

1 **Healthcare utilization and expenditure among people with type 2 diabetes and/or**  
2 **hypertension in Cambodia: results from a cross-sectional survey**

3 Srean Chhim<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Vannarath Te<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Veerle Buffel<sup>5</sup>, Josefien Van Olmen<sup>4</sup>, Savina Chham<sup>1,5</sup>,  
4 Sereyraksmeay Long<sup>2</sup>, Sokunthea Yem<sup>1</sup>, Wim Van Damme<sup>3</sup>, Edwin Wouters<sup>5,6</sup>, Por Ir<sup>1,2</sup>

5  
6 ***Affiliations***

7 <sup>1</sup> Technical Bureau, National Institute of Public Health, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

8 <sup>2</sup> School of Public Health, National Institute of Public Health, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

9 <sup>3</sup> Health Policy Unit, Department of Public Health, Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp,  
10 Belgium

11 <sup>4</sup> Department of Family Medicine and Population Health (FAMPOP), Faculty of Medicine and  
12 Health Sciences, University of Antwerp, Belgium

13 <sup>5</sup> Centre for Population, Family, and Health, Department of Social Sciences, University of  
14 Antwerp, Belgium

15 <sup>6</sup> Centre for Health Systems Research and Development, University of the Free State, South  
16 Africa

17

18 **\* Corresponding author:** Srean Chhim (#109, street 01, Krang Thnong, Saensokh, Phnom Penh,  
19 postal 120804), srean168@gmail.com

20

21 **Keywords:** healthcare, utilization, expenditure, Cambodia

22 **Word count** 5082/4000

23 **ABSTRACT**

24 *Objective:* To assess utilization of public and private healthcare, related healthcare expenditure,  
25 and associated factors for people with type 2 diabetes (T2D) and/or hypertension (HTN) and for  
26 people without those conditions in Cambodia.

27 *Methods:* A cross-sectional household survey.

28 *Settings:* Five operational districts in Cambodia.

29 *Participants:* Data was from 2,360 participants aged  $\geq 40$  years who had used healthcare services  
30 at least once in the three months preceding the survey.

31 *Primary and secondary outcome:* The main variables of interest were the number of healthcare  
32 visits and healthcare expenditure in the last three months.

33 *Results:* The majority of healthcare visits took place in the private sector. Only 22.0% of  
34 healthcare visits took place in public healthcare facilities: 21.7% in people with HTN, 37.2% in  
35 people with T2D, 34.7% in people with T2D plus HTN, and 18.9% in people without the two  
36 conditions ( $P$ -value $<0.01$ ). In people with T2D and/or HTN, increased public healthcare use was  
37 significantly associated with Health Equity Fund (HEF) membership and living in operational  
38 districts with *community-based care*. Furthermore, significant healthcare expenditure reduction  
39 was associated with HEF membership and using public healthcare facilities in these populations.

40 *Conclusion:* Overall public healthcare utilization was relatively low; however, it was higher in  
41 people with chronic conditions. HEF membership and *community-based care* contributed to  
42 higher public healthcare utilization among people with chronic conditions. Using public  
43 healthcare services regardless of HEF status reduced healthcare expenditure, but the reduction in  
44 spending was more noticeable in people with HEF membership. To increase public healthcare  
45 utilization among people with T2D and/or HTN, the public healthcare system should further

46 improve care quality, expand social health protection, and expand *community-based care* for this  
47 population. However, these may require more time and resources. One potential strategy in the  
48 short run is to partner the private sector with the public sector.

49 **STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY**

- 50       ▪ Our study is among the few to examine healthcare utilization and expenditure among  
51       people with two major chronic conditions type 2 diabetes (T2D) and/or hypertension  
52       (HTN) in Cambodia, in comparison with the people without the two conditions.
- 53       ▪ The findings in this study provides could inform decision-makers about strategies for  
54       T2D and HTN management in Cambodia and similar settings.
- 55       ▪ Our study is not representative for the national level as most of the study sites we selected  
56       were rural or semi-rural.
- 57       ▪ We only calculated the healthcare expenditure for those who used the service in the three  
58       months preceding the study, which cannot be generalized to the target population in the  
59       study (people aged 40 years or older).

60

## 61 INTRODUCTION

62 Type 2 diabetes (T2D) and hypertension (HTN) are global public health concerns. They are  
63 major risk factors for cardiovascular diseases, causing about 31% (17.9 million) of all deaths  
64 worldwide annually.<sup>1</sup> The prevalence of people with T2D and/or HTN will likely continue to  
65 increase.<sup>2 3</sup> These two diseases disproportionately affect low- and middle-income countries and  
66 account for around 75% of all deaths in these countries.<sup>1</sup>

67 In Cambodia, large-scale population-based studies such as STEPS Surveys have shed light on the  
68 prevalence and risk factors of chronic diseases. The prevalence of T2D and HTN rose noticeably  
69 over recent years from 2.9% and 11.2% in the population aged 25–64 years in 2010 to 9.6% and  
70 14.2% in the population aged 18–69 years in 2016, respectively.<sup>4</sup>

71 Previous nationally representative surveys have shown that a majority of the population seeks  
72 outpatient curative care in private facilities, but knowledge on the related healthcare uptake and  
73 expenditure among those with T2D and/or HTN is scarce.<sup>5</sup> Additionally, these surveys do not  
74 cover topics related to the management of the diseases, such as healthcare utilization and  
75 expenditure.<sup>6 7</sup> There is only one study by Bigdeli *et al.* which examines access to care for people  
76 with T2D and/or HTN concerning social health protection schemes in Cambodia.<sup>8</sup> This study  
77 shows that 61% of the people with T2D and/or HTN who knew their status were diagnosed in  
78 private facilities.<sup>8</sup> However, this study collected data in 2013, before key interventions were  
79 introduced or expanded in public healthcare facilities.<sup>9</sup> Also, it provides limited information  
80 about which types of health facilities were used, and what differences exist between people with  
81 one or both conditions compared to those without.

82 In the last decade, the Cambodian Ministry of Health (MoH), in collaboration with development  
83 partners, made significant efforts to improve the quality of public healthcare and initiated a few

84 healthcare delivery models for people with T2D and/or HTN in public facilities.<sup>9</sup> These models  
85 include *hospital-based care*, *health center-based care*, *community-based care* and a combination  
86 of all three models (*coexisting care*) (Box 1). These efforts might have changed the pattern of  
87 healthcare utilization and related expenditure, especially among people with T2D and/or HTN.

88

### 89 **Box 1. Overview of different care models in Cambodia in 2021**

- The *hospital-based care* model is standard care, which means an operational district (OD) has a government-run Non-communicable Disease (NCD) clinic at the district referral hospitals.<sup>9</sup> By 2021, 31 out of 117 referral hospitals had implemented this model.
- The *health center-based care* model adopts the World Health Organization Package of Essential Non-communicable Disease Interventions (WHO PEN).<sup>9</sup> In this model, the MoH added the function of a health center to *hospital-based care*. However, the coverage of health centers with the WHO PEN varies in each OD, which can be divided into low coverage (<50% of all health centers implement the WHO PEN; *health center-based care (low)*) and high coverage ( $\geq$ 50% of all health centers implement the WHO PEN; *health center-based care (high)*). The referral flow is slightly different between T2D and HTN. For T2D, this model identifies cases in the health centers through a screening test. If the patients are suspected of having T2D, health centers refer them to a diabetes clinic at a district referral hospital for confirmation of diagnosis. Once diagnosed, severe cases are treated in the hospital clinic, and stable or mild cases are followed up regularly at the health centers. For HTN, the health centers treat mild patients and refer the severe cases to the referral

hospital. By 2021, *health center-based care* was implemented in 137 of 1,221 health centers.

- The *community-based care* model or peer education network established and run by MoPoTsyo, a local non-governmental organization.<sup>9</sup> In this model, peer educators (PEs) are added to hospital-based care. MoPoTsyo trained people with T2D and/or HTN to be PEs. These PEs play a role in screening and referring those suspected of having T2D and/or HTN to seek medical consultation and treatment at the referral hospitals that MoPoTsyo has partnered with. The PEs also provide counseling on lifestyle changes and support self-management to registered network members. By 2019, this *community-based care* model had been implemented in 20 of 102 ODs in 8 of 25 provinces in Cambodia.<sup>9 10</sup> It had 225 PEs to serve 40,000 people with T2D.<sup>10</sup>
- The *coexisting care* model comprises a combination of the above three models. At the time of the study until 2021, only one OD (Daunkeo) had this model.

90

91 A better understanding of the current patterns of healthcare utilization and expenditure among  
92 people with T2D and/or HTN is critical for better targeting resources and strategies to improve  
93 the management of T2D and HTN. The main objectives of this study are two-fold. First, it  
94 evaluates usage and determines the factors associated with public healthcare use in four groups:  
95 (1) people without T2D or HTN, (2) people with T2D alone, (3) people with HTN alone, and (4)  
96 people with T2D plus HTN. Second, it assesses the healthcare expenditure in the three months  
97 preceding the survey for all services used by the four patient groups in public and private  
98 facilities and determines factors associated with (reducing or increasing) healthcare expenditure.





## 100 **METHODS AND CONTEXT**

### 101 **Context**

102 The health system in Cambodia is pluralistic, meaning healthcare services are provided by both  
103 public and private healthcare providers.<sup>5 11</sup>

104 *Public healthcare services* in Cambodia dominate preventive services (reproductive, maternal,  
105 neonatal, and child health), control of primary disease (tuberculosis, malaria, and HIV/AIDS  
106 control), and inpatient treatment.<sup>5</sup> The facilities include health posts, health centers, district  
107 referral hospitals, provincial referral hospitals, and national hospitals.<sup>5</sup> Public healthcare is  
108 organized per operational district (OD)—the third and last administrative level in Cambodia’s  
109 health system management.<sup>5</sup> An OD covers a population of 100,000–200,000 people while a  
110 health center covers a population of 10,000–20,000 people.<sup>5</sup> Remote areas with a small  
111 population can be covered by a health post.<sup>5</sup> The health post provides similar services to a health  
112 center, but it is smaller than a health center.<sup>5</sup> Each OD usually has one district referral hospital  
113 with a few ODs having two district hospitals.<sup>5</sup> The district referral hospital receives self-referred  
114 patients or those referred by the health centers.

115 Alongside this public sector, a large *private healthcare sector*, which is more accessible than the  
116 public sector, dominates outpatient curative care.<sup>5</sup> Since 1994, the Cambodian government  
117 started economic liberalization, permitting staff to work outside their government’s working  
118 hours and own healthcare facilities.<sup>5</sup> Since then, the private healthcare sector and dual practice,  
119 meaning public healthcare workers also have private practices, have grown rapidly. In 2015, over  
120 50% of the healthcare workforce in private healthcare facilities were government personnel.<sup>5</sup> The  
121 private healthcare facilities range from cabinets, laboratories, pharmacies, clinics, and polyclinics  
122 to hospitals.<sup>5</sup> Cabinets are the smallest facilities with less than two beds and mainly provide

123 medical consultation services.<sup>12 13</sup> According to the MoH Progress Report in 2018, over 90% of  
124 private healthcare facilities were cabinets.<sup>12 13</sup> The second most frequent facilities were clinics  
125 (3.2%), providing medical specialties, laboratories, radiology services, and pharmacies.<sup>12</sup> A  
126 clinic has between 10 and 20 beds.<sup>12</sup> In addition, buying medication in pharmacies or drugstores  
127 for self-treatment without a doctor's prescription is common in Cambodia, although not  
128 permitted by law.<sup>14</sup>

129 In terms of health expenditure, the public healthcare sector did not charge user fees until 1996.<sup>5</sup>  
130 In that year, the government also introduced a user-fee scheme for the public sector with fees  
131 approved by the local community to increase healthcare quality at public healthcare facilities.<sup>5 15</sup>  
132 The revenue from the user-fee scheme could be used to incentivize staff and support ongoing  
133 operations. However, the user-fee posed challenges for the poor to access public healthcare. To  
134 address this, the MoH established the Health Equity Fund (HEF) in 2000, a pro-poor social  
135 health protection scheme.<sup>16</sup> The HEF is linked to the implementation of identification of the poor  
136 (known as "IDPoor").<sup>17</sup> It is intended for the "extremely poor" or "poor" category, which is  
137 assessed and verified by the local authorities.<sup>17</sup> People with IDPoor are entitled to the HEF,  
138 meaning that they receive free healthcare services at public healthcare facilities and  
139 transportation expenditure reimbursement.<sup>17</sup> By 2019, the HEF covered approximately three  
140 million or about 20% of Cambodia's population.<sup>16</sup> Another scheme was the National Social  
141 Security Fund (NSSF), established in 2007.<sup>18</sup> The NSSF covers work and non-work-related  
142 illnesses and injuries for formally employed people.<sup>18</sup> Formal employers are mandated to pay for  
143 their staff's NSSF membership. The NSSF had enrolled over 1.7 million employees or about  
144 11% of the population by 2019.<sup>19</sup>

145 However, it is important to note that several studies have indicated that the private sector  
146 constitutes a significant source for out-of-pocket expenditure (OOPE).<sup>20 21</sup> Between 2009 and  
147 2016, around 60% of health expenditure was OOPE while the rest was a combination of the  
148 government's and development partners' budgets. The OOPE per capita increased slightly from  
149 USD 40.6 in 2009 to USD 48.1 in 2016.<sup>21</sup> In 2016, 76.6% of the total OOPE was linked to  
150 private healthcare.<sup>20 21</sup>

151

## 152 **Data sources**

153 This study is part of a larger cross-sectional household survey, with the primary aim of  
154 developing a care cascade for T2D and HTN.

155

## 156 **Settings**

157 The study purposively selected five ODs. The selection was made to include different T2D  
158 and/or HTN care models piloted in Cambodia: *coexisting care*, *community-based care*, *health-*  
159 *center based care (high)*, *health-center based care (low)*, and *hospital-based care* (Box 1).

160 The five ODs in which the study took place are out of 103 ODs in the country and located in five  
161 different provinces. The map of ODs is presented in Annexure 1. These ODs have similar road  
162 infrastructure improvements, in which poor road conditions are no longer a barrier to accessing  
163 healthcare.

164     ▪ *OD Daunkeo, Takeo province*: This OD had the “*coexisting care*” model. At the time of  
165 the study, it was the only OD in which the three care models coexisted. The catchment  
166 area included Takeo town and a large rural area. Its NCD clinic was established in 2002,  
167 and the peer educator network was initiated in 2007 and handed over to the MoH in

168 2015.<sup>22</sup> The WHO PEN was implemented in 5 out of 14 health centers since 2015. The  
169 private services for people with T2D and/or HTN may also be easily accessible.

170 ■ *OD Kong Pisey, Kampong Speu province:* This OD had the “*community-based care*”  
171 model. It has a strong MoPoTsyo network to provide T2D and HTN care to patients.  
172 Located about 54 kilometers from the capital of Phnom Penh, this OD is semi-urban with  
173 a variety of private facilities.

174 ■ *OD Pearaing, Prey Veng province:* This OD had the “*health center-based (high)*” model,  
175 and was the OD with high coverage of the WHO PEN. Six out of nine health centers in  
176 this OD have been piloting the WHO PEN since 2015. Due to dual practice, the high  
177 coverage of the WHO PEN also facilitates accessible private services for people with  
178 T2D and/or HTN.

179 ■ *OD Sot Nikum, Siem Reap province:* This OD had the “*health center-based (low)*”  
180 model, and was the OD with low coverage of the WHO PEN (6/25 of the health centers  
181 started the WHO PEN in 2018). This OD has been historically and significantly  
182 influenced by the financial support of various development partners, and services for  
183 people with T2D and/or HTN have been well arranged at its NCD clinic.<sup>23</sup>

184 ■ *OD Samrong, Oddar Meanchey province:* This OD had a “*hospital-based care*” model. It  
185 had an NCD clinic without the WHO PEN and peer educator network. A large part of the  
186 catchment is a remote area bordering Thailand, approximately 470 kilometers from the  
187 capital. Therefore, the private services for people with T2D and/or HTN may not be  
188 broadly accessible.

189

190 **Samples**

191 The larger household survey recruited 5,072 individuals aged 40 years or older to participate in  
192 the study using a multi-stage cluster sampling method. Initially, it purposively chose five ODs  
193 with different care models for T2D and HTN. Second, 44 villages per OD were randomly  
194 selected, regardless of the population size of each OD. The purpose of this equal probability  
195 selection was to over-sample participants in ODs with a smaller population so that they would  
196 have an adequate sample for each care model. Third, 24 households in each village were selected  
197 by probability systematic sampling, and finally, one person aged 40 years or older per household  
198 was selected at random. To minimize the non-response rate, which can unintentionally exclude a  
199 certain group of the target population from the survey, the selected participants were called back  
200 or followed-up three times when they were absent from their household. If the attempt failed,  
201 another household in the next row in the sampling list was selected. Then, the procedure  
202 described above was repeated. The equal probability selection at the village and household levels  
203 were used with the OD level's same purpose.

204 To correspond to our analytical objective, we used a subset of this sample: we only retained  
205 those who reported using healthcare services at least once in the three months preceding the  
206 survey (Figure 1). A total of 2,360/5,072 participants met this criterion. The 2,360-participant  
207 sample subset included four patient groups: 1,331 people without T2D and HTN, 761 people  
208 with HTN alone, 109 people with T2D alone, and 159 people with T2D plus HTN.

209

210 **Figure 1. Data flow from household selection to final dataset in this study,**

211 **Cambodia, 2020**

212  
213 **Data collection**

214 The data collection took place between July and October 2020. The data collection was  
215 conducted in three steps following the WHO's STEPS Survey approach: (1) interviews with a  
216 structured questionnaire, (2) anthropometric measurements, and (3) biochemical measurements.<sup>6</sup>

217 <sup>7</sup> Since our study only focuses on healthcare utilization and expenditure, we only used  
218 information from step 1—interviews with a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was  
219 tablet-based and comprised of 11 sections, including socio-demographic information, health  
220 status and quality of life, healthcare utilization, social support, lifestyle or behavior measures,  
221 physical activity, diabetes and hypertension knowledge, medication adherence, self-management  
222 support, and decision-making power on food. However, we only used two sections in our  
223 analysis: socio-demographic information and healthcare utilization.

224 The tablet-based questionnaire was installed using the Kobo Toolbox  
225 (<https://kf.kobotoolbox.org>), an open-source software with a free-of-charge server and online  
226 storage.<sup>24</sup>

227 **Measures**

228 This study's primary variable of interest is the number of visits to public and private facilities.  
229 By public healthcare facilities, we refer to government-run facilities that provide medical  
230 services, and include national hospitals, provincial referral hospitals, district referral hospitals,  
231 health centers, and health posts. A health post is similar to a health center, and only a few exist in  
232 remote areas. Therefore, we grouped them with health centers. Private healthcare services are  
233 non-government organizations that provide medical and non-medical services, and include

234 private hospitals, private clinics, pharmacies, homes of trained health workers, and visits of  
235 health workers to the patients' homes. Traditional healing/medicine and using healthcare services  
236 abroad have also been included in this category.

237 The secondary variable of interest was healthcare expenditure, the lump sum expenditure of  
238 medical consultation, treatment, and medication. These data were obtained from the interview  
239 with the participants. They were asked about their use of health services in the three months  
240 preceding the survey (where they went, how often they went to a particular type of healthcare  
241 facility, and how much they spent in each facility in those three months). We include the  
242 questionnaire in Annexure 2. The Cambodian currency (riels) was converted into USD at an  
243 exchange rate of 4,000 riels per USD. The expenditure does not include other spendings such as  
244 on transport, food, or guesthouses/hotels.

245 To better understand the profile of people using public or private healthcare facilities, we  
246 estimated associations between the use of public and private healthcare services and patient  
247 characteristics such as sex (male, female), age (40–49, 50–59, 60+ years old), educational level  
248 (none, primary, secondary or higher), social protection status (NSSF (yes, no), HEF (yes, no)),  
249 wealth quintile (poorest, poor, medium, rich, richest), type of care models (*hospital-based*, *health*  
250 *center-based (high)*, *health center-based (low)*, and *community-based*). The details on wealth  
251 quintile calculation (socio-economic class) are described in Annexure 3.

252

## 253 **Analysis**

254 Healthcare utilization

255 Taking the number of visits as a dependent variable, we report the healthcare visit rate to public  
256 and private facilities over the three months preceding the survey, then stratified by patient  
257 groups.

258 To identify the independent factors associated with healthcare utilization (defined by the number  
259 of visits), we first used bivariate negative binomial regression to identify the potential factors in  
260 the five groups—overall and four patient groups—separately. Variables with a  $P$ -value $<0.25$  in  
261 at least one of the four patient groups or overall group were included in the multiple negative  
262 binomial regression. The exposure variable (total healthcare visits of each participant) was  
263 incorporated into this model. Variables with a  $P$ -value $<0.05$  were considered statistically  
264 significant in this final model. The negative binomial regression was chosen over Poisson  
265 regression because the number of visits was over-dispersed.

266

267 Medical expenditure

268 We took healthcare expenditure in the three months preceding the survey as the dependent  
269 variable. Due to the limitation of our data, we focused more on assessing the factors associated  
270 with healthcare expenditure and did not explore the overall medical expenditure. We reported the  
271 overall arithmetic mean and then stratified the mean by patient groups. The expenditure was  
272 calculated separately for each patient group. Because arithmetic means can be easily affected by  
273 extremely high values, we removed the values above the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile, which we believe were  
274 too high in our sample.

275 Our analysis was carried out in three steps to separately identify the independent factors  
276 associated with healthcare expenditure in the four patient groups. First, a logarithmic  
277 transformation of the medical expenditure was performed as the data was skewed to the right.



278 Second, in the bivariate analysis, we compared the geometric mean of healthcare expenditure by  
279 characteristics of the participants. This analysis identified the variables potentially associated  
280 with the healthcare expenditure at a  $P$ -value $<0.25$ . During this phase, the Student's  $t$ -test for  
281 binary explanatory variables and the one-way ANOVA test for non-binary explanatory variables  
282 were used. Variables with a significant level at a  $P$ -value $<0.25$  in any patient group were  
283 included in the multiple linear regression. Third, multiple linear regression was performed and  
284 the coefficient and 95% confidence interval (CI) values were exponentiated to a risk ratio (RR)  
285 for better interpretation.

286 Data were analyzed using Stata 16.0 (Stata Corp LLC, College Station, Texas 77, USA), and R  
287 programming's GGLOT2 package was used to produce the graphs.

288

### 289 **Ethical approval**

290 The protocol was approved by the National Ethics Committee for Human Research (NECHR) on  
291 April 29, 2019 (No. 105 NECHR) and by the Institutional Review Board of Institute of Tropical  
292 Medicine (Antwerp) on October 25, 2019 (No. 1,323/19). All participants provided their consent  
293 and volunteered to take part in the study.

294

### 295 **Patient and public involvement**

296 No patient was involved in the development of the research question and outcome measures,  
297 study design, and study participant recruitment. The findings are not disseminated to the study  
298 participants.

299

300 **RESULTS**

301 **Characteristics of participants**

302 Our analysis included 2,360 participants, including 1,331 people without T2D or HTN, 761  
 303 people with HTN alone, 109 with T2D alone, and 159 with T2D plus HTN. The other  
 304 participants were excluded because they had not used healthcare services in the three months  
 305 preceding the survey (N=2,703) or had a missing response to the primary variable of interest  
 306 (N=9).

307 Females were more prevalent in all patient groups, especially in the T2D plus HTN group. The  
 308 age range was between 40 and 96 years, with people with HTN and T2D plus HTN having a  
 309 significantly higher average age than those without the two conditions. The majority of  
 310 participants did not attend school or attended only primary school.

311 Regarding the social health protection scheme, a small proportion of participants in all groups  
 312 had the NSSF membership (4.8% overall). A larger proportion of patients across all groups had  
 313 the HEF membership (18.4% overall).

314

315 Table 1. Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of participant, 2020, Cambodia

Variable	Overall (N=2360)	No T2D/HTN (N=1331)	HTN (N=761)	T2D (N=109)	T2D plus HTN (N=159)	P- value
		n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	
Sex of participant						
Male	689 (29.2)	457 (34.3)	179 (23.5)	29 (26.6)	24 (15.1)	<0.001
Female	1671 (70.8)	874 (65.7)	582 (76.5)	80 (73.4)	135 (84.9)	
Age in years						
Range	40–96	40–96	40–90	40–81	40–82	
Mean (±SD)	58.5 (±10.4)	56.0 (±10.3)	62.4 (±10.0)	57.6 (±8.4)	61.7 (±8.2)	<0.001
40–49	497 (21.1)	398 (29.9)	75 (9.9)	17 (15.6)	7 (4.4)	<0.001
50–59	803 (34.0)	464 (34.9)	231 (30.4)	46 (42.2)	62 (39.0)	
60 or older	1060 (44.9)	469 (35.2)	455 (59.8)	46 (42.2)	90 (56.6)	
Educational level						
No formal schooling	757 (32.1)	393 (29.5)	283 (37.2)	35 (32.1)	46 (28.9)	<0.016
Primary school	1308 (55.4)	755 (56.7)	398 (52.3)	61 (56.0)	94 (59.1)	
Secondary school or higher	295 (12.5)	183 (13.7)	80 (10.5)	13 (11.9)	19 (11.9)	

Having NSSF membership (yes)	114 (4.8)	62 (4.7)	36 (4.7)	6 (5.5)	10 (6.3)	0.806
Having HEF membership (yes)	434 (18.4)	247 (18.6)	143 (18.8)	18 (16.5)	26 (16.4)	0.849
Wealth quintile						
Poorest	441 (18.7)	261 (19.6)	140 (18.4)	16 (14.7)	24 (15.1)	0.050
Poor	447 (18.9)	263 (19.8)	139 (18.3)	18 (16.5)	27 (17.0)	
Medium	467 (19.8)	262 (19.7)	144 (18.9)	27 (24.8)	34 (21.4)	
Rich	480 (20.3)	244 (18.3)	176 (23.1)	16 (14.7)	44 (27.7)	
Richest	525 (22.2)	301 (22.6)	162 (21.3)	32 (29.4)	30 (18.9)	
Care model						
Coexisting	432 (18.3)	248 (18.6)	147 (19.3)	20 (18.3)	17 (10.7)	0.015
Community-based	480 (20.3)	276 (20.7)	153 (20.1)	18 (16.5)	33 (20.8)	
Health center-based (high)	486 (20.6)	257 (19.3)	174 (22.9)	27 (24.8)	28 (17.6)	
Health center-based (low)	518 (22.0)	292 (21.9)	170 (22.3)	18 (16.5)	38 (23.9)	
Hospital-based	444 (18.8)	258 (19.4)	117 (15.4)	26 (23.9)	43 (27.0)	

316 *Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; NSSF, National Social Security Fund; HEF, Health Equity Fund*

317 *Note: Health center-based (high) means the OD with high coverage (six out of nine) of health centers with the WHO*

318 *PEN; Health center-based (low) means the OD with low coverage (six out of 25) of health centers with the WHO*

319 *PEN*

320

### 321 **Public and private healthcare utilization**

322 The 2,360 individuals reported 6,645 visits to the healthcare facilities in the three months

323 preceding the survey, averaging 2.8 visits per person over three months.

324 Figure 2 presents the proportion of visits to public and private healthcare facilities. At the facility

325 level, as shown in Figure 2A, the largest share was accounted for by private clinics (28.5%),

326 followed by visits to the private homes of nurses or doctors (15.6%), private pharmacies

327 (15.3%), health centers (12.6%), and private hospitals (11.6%).

328 The common public healthcare facilities used by participants with T2D and T2D plus HTN were

329 provincial/national and district referral hospitals (Figure 2A). Approximately 29.7% of visits

330 from people with T2D and 29.6% from people with T2D plus HTN went to provincial/national

331 and district hospitals (Figure 2A). These proportions were higher than 6.9% for people without

332 T2D or HTN and 6.1% for HTN only.

333 Overall, the private sector occupied about 78.0% of the total visits, and the public sector

334 occupied 22.0% (Figure 2B). All groups visited private healthcare facilities more frequently than

335 public healthcare facilities (Figure 2). However, the frequency of visiting public facilities was

336 statistically higher in people with T2D and T2D plus HTN. As shown in Figure 2B, 37.2% of  
 337 visits from people with T2D and 34.7% of visits from people with T2D plus HTN were to public  
 338 healthcare facilities, compared with 18.9% of visits from people without the two conditions and  
 339 21.7% of the visits from people with HTN ( $P$ -value<0.001).

340

341 **Figure 2. Proportion of visits to public and private facilities in Cambodia, 2020**

342

343 **Public healthcare utilization by participant characteristics**

344 Table 2 compares the public healthcare facility user rates defined as the proportion of public  
 345 healthcare visits over total visits (public visits plus private visits). The user rates were  
 346 disaggregated by participant characteristics. In this bivariate analysis, age, NSSF, HEF, wealth  
 347 quintile, and care model were significantly associated with public healthcare utilization at a  $P$ -  
 348 value<0.25 in at least one patient group. Therefore, we included these variables in the multiple  
 349 negative binomial regressions.

350

351 Table 2. Proportions of visits to public facilities by participant characteristics, 2020, Cambodia

Variable	Overall (N=6645)		No T2D/HTN (N=3467)	HTN (N=2345)	T2D (N=320)	T2D plus HTN (N=513)
	User (%)	rate	User rate (%)	User rate (%)	User rate (%)	User rate (%)
Sex						
Male		20.9	17.9	21.9	47.2	26.4
Female		23.7	20.7	23.2	33.3	37.6
$P$ -value		0.936	0.803	0.879	0.552	0.847
Age in years						
40–49		17.5	14.8	27.4	23.8	32.1
50–59		24.3	22.4	19.2	35	51.4
60+		24.0	21.1	24.2	43.5	26.3
$P$ -value		0.442	<b>0.096</b>	0.601	0.708	0.254
Educational level						
No schooling		21.9	20.1	19.3	37.5	39.6
Primary		22.9	18.8	23.2	45	34.6
Secondary/higher		25.5	22.6	33.1	—	29.5

<i>P</i> -value	0.998	0.981	0.606	0.92	0.932
Having NSSF membership					
No	22.2	19.9	21.2	37.5	33.3
Yes	35.9	17.1	52.4	31.6	66.7
<i>P</i> -value	0.512	0.4505	<b>0.165</b>	0.808	0.343
Having HEF membership					
No	19.8	18	18.3	34.2	29.5
Yes	35.7	27.5	39.5	55.6	65.1
<i>P</i> -value	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.014</b>	0.346	<b>0.04</b>
Household socio-economic class					
Poorest	28.2	20.4	33.5	54.5	58
Poor	24.9	23.5	23.3	27.3	42.7
Medium	22.3	15.2	25.7	36.6	37.5
Rich	22.1	20.5	19.9	50	30
Richest	18.1	18.9	14.8	29.9	16.5
<i>P</i> -value	0.029	0.419	<b>0.083</b>	0.966	<b>0.218</b>
Care model					
Coexisting	31.1	25.8	36.6	53.0	20.0
Community-based	19.5	18.0	13.6	56.8	39.2
Health center-based (high)	14.7	13.2	14.8	19.0	23.8
Health center-based (low)	21.4	21.5	16.6	46.7	32.7
Hospital-based	24.4	16.3	29.7	22.5	42.9
<i>P</i> -value	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.007</b>	<b>0.018</b>	<b>0.172</b>	<b>0.162</b>

Abbreviation: NSSF, National Social Security Fund; HEF, Health Equity Fund

Note:

- The % of private healthcare is not presented in this table but can it be calculated by subtracting the % of the public healthcare from 100%.
- Health center-based (high) means the OD with high coverage (six out of nine) of health centers with the WHO PEN; Health center-based (low) means the OD with low coverage (six out of 25) of health centers with the WHO PEN
- “N” denotes the total of visits.
- *P*-values<0.25 are in bold, indicating a significant level at 0.25. Variables with *P*-value<0.25 were included in multivariate analysis.

352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361

362

363 Table 3 presents the results of the multiple negative binomial regressions. Overall, the significant  
364 increase in public healthcare use was associated with having T2D and T2D plus HTN, living in  
365 the OD with *coexisting care*, and HEF membership.

366 In people without T2D or HTN, HEF membership was significantly associated with public  
367 healthcare use: adjusted incidence rate ratio (AIRR) of 1.4 [95% CI 1.0–2.0], *P*-value<0.05). We  
368 did not observe the same association in the other three groups.

369 In people with HTN, the poorest category was significantly associated with increasing public  
 370 healthcare use with an AIRR of 2.1 [95% CI 1.1–4.0],  $P$ -value=0.02), compared to those in the  
 371 richest category. Nevertheless, the same association was not seen in other patient groups.  
 372 Regarding the care model, in people with T2D, the OD with *community-based care* (AIRR 3.7  
 373 [95% CI 1.2–11.3],  $P$ -value=0.019) and the OD with low coverage of *health center-based care*  
 374 (AIRR 3.3 [95% CI 1.1–9.8],  $P$ -value=0.036) were significantly higher in public healthcare use  
 375 than in the OD with *hospital-based care*.  
 376 In people with T2D plus HTN, the OD with *coexisting care* was associated with higher public  
 377 healthcare use (AIRR 4.0 [95% CI 1.2–12.9],  $P$ -value=0.020).

378  
 379 Table 3. Factors associated with public healthcare use, 2020, Cambodia

	Overall (N=2360)	No T2D/HTN (N=1331)	HTN (N=161)	T2D (N=109)	T2D plus HTN (N=759)
Disease group	AIRR [95% CI]	AIRR [95% CI]	AIRR [95% CI]	AIRR [95% CI]	AIRR [95% CI]
No T2D/HTN	Ref.	—	—	—	—
HTN	1.0 [0.8–1.2]	—	—	—	—
T2D	<b>1.9 [1.3–2.9]**</b>	—	—	—	—
T2D plus HTN	<b>1.9 [1.3–2.7]***</b>	—	—	—	—
Age in year					
40–49	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	
50–59	1.2 [0.9–1.5]	1.4 [1.0–1.9]	0.6 [0.3–1.2]	1.5 [0.5–4.5]	1.2 [0.3–4.2]
60+	1.1 [0.8–1.4]	1.2 [0.9–1.7]	0.7 [0.4–1.3]	1.5 [0.5–4.5]	0.6 [0.2–2.2]
Having NSSF membership					
No	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	
Yes	1.4 [0.9–2.1]	1.0 [0.5–1.8]	2.0 [0.9–4.6]	2.3 [0.5–10.1]	1.9 [0.7–4.8]
Having HEF membership					
No		Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	
Yes	<b>1.4 [1.1–1.8]*</b>	<b>1.4 [1.0–2.0]*</b>	1.4 [0.9–2.3]	2.1 [0.8–5.1]	<b>1.9 [1.0–3.7]</b>
Household socio-economic class					
Poorest	<b>1.4 [1.0–2.0]*</b>	1.0 [0.7–1.6]	<b>2.1 [1.1–4.0]*</b>	1.2 [0.4–3.5]	2.6 [0.9–7.1]
Poor	1.2 [0.9–1.7]	1.1 [0.7–1.7]	1.2 [0.7–2.3]	0.7 [0.2–2.1]	2.6 [1.0–7.3]
Medium	1.1 [0.8–1.5]	0.9 [0.6–1.4]	1.2 [0.7–2.3]	0.9 [0.4–2.2]	3.0 [1.2–7.7]
Rich	1.1 [0.8–1.4]	1.1 [0.7–1.7]	1.0 [0.6–1.8]	1.2 [0.4–3.5]	1.7 [0.7–4.1]
Richest	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Care model					
Coexisting	<b>1.4 [1.0–1.9]*</b>	1.5 [1.0–2.3]	1.3 [0.7–2.3]	2.5 [0.8–7.6]	<b>4.0 [1.2–12.9]*</b>
Community-based	0.9 [0.7–1.2]	1.0 [0.6–1.5]	0.5 [0.3–1.0]	<b>3.7 [1.2–11.3]*</b>	1.7 [0.5–6.1]

Health center-based (high)	0.8 [0.6–1.1]	0.8 [0.5–1.3]	0.7 [0.4–1.3]	1.3 [0.4–3.9]	2.7 [0.9–8.8]
Health center-based (low)	1.0 [0.8–1.4]	1.4 [1.0–2.1]	0.6 [0.3–1.0]	<b>3.3 [1.1–9.8]*</b>	3.0 [1.0–9.1]
Hospital-based	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.

380 (\*)  $P$ -value<0.05, (\*\*)  $P$ -value<0.01, (\*\*\*)  $P$ -value<0.001

381 Abbreviation: AIRR, adjusted incidence rate ratio; CI, confidence interval; Ref., reference group; OD, operational

382 district

383 Note: Health center-based (high) means the OD with high coverage (six out of nine) of health centers with the WHO

384 PEN; Health center-based (low) means the OD with low coverage (six out of 25) of health centers with the WHO

385 PEN

386

387

### 388 **Healthcare expenditure**

389 Medical cost per year, overall and by facility

390 Overall, those who used healthcare spent an average of USD 25.3 [95% CI 22.9–27.6] for all

391 healthcare services in the three months preceding the survey (Figure 3).

392 When comparing patient groups, people with T2D plus HTN had the highest healthcare

393 expenditure with an average of USD 43.6 [95% CI 29.7–57.2], followed by people with T2D

394 with an average of USD 34.0 [95% CI 25.5–42.6]. These expenditures were statistically higher

395 than the average of USD 17.1 [95% CI 13.1–21.1] in people with HTN and the average of USD

396 26.9 [95% CI 23.9–29.9] in people without the two conditions with a  $P$ -value<0.001.

397

### 398 **Figure 3. Healthcare expenditure by patient groups in the three months preceding** 399 **the survey in 2020, Cambodia**

400

401 Table S1 shows the arithmetic mean of healthcare expenditure (Annexure 4). The arithmetic

402 mean is the mean before the data log-transformation. Since our model's Risk Ratio (RR) in Table

403 4 is the geometric mean (after log-transformation) ratio, we presented the geometric mean in

404 Table S2 (Annexure 4). In the bivariate analysis, sex, age, NSSF, HEF, wealth quintile, sector

405 (public vs. private), and care model were statistically associated with healthcare expenditure in  
 406 one or more patient groups with a  $P$ -value<0.25. These variables were included in the multiple  
 407 linear regression.

408 Table 5 presents results from multiple linear regression. Overall, having T2D or T2D plus HTN,  
 409 being female, having reported using both private and public healthcare, and living in the OD  
 410 with *community-based care* was significantly associated with increased healthcare expenditure.  
 411 In contrast, holding HEF membership and using public healthcare was significantly associated  
 412 with healthcare expenditure reduction.

413 At the group level, in people without the two conditions, HEF membership was significantly  
 414 associated with a reduction in healthcare expenditure with an adjusted risk ratio (ARR) of 0.7  
 415 [95% CI 0.5–0.8],  $P$ -value<0.001). The same association was seen in people with HTN (ARR of  
 416 0.8 [95% CI 0.6- 1.0],  $P$ -value<0.01), and in T2D plus HTN (ARR of 0.3 [95% CI 0.2–0.6],  $P$ -  
 417 value<0.001). However, the association was not observed in people with T2D.

418 In people without the two conditions, using public healthcare was significantly associated with a  
 419 reduction in the expenditure (ARR of 0.3 [95% CI 0.2–0.3],  $P$ -value<0.001). The association  
 420 was also found in people with HTN (ARR 0.4 [95% CI 0.3–0.5],  $P$ -value<0.001).

421 People with T2D plus HTN who resided in the OD with *community-based care* were  
 422 significantly associated with a higher expenditure with an ARR of 2.0 [95% CI 1.1–3.8],  $P$ -  
 423 value<0.01) than those with *hospital-based care*.

424  
 425 Table 4 Factors associated with reducing or increasing healthcare expenditure in 2020,  
 426 Cambodia

Variable	Overall [N=2142]	No T2D/HTN [N=1187]	HTN [N=726]	T2D [N=98]	T2D plus HTN [N=139]
	ARR [95% CI]	ARR [95% CI]	ARR [95% CI]	ARR [95% CI]	ARR [95% CI]



Disease group						
No T2D/HTN		Ref.	—	—	—	—
HTN	0.9 [0.7–1.0]	—	—	—	—	—
T2D	<b>2.1 [1.6–2.7]***</b>	—	—	—	—	—
T2D plus HTN	<b>1.9 [1.5–2.4]***</b>	—	—	—	—	—
Sex						
Male		Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Female	<b>1.2 [1.1–1.4]**</b>	<b>1.4 [1.2–1.7]***</b>	1.0 [0.8–1.2]	0.7 [0.4–1.5]	1.5 [0.8–2.9]	
Age in years						
40–49	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.		
50–59	1.1 [0.9–1.3]	1.0 [0.8–1.2]	1.4 [1.0–2.0]	1.1 [0.5–2.4]	1.4 [0.5–3.7]	
60+	1.0 [0.9–1.2]	1.1 [0.8–1.3]	1.3 [1.0–1.9]	0.9 [0.4–1.9]	1.0 [0.4–2.7]	
Educational level						
No schooling	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Primary	1.0 [0.9–1.1]	1.1 [0.9–1.4]	0.8 [0.7–1.0]	0.9 [0.5–1.7]	1.1 [0.7–1.8]	
Secondary/higher	1.1 [0.8–1.3]	1.2 [0.9–1.6]	0.9 [0.6–1.3]	—	1.6 [0.7–3.7]	
Having NSSF membership						
No	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Yes	0.9 [0.6–1.2]	0.9 [0.6–1.4]	0.9 [0.6–1.4]	0.6 [0.2–2.0]	<b>0.4 [0.2–0.9]*</b>	
Having HEF membership						
No	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Yes	<b>0.7 [0.6–0.8]***</b>	<b>0.7 [0.5–0.8]***</b>	<b>0.8 [0.6–1.0]***</b>	0.7 [0.3–1.6]	<b>0.3 [0.2–0.6]***</b>	
Household wealth quintile						
Poorest	1.1 [0.9–1.4]	1.3 [0.9–1.7]	1.1 [0.8–1.5]	0.5 [0.2–1.2]	1.1 [0.5–2.2]	
Poor	1.1 [0.9–1.3]	1.1 [0.8–1.4]	1.2 [0.9–1.7]	0.8 [0.3–1.8]	0.6 [0.3–1.3]	
Medium	1.1 [0.9–1.3]	1.1 [0.8–1.4]	1.2 [0.9–1.6]	0.8 [0.4–1.6]	0.9 [0.4–1.7]	
Rich	1.2 [1.0–1.4]	1.3 [1.0–1.7]	1.2 [0.9–1.6]	0.7 [0.3–1.7]	0.9 [0.5–1.7]	
Richest	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Healthcare sector						
Private	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.
Public	<b>0.3 [0.3–0.4]***</b>	<b>0.3 [0.2–0.3]***</b>	<b>0.4 [0.3–0.5]***</b>	0.7 [0.4–1.2]	0.8 [0.5–1.3]	
Both	<b>1.5 [1.1–1.9]***</b>	<b>1.6 [1.1–2.4]**</b>	0.9 [0.4–1.7]	—	1.2 [0.3–5.4]	
OD with different care						
Coexisting	1.0 [0.9–1.3]	1.0 [0.8–1.3]	1.0 [0.7–1.4]	1.0 [0.4–2.6]	1.7 [0.8–3.9]	
Community-based	<b>1.4 [1.1–1.6]**</b>	1.2 [0.9–1.6]	1.3 [1.0–1.9]	1.3 [0.6–3.2]	<b>2.0 [1.1–3.8]**</b>	
Health center-based [high]	1.0 [0.8–1.2]	1.0 [0.7–1.3]	1.1 [0.8–1.5]	0.9 [0.4–1.9]	1.3 [0.7–2.6]	
Health center-based [low]	0.8 [0.7–1.0]	0.8 [0.6–1.0]	0.8 [0.6–1.1]	1.3 [0.5–3.0]	1.5 [0.8–2.6]	
Hospital-based	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.

427 (\*)  $P$ -value < 0.05, (\*\*)  $P$ -value < 0.01, (\*\*\*)  $P$ -value < 0.001

428 Abbreviation: ARR, adjusted risk ratio; CI: confidence interval; Ref., reference group; OD, operational district

429 Note: Health center-based (high) means the OD with high coverage (six out of nine) of health centers with the WHO

430 PEN; Health center-based (low) means the OD with low coverage (six out of 25) of health centers with the WHO

431 PEN;  $P$ -values < 0.05, < 0.01, < 0.001 are in bold, indicating the variables are significantly associated with

432 expenditure

433

434

435 **DISCUSSION**

436 The results show that the use of the public healthcare system remains low for all groups in our  
437 study, with about one in every five healthcare visits taking place in the public sector overall.  
438 People with chronic conditions, HEF membership, living in the OD with *community-based care*  
439 contributed to public healthcare uptake. The healthcare expenditure was significantly reduced  
440 when patients used public healthcare services, regardless of HEF membership. However, the  
441 reduction in spending was more noticeable in people with HEF membership. In contrast,  
442 expenditure was higher among patients living in the OD with *community-based care*.  
443 People in Cambodia predominantly used healthcare in private facilities for outpatient curative  
444 care.<sup>21</sup> Our study showed that this is also the case for people with chronic conditions such as  
445 T2D and HTN although this group had a slightly higher rate of using public healthcare services.  
446 This result is congruent with earlier findings that approximately 61% of T2D and/or HTN  
447 patients received their initial diagnosis in private settings.<sup>8</sup> A qualitative study in Cambodia  
448 suggested that people with T2D did not prefer diabetes services at public facilities because they  
449 were less accessible due to geographical factors or distance and limited medication supply.<sup>25</sup> Our  
450 findings suggest that healthcare quality and access to public healthcare services is still below the  
451 expectations of people. To increase public healthcare utilization, efforts need to be made to  
452 expand the coverage and quality of T2D and HTN services in public healthcare facilities.  
453 However, this may require time and resources, which will have budget implications, while  
454 Cambodia may not be able to increase the budget for health more than its economic growth rate  
455 of about 7% per year.<sup>26</sup> Another approach could be to recognize the role of private healthcare  
456 providers and include them in the coverage schemes. This would mean that they are required to

457 comply with government policies and regulations. The practical, financial, legal, and political  
458 implications of such strategies need to be examined.

459 Previous studies revealed that HEF membership contributed to the health service uptake at public  
460 facilities and reduced healthcare expenditure in general users.<sup>16,27</sup> Our findings extended the  
461 understanding that HEF membership has also increased public healthcare use and substantially  
462 reduced healthcare spending among people with T2D and/or HTN. Since HEF benefits are only  
463 available in public healthcare facilities, it is not surprising that it also contributes to increasing  
464 service uptake in public facilities. These findings suggest that HEF membership should be  
465 expanded among people with chronic conditions, alongside with improving service coverage and  
466 quality. By doing so, the health services with quality for people with T2D and/or HTN will be  
467 more accessible with fewer financial barriers.

468 *Community-based care* contributed to the higher public service uptake among T2D and/or HTN,  
469 but it also contributed to the higher expenditure for the users. In ODs with this model, PEs refer  
470 patients to the public referral hospitals, so it is not surprising that the public service uptake is  
471 slightly higher than other ODs.<sup>28</sup> However, it is somewhat surprising that people with T2D  
472 and/or HTN in the OD with *community-based care* spent more on their health services. This may  
473 be explained by higher unit costs spent by the supply side in *community-based care* to operate  
474 their services, so the patients are charged a higher fee than other models. Our team had  
475 conducted a costing study in 2020 to examine the costs to operate services by different care  
476 models. The study found that the unit costs were higher for T2D and HTN patients in the  
477 *community-based care* than the *hospital-based care* (USD 101 vs. USD 77 for a T2D patient and  
478 USD 83 vs. USD 55 for an HTN patient). The higher unit costs in the *community-based care*  
479 were driven by adding PE components and field activities to the model. The investment in

480 *community-based care* leads to better treatment outcomes, but it is not explored in our study. A  
481 previous study provided limited information that a significant proportion of patients in the  
482 *community-based care* network had achieved fasting blood glucose goals of 126 mg/dl, from  
483 10% to 45%, and blood pressure goals of 140/90 mm Hg, from 58% to 67%, after a 12-month  
484 follow-up.<sup>22</sup> This study, however, did not have a control group (patients outside the network).  
485 From this, we can learn two things. First, the adapting and scaling up of PEs should be done with  
486 a careful budget plan as PEs incur operational costs. Second, a study investigating the treatment  
487 outcomes between different care models and cost-effectiveness remains the gap in Cambodia and  
488 should be conducted for a better decision.

489 There are several strengths in our study. First, our study is among the few to examine healthcare  
490 utilization and expenditure both among people with T2D and/or HTN and people without the two  
491 conditions. It furthermore covers both the public and private sectors. This broad scope renders  
492 the results useful to inform T2D and HTN interventions in Cambodia. Second, we covered a  
493 wide range of ODs with different care models and geographically dispersed, which means that  
494 our participants are heterogeneous. Third, the data collection was robust and ensured a reliable  
495 data set.

496 Our study also had its limitations. First, it may not represent the national level as most of the  
497 study sites (villages) we selected were rural or semi-rural, which may lead to overestimating the  
498 healthcare utilization in public facilities. Second, the ODs were purposively selected with  
499 oversampling the OD with interventions, increasing the service uptake in public facilities. This  
500 may lead to overestimating the public healthcare use in our study. Third, we only calculated the  
501 healthcare expenditure for those who used the service in the three months preceding the survey,  
502 which cannot be generalized to the target population in the study (people aged 40 years or older).

503 However, it is unlikely to be significant because we focused more on factors associated with  
504 increasing or reducing healthcare expenditure. Fourth, the sample size may be relatively small  
505 when we stratified them into four groups. Therefore, variables that were not significantly  
506 associated with the dependent variables in our study may be due to the insufficient sample size.

507

## 508 **CONCLUSION**

509 Healthcare utilization at public healthcare facilities is relatively low for all groups; however, it is  
510 higher in people with chronic conditions. HEF membership and *community-based care*  
511 contributed the higher public healthcare utilization in people with chronic conditions. Using  
512 public healthcare services regardless of HEF status reduced the healthcare expenditure, but the  
513 reduction in spending was more noticeable in people with HEF membership. To increase public  
514 healthcare utilization among people with T2D and/or HTN, the public healthcare system should  
515 further improve care quality, expand social health protection, and expand community-based care  
516 for this population. However, these may require more time and resources. One potential strategy  
517 in the short run is to partner the private sector with the public sector. Future research should link  
518 healthcare use and expenditure across different healthcare models to actual treatment outcomes  
519 to denote areas for further investment.

520

521 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

522 We would like to thank all the participants in the study and all data collectors for carefully  
523 following the instructions.

524

525 **CONFLICT OF INTERESTS**

526 All authors declare no conflict of interest.

527

528 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

529 SC, PI, VT, EW designed the study; SC analyzed data; all authors wrote the manuscript.

530

531 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

532 Data are available on reasonable request. Data are available on reasonable request to Dr. Por Ir  
533 ([ipor@niph.org.kh](mailto:ipor@niph.org.kh)).

534

535 **FUNDING**

536 This work was funded by the Belgian Government through the VLIR-UOS project, the Fourth  
537 Funding Agreement (FA4) Programme (2017–2021) between the Belgian Directorate of  
538 Development Cooperation and the Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, and the Horizon2020  
539 Framework Program of the European Union, grant no 825432.

540

541 **REFERENCES**


- 542 1. World Health Organization. Cardiovascular diseases, 2020. Available:  
543 [http://origin.who.int/cardiovascular\\_diseases/en/](http://origin.who.int/cardiovascular_diseases/en/) [Accessed January 16, 2022].
- 544 2. World Health Organization. Global report on diabetes, 2016. Available:  
545 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241565257> [Accessed January 16, 2022].
- 546 3. World Health Organization. Hypertension, 2019. Available: [https://www.who.int/news-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/hypertension)  
547 [room/fact-sheets/detail/hypertension](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/hypertension) [Accessed January 16, 2022].
- 548 4. University of Health Sciences. National noncommunicable disease risk factor survey: STEPS  
549 survey 2016. Phnom Penh: University of Health Sciences, 2016.
- 550 5. World Health Organization. The Kingdom of Cambodia health system review, 2015.  
551 Available:  
552 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/208213/9789290616917\\_eng.pdf?sequen](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/208213/9789290616917_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)  
553 [ce=1&isAllowed=y](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/208213/9789290616917_eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y) [Accessed January 16, 2022].
- 554 6. University of Health Sciences (UHS) and the Preventive Medicine Department (DPM) of the  
555 Ministry of Health and World Health Organization (WHO). Prevalence of non-  
556 communicable disease risk factors in Cambodia: STEPS Survey, 2010. Available:  
557 [https://www.who.int/ncds/surveillance/steps/2010\\_STEPS\\_Report\\_Cambodia.pdf](https://www.who.int/ncds/surveillance/steps/2010_STEPS_Report_Cambodia.pdf)  
558 [Accessed January 16, 2022].
- 559 7. University of Health Sciences (UHS) and the Preventive Medicine Department (DPM) of the  
560 Ministry of Health and World Health Organization (WHO). Prevalence of non-  
561 communicable disease risk factors in Cambodia: STEPS Survey, 2016.

- 562 8. Bigdeli M, Jacobs B, Men CR, et al. Access to Treatment for Diabetes and Hypertension in  
563 Rural Cambodia: Performance of Existing Social Health Protection Schemes. *PLOS One*  
564 2016;11(1):e0146147.^
- 565 9. Ministry of Health - Cambodia. National standard operating procedure for diabetes and  
566 hypertension management in primary care 2019. Phnom Penh: MoH, 2019.
- 567 10. Rao M, van Pelt M, LoGerfo J, et al. Utilization of diabetes management health care services  
568 and its association with glycemic control among patients participating in a peer educator-  
569 based program in Cambodia. *PloS One* 2020;15(6):e0235037–e37.^
- 570 11. Department of Planning and Health Information. Health information system master plan  
571 2016–2020. Phnom Penh: Cambodian Ministry of Health, 2017.
- 572 12. Health Policy Plus. A Legal and Regulatory Assessment of Private Healthcare Provision in  
573 Cambodia. Washington, DC, USA: Health Policy Plus, 2019.
- 574 13. Ministry of Health - Cambodia. Health Progress Report, 2018. Available:  
575 [http://moh.gov.kh/content/uploads/2017/05/2019\\_MoH-Final01-Low.pdf](http://moh.gov.kh/content/uploads/2017/05/2019_MoH-Final01-Low.pdf) [Accessed  
576 January 16, 2022].
- 577 14. Bureau-Point E, Baxerres C, Chheang S. Self-Medication and the Pharmaceutical System in  
578 Cambodia. *Med Anthropol* 2020;39(8):765–81.^
- 579 15. Jacobs B, Price N. The impact of the introduction of user fees at a district hospital in  
580 Cambodia. *Health Policy Plan* 2004;19(5):310–21.^
- 581 16. Annear PL, Tayu Lee J, Khim K, et al. Protecting the poor? Impact of the national health  
582 equity fund on utilization of government health services in Cambodia, 2006–2013. *BMJ*  
583 *Glob Health* 2019;4(6):e001679.^




- 584 17. Kaba MW, Baesel K, Poch B, et al. IDPoor: a poverty identification programme that enables  
585 collaboration across sectors for maternal and child health in Cambodia. *BMJ*  
586 2018;363:k4698.^
- 587 18. National Social Security Fund (NSSF). Health Insurance Scheme, 2021. Available:  
588 <https://www.nssf.gov.kh/default/health-care-scheme-2/> [Accessed January 16, 2022].
- 589 19. Kolesar RJ, Pheakdey S, Jacobs B, et al. Expanding social health protection in Cambodia: An  
590 assessment of the current coverage potential and gaps, and social equity considerations.  
591 *Int Soc Secur Rev* 2020;73(1):35–63.^
- 592 20. World Health Organization. Regional Office for the Western/Pacific. Cambodia national  
593 health accounts (2012–2016): health expenditure report, 2019. Available:  
594 <http://iris.wpro.who.int/handle/10665.1/14362> [Accessed January 16, 2022].
- 595 21. World Health Organization. Regional Office for the Western/Pacific. Financial health  
596 protection in Cambodia (2009–2016): analysis of data from the Cambodia  
597 Socioeconomic Survey, 2019. Available: <http://iris.wpro.who.int/handle/10665.1/14436>  
598 <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/330701> [Accessed January 16, 2022].
- 599 22. Taniguchi D, LoGerfo J, van Pelt M, et al. Evaluation of a multi-faceted diabetes care  
600 program including community-based peer educators in Takeo province, Cambodia, 2007-  
601 2013. *PloS One* 2017;12(9):e0181582.^
- 602 23. Janssens B, Van Damme W, Raleigh B, et al. Offering integrated care for HIV/AIDS,  
603 diabetes and hypertension within chronic disease clinics in Cambodia. *Bulletin of the*  
604 *World Health Organization* 2007;85(11):880-85.^
- 605 24. KoBoToolbox at the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative. KoBoToolbox, Available:  
606 <https://www.kobotoolbox.org/#home> [Accessed January 16, 2022].

- 607 25. Nang EEK, Dary C, Hsu LY, et al. Patients' and healthcare providers' perspectives of  
608 diabetes management in Cambodia: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(11):e032578–  
609 e78.^
- 610 26. Thin K, Sokbunthoeun S. Assessing government's fiscal space for moving towards universal  
611 health coverage in Cambodia. *Global Journal of Medicine and Public Health*  
612 2017;6(3):11.^
- 613 27. Jithitikulchai T, Feldhaus I, Bauhoff S, et al. Health equity funds as the pathway to universal  
614 coverage in Cambodia: care seeking and financial risk protection. *Health Policy Plan*  
615 2021;36(1):26–34.^
- 616 28. van Olmen J, Eggermont N, van Pelt M, et al. Patient-centred innovation to ensure access to  
617 diabetes care in Cambodia: the case of MoPoTsyo. *J Pharm Policy Pract* 2016;9(1):1.^  
618



### A. Proportion of visits by health facility



### B. Proportion of visits by sector

