a) technical abilities, including the ability to conduct surveillance, contact tracing, and infection prevention; b) governance capacity, marked by capacity for multisectoral collaboration, emergency risk communication; and c) resource availability, defined in terms of finances, and human resources. However, these indices were constructed neither systematically nor empirically.

Other attempts to explore epidemic response timeliness have typically drawn on sporadic *post hoc* reviews or case studies. For example, the United States (US) Center for Disease Control (CDC) documented that it responded quickly within the month that the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) case was reported to the online Program for Monitoring Emerging Diseases, it mobilized its personnel to begin collecting more information, quickly developed briefings for staff members and the general public, and posting travel updates [2].

The literature has typically shied away from rigorous frameworks to examine how timely response to epidemics could be enacted. One study, however, did attempt such a methodology. Hanvoravongchai et al. examined the six Asian health systems' preparedness for influenza pandemic [3]. They concluded that more prepared health systems had pandemic response integrated into national disaster preparedness framework, lower public health official turnovers, previous pandemic exposures, and more political emphasis on preparedness. Nevertheless, their work was focused on generating hypotheses rather than testing hypotheses, and as such, there is a dearth of literature that systematically tests a developed hypothesis on what affects timeliness of epidemic response.

Objectives

This study aims to explore why health systems differ in their timeliness of issuing policy responses to COVID-19 before the epidemic took hold within their health system. Exploring what drives timelier response may point future health system researchers in fruitful directions.

This study focuses on the health systems' organizational aspects, which have been traditionally opaquer and de-emphasized particularly among low- and middle-income countries [4]. This is unfortunate because it is the dynamics and bureaucratic abilities within the guiding government bodies that affect the policy development. Specifically, the dynamics within the executive branch of government determine policy responses, and this branch is particularly relevant for epidemic responses. First, they can respond most swiftly in an emergency. The legislative branch often requires passing several readings of the law and the judicial branch is responsible for *ex post* interpretation of laws. Second, the executive branch drives the responses of subsidiary government organizations, providing targets and support for organizations such as the Center for Disease Control. Here, the executive branch is considered as a single decision-making unit, experiencing the relevant dynamics together, since the relevant parties within this unit must reach a consensus on the relevant policies.

The popular media claims that the countries with more serious exposures to SARS or MERS-CoV responded more appropriately to COVID-19 [5,6]. The intuition is that the health systems faced with pandemic in the past have learned from their past experiences, and can therefore cope better, be it more promptly or more effectively.

Such intuitive reasoning resonates with both organizational memory theory and institutional memory theory. *Organizational memory* is defined as the "stored information from an organization's history that can be brought to bear on present decisions."[7] In contrast, *institutional memory* was in fact not explicitly defined though it reflects a similar idea [8]. Given the richer development of the organizational memory theory, I favour the organizational memory term for the rest of the paper. In Walsh and Ungson's seminal review of organizational memory, they describe that relevant information about a problem and associated decision is encoded within an organization via several methods, such as individuals' memories, organizational procedures, and organizational cultures [7]. When a similar problem surfaces again, the organization retrieves the stored information. Assuming that the executive branch personnel aim for timelier responses, this therefore leads to the first hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Exposure to major epidemics within the recent history leads to more timely response.

The duration of the lessons may be non-permanent depending on the way the lessons were encoded. If encoded into policies, the lessons may last as long as the institution itself. However, Walsh and Ungson suggest that much of the organizational memory is encoded within the individuals' memories [7], rendering the lessons impermanent. As more individuals exposed to the problem retire, the relevant lessons and expertise fades. With more recent exposures, the memory of the relevant procedures allows more appropriate response. This therefore generates the second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: The more time elapsed since the last major epidemic in a health system, the slower the response in the health system.

Psychology has shown also that the depth of memory correlates with the intensity of the emotions during the event [9,10]. The stronger the emotion, the stronger the activation of emotional processing center amygdala, leading to more lasting encoding of the memories in the hippocampus [11]. The more severe the previous epidemic, the more likely that the involved individuals would retain the lessons for prolonged period. It follows then that the more serious the last epidemic the executive branch faced, the deeper the episodic memory.

Hypothesis 3: The more cases a health system dealt with in past major epidemics, the timelier the policy responses in the health system.

Methods:

Study design

This study uses a cross-sectional regression to assess the association between exposure to major epidemics previously and timeliness of COVID-19 response.

Major epidemics were included if they: occurred within the last 20 years (i.e., years 2000 – 2020), were documented within the WHO Disease Outbreak Network, had case fatality rate > 1, affected multiple health systems, and affected more than 500 cases in total. Diseases were excluded if they had vaccines available at the time of the outbreak, were vector-borne diseases, or were COVID-19. This process resulted in the following diseases: SARS, H1N1, Ebola, and MERS.

Health systems were considered to have been affected by these diseases if they had >100 cases of the disease during the outbreak (i.e., not relying on retrospective modeling parameters). All countries listed in World Bank database were considered. Health systems were parsed out

from countries list if they have unique health system operations[1]. This resulted in a total of 177 health systems.

The number of policies considered were the first policies of each of the five WHO categories (i.e., individual measures, environmental measures, surveillance and response measures, social and physical distancing measures, and international travel measures). The total number of policies in the dataset were 846 policies.

Dataset and variables

The list of datasets and variables are provided in table 1 and table 2, respectively.

The timeliness of response was the difference in days between the policy issuance and January 5th, 2020, when WHO first announced the pneumonia of unknown significance. Exposure to any major epidemics accounted for exposure to any of the included diseases. Total number of cases tabulated the total number of cases resulting from the included diseases. Years since epidemics was calculated in terms of the number of years between 2020 and the last year the disease occurred in the health system. The dataset also included several variables that may affect executive governments' decision process and confound the relationship between policy timeliness and organizational memory. Covariates include corruption, fiscal spending, and executive government's political preferences. Continent-specific cultures are proxied using WHO regions. Health care spending priority is proxied using total health expenditure as a proportion of total government revenue.

Statistical methods

The key estimating equations are equations 1 and 2.

$$\text{Firstpol_diffjan}_{i,j} = \alpha + \beta_1\text{Anyepi}_{i,j} + \beta_2\text{Totcase}_{i,j} + \gamma_1 X_{i,j} + \gamma_2\text{WHO_Region}_{i,j} + \varepsilon_j \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Firstpol_diffjan}_{i,j} = \alpha + \beta_3\text{Totcase}_{i,j} + \beta_4\text{Yr_since}_{i,j} + \gamma_1 X_{i,j} + \gamma_2\text{WHO_Region}_{i,j} + \varepsilon_j \quad (2)$$

Equation 1 tests whether the first policy relative to Jan 5, 2020 for health system *i* in WHO region *j* is associated with exposure to any epidemics (β_1) and total cases (β_2) while controlling for the vector of health system covariates *X*. Equation 2 tests whether policy timeliness is associated with total cases (β_3) and years since last major epidemics (β_4). Both equations use WHO Region fixed effects, and standard errors are clustered at WHO region level using CR2 adjustment.

Ideally, all three key independent variables can be tested together in one equation, but the

[1] This recoding mainly affected Hong Kong and Taiwan.

collinearity between *Anyepi* and *Yr_since* precludes simultaneous testing.

β_1 to β_3 are expected to be negative, suggesting that any exposure to epidemics or higher total cases from epidemics. β_4 is expected to be positive to indicate that longer time elapsed since last major epidemic is associated with longer policy delay.

Bias

There may be residual confounding resulting from the indices, as some were available only for 2017 or 2018. The regression dropped health systems for which there were missing covariates. This differential attrition typically involves underdeveloped countries. Because these countries could have responded either more quickly or more slowly to COVID-19, it is difficult to predict the direction of bias.

Results

Descriptive data

On average, the delay of first policy relative to the first WHO announcement of COVID-19 was approximately 60 days. About 7 % of the dataset included policies from health systems exposed to any history of epidemics. Among health systems exposed to major epidemics, the average was about 11 years since last epidemic. The epidemics affected on average 243 cases within the health systems. The corruption index was 44, suggesting that on balance, the governments may be more corrupt. The GDP per capita was USD 16,250, suggesting that the average is skewed towards high income countries. The level of expenditure for health priority spending appears to be closer towards low- and middle-income countries' spending than high income countries'. More of the systems exhibited either more rightist or leftist governments, with somewhat lower representation from the South-East Asia Region; and WPRO, Western Pacific Region. The descriptive data is summarized in table 3.

Main results

Equation 1 analyzed first policies among all five WHO subcategories in all available health systems. Results suggest that any epidemic exposure is associated with nearly 20 days of earlier response, and is almost statistically significant ($t = -3.2449$, $p = 0.0750$). The number of total cases was not statistically significant in this specification.

Equation 2 analyzed only health systems previously exposed to major epidemics. This specification showed that number of total cases is significantly associated with timelier response. For an average burden of 243 cases in a health system with previous epidemics, this translates to approximately 0.68 days earlier response. More recent major epidemics is also associated with timelier response, to the tune of approximately half a day earlier response as the delay from last

epidemic decreases by a year.

The second model explained much more variance (0.3356 vs. 0.1107 in adjusted R^2). The results of both regressions are provided in Table 4.

Discussion

Key results and interpretation

This study is, as far as I know, the first to formally apply organizational memory theory to explore the timeliness of COVID-19 response. This study identified that there may be shorter delays to initial policies when exposed to any previous epidemics within the last 20 years that caused more than 100 cases. This was nearly significant using a conservative clustering adjustment[2] [12]. The association between policy timeliness and organizational memory was significant when disaggregated into total cases and years since last major epidemic, and translates to approximately 0.68 days of earlier responses for a health system with average burden of recent major epidemic. As the duration to last major epidemic decreases by one year, this is also associated with approximately half a day improvement in policy response timing.

In the context of COVID-19, at least 124 countries have experienced over a total of 1,000 cases, and 64 countries over 10,000 cases. Assuming that the relationship holds for future epidemics, this translates to approximately 2.8 and 28 days earlier response in the face of future major epidemic.

Policy implication

The fact that longer time elapsed since last epidemics leads to delay in responses suggest that there is indeed erosion of organizational memory over time. To maximize the benefits of organizational memory, policymakers would do well to identify the lessons of the epidemics such that they can codify them into the institution.

Further, policymakers can learn from other systems that are more severely or more recently affected, since those systems are likely to conduct more timely responses. Scenarios and drills drawing on their lessons can then help “immunize” the more naïve systems to generate appropriate organizational memory.

Future research avenues

Peeri et al. suggest that health systems may have learned to communicate with the public more

---

[2] Using CR0 or stata adjustments for cluster robust standard error, the exposure to any epidemics and total cases in model 1 were both significant (results not shown).

regarding hygiene and establish quarantine processes, but political leaders had not appreciated the importance of transparency or leveraged technology for more prompt surveillance methods [13]. The call towards such higher order considerations for more timely responses resonates with the need for further reflections for timelier responses.

Additional reflections and research may also draw from the work of Van Bavel et al., which highlighted a variety of social and behavioural mechanisms that could be useful for responding to COVID-19 [14]. Among the strategies highlighted, the risk communication, public persuasion, and misinformation denouncement are particularly relevant in times of crisis as they can be quickly implemented. Exploring how health systems have incorporated relevant lessons into their executive branch of government may help inform policymakers what lessons they ought to incorporate into their future health systems coming out of COVID-19.

One particularly meaningful avenue is to clarify whether timelier response translates to improvement in lowering deaths or economic costs. As COVID-19 is yet incomplete, future studies might follow up on this front once COVID-19 resolves.

Limitations

The cross-sectional design limits the interpretation to association, not causation. Further, the lack of health systems previously exposed to major epidemics precludes generalization across all systems. Health systems with previous epidemics may have developed more timely reporting procedures of policies to WHO, in which case timelier policy responses may actually be merely be an artifact of timelier reporting. The data is limited in that it cannot tease apart such nuances.

References

1 Kandel N, Chungong S, Omaar A, *et al.* Health security capacities in the context of COVID-19 outbreak: an analysis of International Health Regulations annual report data from 182 countries. *The Lancet* 2020;**395**:1047–53. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30553-5

2 Williams HA, Dunville RL, Gerber SI, *et al.* CDC's Early Response to a Novel Viral Disease, Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV), September 2012-May 2014. *Public Health Rep* 2015;**130**:307–17. doi:10.1177/003335491513000407

3 Hanvoravongchai P, Adisasmito W, Chau PN, *et al.* Pandemic influenza preparedness and health systems challenges in Asia: results from rapid analyses in 6 Asian countries. *BMC Public Health* 2010;**10**:322. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-10-322

4 Lega F, Prenestini A, Spurgeon P. Is Management Essential to Improving the Performance and Sustainability of Health Care Systems and Organizations? A Systematic Review and a

Roadmap for Future Studies. *Value in Health* 2013;**16**:S46–51. doi:10.1016/j.jval.2012.10.004

5 Graham-Harrison E. Experience of Sars a key factor in countries' response to coronavirus. The Observer. 2020.https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/mar/15/experience-of-sars-key-factor-in-response-to-coronavirus (accessed 12 May 2020).

6 Fox J. What Prepares a Country for a Pandemic? An Epidemic Helps. Bloomberg.com. 2020.https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2020-03-18/covid-19-response-better-in-countries-with-sars-mers-coronavirus (accessed 12 May 2020).

7 Walsh JP, Ungson GR. Organizational memory. *AMR* 1991;**16**:57–91. doi:10.5465/amr.1991.4278992

8 Berger AN, Udell GF. The institutional memory hypothesis and the procyclicality of bank lending behavior. *Journal of Financial Intermediation* 2004;**13**:458–95. doi:10.1016/j.jfi.2004.06.006

9 Daselaar SM, Rice HJ, Greenberg DL, *et al.* The Spatiotemporal Dynamics of Autobiographical Memory: Neural Correlates of Recall, Emotional Intensity, and Reliving. *Cereb Cortex* 2008;**18**:217–29. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhm048

10 Talarico JM, LaBar KS, Rubin DC. Emotional intensity predicts autobiographical memory experience. *Mem Cognit* 2004;**32**:1118–32. doi:10.3758/bf03196886

11 LaBar KS. Beyond Fear Emotional Memory Mechanisms in the Human Brain. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 2007;**16**:173–7.

12 Cameron AC, Gelbach JB, Miller DL. Bootstrap-Based Improvements for Inference with Clustered Errors. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 2008;**90**:414–27.

13 Peeri NC, Shrestha N, Rahman MS, *et al.* The SARS, MERS and novel coronavirus (COVID-19) epidemics, the newest and biggest global health threats: what lessons have we learned? *Int J Epidemiol* doi:10.1093/ije/dyaa033

14 Bavel JJV, Baicker K, Boggio PS, *et al.* Using social and behavioural science to support COVID-19 pandemic response. *Nature Human Behaviour* 2020;**4**:460–71. doi:10.1038/s41562-020-0884-z

15 WHO. Disease outbreaks by year. WHO. 2020.http://www.who.int/csr/don/archive/year/en/ (accessed 28 May 2020).

16 Department of Health. Department of Health, Seychelles. 2020.https://www.facebook.com/pg/mohseychellesofficial/posts/?ref=page_internal (accessed 28 May 2020).

17 IHME. Geopositioned Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus Occurrences Database 1983-2017. 2018.http://ghdx.healthdata.org/record/ihme-data/geopositioned-mers-cov-occurrences-database-1983-2017

18 WHO. Summary table of SARS cases by country, 1 November 2002 - 7 August 2003. WHO. 2003.https://www.who.int/csr/sars/country/2003_08_15/en/ (accessed 28 May 2020).

19 Giahuye JH, Brice akini. WHO declares Liberia free of active Ebola virus transmission. Thomson Reuters Foundation News. 2016.https://news.trust.org/item/20160609104923-cft2c/ (accessed 28 May 2020).

20 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2014-2016 Ebola Outbreak in West Africa. 2020.https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/history/2014-2016-outbreak/index.html (accessed 28 May 2020).

21 WHO. Maps of the spread of influenza A(H1N1). WHO. 20019.https://www.who.int/csr/disease/swineflu/h1n1_maps_may/en/ (accessed 28 May 2020).

22 Roser M, Ritchie H, Ortiz-Ospina E, *et al.* Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). *Our World in Data* Published Online First: 4 March 2020.https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus (accessed 28 May 2020).

23 WHO. Tracking Public Health and Social Measures: A Global Dataset. 2020.https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/phsm (accessed 28 May 2020).

24 Transparency international. Corruption Perceptions Index. 2020.https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2019/press-and-downloads (accessed 7 Jun 2020).

25 Country Economy. Taiwan GDP - Gross Domestic Product 2018.

2018.https://countryeconomy.com/gdp/taiwan (accessed 7 Jun 2020).

26 World Bank. GDP per capita (current US$). 2020.https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD (accessed 7 Jun 2020).

27 World Bank. Current health expenditure (% of GDP). 2020.https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SH.XPD.CHEX.GD.ZS (accessed 7 Jun 2020).

28 Worldodemeter. Taiwan Population. 2020.https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/taiwan-population/ (accessed 8 Jun 2020).

29 World Bank. Population, total. 2020.https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL (accessed 7 Jun 2020).

Table 1: List of datasets

Dataset Name	**Content**	**Source(s)**
Past Epidemics exposure	Number of cases, deaths, and years affected by SARS, H1N1, MERS, Ebola Note: Saudi Arabia's MERS burdens were hand coded based on review of the monthly reports of Disease outbreak News[15]. Data available upon request. Seychelles' international travel ban was modified to February 3rd, 2020 [16].	[15,17–21]
COVID-19 cases and deaths	Day-by-day number of cases and deaths of COVID-19	[22]
Public Health and Social Measures	Number, type, and content of policy measures for COVID-19 as classified by WHO and up-to-date as of May 14th, 2020	[23]
Corruption Perception Index	Population's perception of corruption	[24]
GDP per capita	GDP per capita in current US Dollars in 2018 Note: Taiwan's GDP per capita was supplemented[25].	[26]
Health priority	Health expenditure as a percentage of all GDP in 2018	[27]
Population size	Number of people in the population in 2018 Note: Taiwan's population was supplemented [28].	[29]

Table 2: List of variables

Variable name	Operational definition	Type
Key Dependent Variable		
Firstpol_diffjan	Delay of first policy of each WHO category relative to Jan 5, 2020 (i.e., when WHO first announced pneumonia of unknown significance)	Continuous
Key independent variables		
Anyepi	History of exposure to major epidemics in last 20 years	Binary (Yes = 1; No = 0)
Totcase	Total number of cases from major epidemics within the last 20 years. (Note: health systems with less than 100 cases of an outbreak were coded as having 0 cases.)	Continuous
Yr_since	Number of years elapsed since the last major epidemic. Health systems without major epidemics were coded as NA.	Continuous
Covariate Variables		
Corrupt	Corruption index in 2019	Continuous
GDPcap	GDP per capita in 2018	Continuous
Hlthpri	Health care priority, as defined by total health expenditure as a fraction of total government revenue in 2018	Continuous
Execrlc	Executive asbranch's political leaning towards right (1), center (2), left (3), no information (0), or no executive branch (NA) in 2017	Categorical
WHO_Region	Regions of world as denoted by WHO classification in 2020	Categorical

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Mean or Number	Standard Error or Proportion	N
Dependent Variable			
First policy delay since Jan 5, 2020	58.63	0.98	846
Independent Variables			
Anyepi	63.00	0.07	846
Totcase	243.26	50.25	846
Yr_since	10.83	0.81	63
Covariates			
Corrupt	44.77	0.66	846
GDPcap	16250.65	735.38	820
Hlthpri	6.56	0.09	807
Execrlc			759
Right	155	0.20	
Center	69	0.09	
Left	182	0.24	
No information	353	0.47	
WHO Region[3]			846
AFRO	196	0.23	
AMRO	158	0.19	
EMRO	101	0.12	
EURO	256	0.30	
SEARO	47	0.06	
WPRO	88	0.10	

[3] The WHO regions are defined as follows: AFRO, African region; AMRO, Americas; EMRO, Eastern Mediterranean; EURO, European Region; SEARO, South-East Asia Region; and WPRO, Western Pacific Region.

Table 4: Delay of timeliness relative to Jan 5, 2020

	Model 1	**Model 2**
(Intercept)	70.0747***	122.8742***
	(1.8453)	(0.0000)
Anyepi	-21.071	
	(6.4936)	
Totcase	0.0023	-0.0028***
	(0.0009)	(0.0000)
Yr_since		0.4020***
		(0.0000)
Corrupt	-0.0816	-1.2139***
	(0.0396)	(0.0000)
GDPcap	0.0001	0.0007***
	(0.0001)	(0.0000)
hlthpri	0.3860	1.0208***
	(0.4981)	(0.0000)
execrlc1	-4.9954	
	(2.854)	
execrlc2	-1.0379	-8.6933***
	(2.0245)	(0.0000)
execrlc3	-1.8753	16.4269***
	(3.7454)	(0.0000)
R^2	0.1268	0.4542
Adj. R^2	0.1107	0.3356
Num. obs.	719	57

$^{***}p < 0.001$; $^{**}p < 0.01$; $^{*}p < 0.05$. Model clustered at WHO region with CR2 adjustment. WHO region fixed effects output suppressed.