Improving the efficiency of scale-up and deployment of community health workers in Mali: a geospatial analysis
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ABSTRACT

Optimising the scale and deployment of community health workers (CHWs) is important for maximizing geographical accessibility of integrated primary health care (PHC) services. Yet little is known about approaches for doing so.

We used geospatial analysis to model optimised scale-up and deployment of CHWs in Mali, to inform strategic and operational planning by the Ministry of Health and Social Development. Accessibility catchments were modelled based on travel time, accounting for barriers to movement. We compared geographic coverage of the estimated population, under-five deaths, and plasmodium falciparum (Pf) malaria cases across different hypothetical optimised CHW networks and identified surpluses and deficits of CHWs compared to the existing CHW network.

A network of 15843 CHW, if optimally deployed, would ensure that 77.3% of the population beyond 5 km of the CSCom (community health centre) and CSRef (referral health facility) network would be within a 30-minute walk of a CHW. The same network would cover an estimated 59.5% of U5 deaths and 58.5% of Pf malaria cases. As an intermediary step, an optimised network of 4500 CHW, primarily filling deficits of CHW in the regions of Kayes, Koulikoro, Sikasso, and Ségou would ensure geographic coverage for 31.3% of the estimated population. There were no important differences in geographic coverage percentage when prioritizing CHW scale-up and deployment based on the estimated population, U5 deaths, or Pf malaria cases.

Our geospatial analysis provides useful information to policymakers and planners in Mali for optimising the scale-up and deployment of CHW and, in turn, for maximizing the value-for-money of resources of investment in CHWs in the context of the country’s health sector reform. Countries with similar interests in optimising the scale and deployment of their CHW workforce may look to Mali as an exemplar model from which to learn.
INTRODUCTION

Achieving universal health coverage (UHC) and ensuring effective pandemic preparedness and response will require increased investment in primary health care (PHC) and strengthening health systems, particularly at the primary health care level and in communities. Community health workers (CHWs) are essential to the PHC approach as members of multidisciplinary PHC teams providing community-based PHC services tailored to population needs and preferences and serving as a trusted bridge between the health system and communities. Investments in CHWs can be cost-effective and equity-promoting, particularly when CHWs are fairly remunerated and well-supported by the health system and communities they serve. Investment in CHWs can also promote economic development and gender equality through fair pay in formal sector jobs, decent working conditions, opportunities for women in leadership roles, as well as social dialogue and collective bargaining. However, globally there is a human resources for health (HRH) shortage, including for CHWs. The WHO estimates a deficit of 18 (range 16-19) million health workers by 2030. This deficit is exacerbated by a maldistribution of HRH, including CHWs, with the most severe effects in Africa, particularly in rural, remote, and under-served geographic areas. As countries strive to increase sustainable financing for HRH, including for CHWs, concurrent efforts are needed to maximize the impact and efficiency of available funding through optimising the scale and deployment of HRH. Global strategies and frameworks from the WHO call for optimising the distribution of HRH and geographical accessibility to integrated PHC services. Geospatial analysis using geographic information systems (GIS) can be a powerful tool in the HRH toolkit in this regard. However, few countries have used geospatial analysis to optimise the scale and deployment of HRH. Previous research has focused on the use of geospatial analysis to assess the geographical accessibility of health facilities, the distribution of health facility-based HRH, and the efficiency of deployment of existing CHW networks and/or optimising the scale-up and efficiency of deployment of CHWs for subnational geographic areas or using a Euclidean distance-based approach. To our knowledge, only three countries have used geospatial analysis with a modelling approach based on travel-time to explore the optimization of the scale and deployment of CHWs at national scale.
In Mali, CHWs – known as *Agents de santé communautaire* or *CHWs* – have been a central part of the country’s HRH at the community level since 2008. At the time of writing, the Ministry of Health and Social Development (MSDS is the French acronym) country was updating the national community health strategy in the context of a new health sector development plan and ongoing health system reform aiming to achieve UHC through primary health care.\textsuperscript{35,36} We used data from a national CHW master list and other spatial datasets in a geospatial analysis to model optimised scale-up and deployment of CHWs in Mali and inform strategic and operational planning by the MSDS. We modelled accessibility catchments based on travel time, accounting for barriers to movement, and compared geographic coverage of the estimated population, under-five deaths, and plasmodium falciparum (*Pf*) malaria cases across hypothetical optimised networks when CHW deployment prioritised the estimated population, under-five deaths, or *Pf* malaria cases. Lastly, we compared a hypothetical optimised CHW network with the existing CHW network to identify surpluses and deficits of CHWs.

**DATA AND METHODS**

**Policy questions**

The MSDS was interested in two policy questions:

1) How can we optimise scale-up and deployment of the CHWs? Is it more efficient to deploy CHWs based on the estimated population, under-five deaths, or *Pf* (*plasmodium falciparum*) malaria cases beyond 5 km of the CSCom and CSRef network? Does one of these approaches perform best overall in terms of efficiency of deployment?

2) What percent of the population beyond 5 km of the CSCom and CSRef network can be covered by an optimised CHW network and how many CHWs are needed to do so? Comparing the existing CHW network and an optimised and scaled-up CHW network, are there deficits/surpluses of CHWs and where are the deficits/surpluses of CHWs located?

**Study setting**

In 2020 the health system included public, private, community, and confessional institutions organized in a decentralized, pyramidal structure with four administrative levels – a tertiary
referral level, a secondary referral level, a primary referral level and a primary level –
overseen by the MSDS. The primary level was composed of public sector community
health centres (*Centres de santé communautaire*, CSCom) and private sector health facilities
staffed by nurses and – in some cases – generalist doctors providing a minimum package of
primary health care services and referral/counter-referral services to/from primary referral
facilities (*Centres de santé de référence*, CSRef) staffed by nurses and doctors trained on
referral services (see Supplementary Fig 1 in S1 Appendix 1 located in the Public Data
Repository). CSCom were designed to serve the population within 5 km. At the base of the
primary level were paid, full-time CHWs providing community-based primary health care
services, including prevention, promotion, and curative services, conducting surveillance
activities, and supervising part-time community health volunteers known as *relais*. The
focus of our analysis was on the CHWs. The *relais* were beyond the scope of the current
analysis.

According to the national community health strategy of 2016-2020, CHWs were defined as a
paid, full-time CHW, recruited from, and living in the community they serve and recognized
by the MSDS as meeting the minimum criteria for CHWs. CHWs were allowed to provide a
standard minimum package of services defined by the MSDS and implemented in the context
of the national community health strategy. This minimum primary health care package
included prevention, promotion, and curative services. This included household visits to
promote reproductive, maternal, newborn, and child health and nutrition, and water and
sanitation interventions; provision of family planning, integrated community case
management (iCCM) of diarrhoea, pneumonia, malaria, and acute malnutrition among
children under-five, monitoring of vital events such as births and deaths, disease surveillance;
participation in mass campaigns (e.g. for childhood vaccinations, distribution of seasonal
malaria chemoprevention, and long-lasting insecticide-treated bednets) and supervision of the
*relais*. CHWs were deployed to CHW sites, i.e., villages selected by the community health
association where the CHWs lived and worked and, in principle, located in rural areas beyond
5 km from a CSCom. CHWs were attached to the nearest CSCom for supervision and
resupply. The catchment of a CHW was defined as the area within 3-4 km of the CHW
site. CHW sites were, in principle, the largest village within the catchment area of the CHW
which also included satellite villages (i.e., villages apart from the CHW site but within the
CHW catchment area and meant to be served by the CHW through outreach). The national
community health strategy 2016-2020 indicated a norm of 1 CHW per 700 population in the
regions of the Center and South (Kayes, Koulikoro, Mopti, Segou, Sikasso) and 1 CHW per
300-500 population in the regions of the North (Gao, Tombouctou).\textsuperscript{37} For our analysis, and in
agreement with the MSDS, we used the ratio of 1 CHW per 700 population for the regions of
the Center and South and 1 CHW per 500 for the regions of the North.

\textbf{Data}

We obtained the following spatial datasets to inform our models of geographic coverage and
efficiency of deployment of the CHWs: administrative boundaries (national, regional,
commune),\textsuperscript{38-40} a 2020 national georeferenced master facility list,\textsuperscript{41} a 2020 national CHW
master list (CHWML),\textsuperscript{42} digital elevation model,\textsuperscript{43} land cover,\textsuperscript{44} roads,\textsuperscript{45} official population
estimates at commune level for 2020,\textsuperscript{46} estimated population count at 100 m x 100 m
resolution for 2020\textsuperscript{47} and travel scenarios. As of 2020, there were 3 104 working CHWs.

Integrated PHC services provided by CHWs were intended to address under-five mortality,
with \textit{Pf} malaria as a major driver of curative consultations among children under-five in
Mali.\textsuperscript{48} Because the MSDS was interested to explore the efficiency of deployment of CHWs
vis a vis the spatial distribution of estimated under-five deaths, in addition to the efficiency of
their deployment vis a vis the estimated population, we obtained modelled estimates of the
annual mean under-five mortality rate in 2017\textsuperscript{49} and estimated live births\textsuperscript{50} at 5 km x 5 km
resolution to develop a raster layer for the estimated under-five deaths in 2020 at 1 km x 1km.

Similarly, because the MSDS was interested to explore the efficiency of deployment of
CHWs vis a vis the spatial distribution of estimated \textit{Pf} malaria cases, we obtained modelled
estimates of the annual mean incidence of \textit{Pf} malaria among all ages (0-99 years) in 2019 at 5
km x 5 km resolution\textsuperscript{51} to develop a raster layer for the estimated \textit{Pf} malaria cases (all ages) in
2020 at 1 km x 1km. We prepared the input datasets in the projected coordinate reference
system EPSG:32629 - WGS 84 / UTM zone 29N for Mali at 1 km x 1 km resolution. We used
one travel scenario, walking in dry conditions, reflecting the most relevant travel scenario for
the population served by the CHWs. We prepared a travel speed table reflecting walking in
dry conditions (S1 Appendix located in the Public Data Repository). We adapted travel
speeds for each land cover class and road class from previous studies\textsuperscript{20,52,53} Travel speeds
refer to the population walking in dry conditions in the direction of the CHW.

\textbf{Populations of interest}

We considered three populations of interest for the first policy question:

- a) the estimated population in areas beyond 5 km of a CSRef or CSCom in 2020;
b) the estimated under-five deaths in areas beyond 5 km of a CSRef or CSCom in 2020; and
c) the estimated Pf malaria cases in areas beyond 5 km of a CSRef or CSCom in 2020.

Hypothetical CHW networks

We considered three hypothetical CHW networks for the first policy question (see Table 1 for definitions).

Table 1. Definitions for the hypothetical CHW networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothetical CHW network</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing population</td>
<td>A hypothetical CHW network deployed to prioritize geographic coverage of the estimated population in areas beyond 5 km from a CSRef or CSCom in 2020 by ordering the processing order (deployment) based on the estimated population in areas beyond 5 km from a CSRef or CSCom in 2020 within a 30-minute catchment area of a given CHW, prioritizing catchments with a higher estimated population over those with a lower estimated population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing U5 deaths</td>
<td>A hypothetical CHW network deployed to prioritize geographic coverage of the estimated under-five deaths in areas beyond 5 km from a CSRef or CSCom in 2020 by ordering the processing order (deployment) based on the estimated under-five deaths in areas beyond 5 km from a CSRef or CSCom in 2020 within a 30-minute catchment area of a given CHW, prioritizing catchments with a higher estimated number of under-five deaths over those with a lower estimated number of under-five deaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing Pf malaria cases</td>
<td>A hypothetical CHW network deployed to prioritize geographic coverage of the estimated Pf malaria cases among all ages (0-99 years) in areas beyond 5 km from a CSRef or CSCom in 2020 by ordering the processing order (deployment) based on the estimated number of Pf malaria cases in areas beyond 5 km from a CSRef or CSCom in 2020 within a 30-minute catchment area of a given CHW, prioritizing catchments with a higher estimated number of Pf malaria cases over those with a lower estimated number of Pf malaria cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See pages 18, 22-23 of S1 Appendix located in the Public Data Repository for additional details on the hypothetical CHW networks.
In preparation for our hypothetical scale-up CHW networks, we analysed the spatial distribution of the estimated population beyond 5 km from a CSCom or CSRef. We found that this population was predominantly located in 1 kmx 1 km grid cells with an estimated population of at least 150 people. A 1 kmx 1 km grid cell with an estimated 150 people is equivalent to roughly 20% of the 1 CHW to 700 population ratio for regions of the South and roughly 30% of the 1 CHW to 500 population ratio for regions of the North. We restricted potential CHW sites for our hypothetical scale-up CHW networks to 1 kmx 1 km grid cells beyond 5 km of a CSCom with an estimated population of at least 150 people. This helped avoid deploying CHWs to areas with less than 20-30% of the expected CHW to population ratio, which would be an inefficient use of CHWs.

Further details on the data and methods used to derive these geographic areas are in S1 Appendix located in the Public Data Repository.

**Geographic coverage**

The national community health strategy defined the catchment area of a CHW as the area within 3-4 km of the CHW site. This definition ignores barriers to movement and the maximum population capacity of the CHW. To model more realistic catchment areas, we defined the catchment area of the CHWs using the concept of geographic coverage. Geographic coverage is defined as the theoretical catchment area of a health service delivery location, within a maximum travel time, accounting for the mode of transportation and the maximum population capacity of the type of health service delivery location. In our analysis we defined geographic coverage as the estimated population (of interest) within a theoretical catchment area of the CHW network, given a 30-minute maximum travel time (walking scenario) and the maximum population capacity of the CHWs. The maximum population capacity for CHWs was based on the MSDS norms for the ratio of CHWs per population noted above. The maximum extent of an CHW catchment was therefore delimited by the maximum travel time of 30 minutes except in cases where the estimated population in the catchment exceeded the maximum population capacity. In this case, the extent of the catchment was defined by the area containing the estimated population, up to the maximum population capacity. There was no MSDS norm for the ratio of CHW per U5 deaths or Pf malaria cases. Assuming one CHW could cover all estimated U5 deaths or Pf malaria cases within their catchment regardless of population size would be unrealistic. For metrics (b) and (c) we based the number of CHWs required for the hypothetical CHW networks on the
estimated number of CHW needed to cover the estimated population in each catchment using
the MSDS norms above. We used the "geographic coverage" module of AccessMod 5.6.56
for all analyses.33

**Assessing the efficiency of scale-up and deployment**

We defined efficiency of deployment as the geographic coverage of the estimated population
of interest achieved by a given number of CHWs, based on an adaptation of Palmer and
Torgerson’s definition of technical efficiency.54 A CHW network designed to optimise the
efficiency of CHW deployment maximizes geographic coverage of the population of interest
with the fewest number of CHWs. This requires deploying CHWs such that each CHW
maximizes the gain in geographic coverage of the population. We assessed the efficiency of
deployment by comparing the gain/loss of geographic coverage for each hypothetical CHW
network compared to each of the other hypothetical CHW networks, given the same number
of CHWs, for each of the populations of interest.

The above analysis resulted in nine results, three results per population of interest (a-c
above), and three results per hypothetical network (defined in Table 1). For each population
of interest (a-c,) we compared the efficiency of deployment of CHWs across the hypothetical
networks using a visual inspection of the slope of geographic coverage.

**Comparison with the existing network of CHW**

For the second policy question, we used the hypothetical CHW network prioritizing the
population at full scale to determine the geographic coverage of the estimated population
beyond 5 km of the CSCom and CSRef networks that could be achieved, and the estimated
number of CHWs needed to do so. We also estimated what could be achieved in terms of
geographic coverage with the first 4500 CHWs of the hypothetical CHW network (ranked in
order of greatest contribution to geographic coverage to least contribution). We compared the
hypothetical CHW network at full scale and the first 4500 hypothetical CHWs with the
existing network of CHWs to estimate deficits/surpluses of CHWs at national, regional,
district, and CSCom catchment area levels. The first 4500 CHWs of the hypothetical CHW
network was used as a comparison as it presented a practical and feasible next target, given
the existing network of 3104 CHWs and anticipated levels of funding for CHWs in the near-
term.
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RESULTS

Efficiency of deployment

A hypothetical network of 15843 CHWs would ensure 77.4% of the estimated 2020 population beyond 5 km of a CSRef or CSCom were within a 30-minute walk of an CHW. Across the three hypothetical CHW networks, there was less than 0.6 percentage points difference in geographic coverage when prioritizing the estimated population, estimated U5 deaths, or estimated Pf malaria cases among all ages (0-99 years) in 2020 within a 30-minute catchment of an CHW (Table 2 and Fig 1; also see tabs “Comparison_Pop”, “Comparison_U5d”, and “Comparison_Cases” in S2 Appendix located in the Public Data Repository).

Table 2. Geographic coverage of the estimated population, estimated U5 deaths, and estimated Pf malaria cases within a 30-minute catchment (walking in dry conditions) of an CHW, by three hypothetical CHW networks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothetical CHW network (n=15843)</th>
<th>Estimated population</th>
<th>Estimated U5 deaths</th>
<th>Estimated Pf malaria cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing population</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing U5 deaths</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing Pf malaria cases</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 1. Comparison of geographic coverage beyond 5 km of the existing CSCom and CSRef network according to CHW scale-up and deployment approach at 1 kmx 1 km resolution.

A) Geographic coverage of the estimated population in 2020 beyond 5 km of the existing CSCom and CSRef network covered within a 30-minute catchment area (walking) by the CHW network, according to CHW scale-up scenario; B) Geographic coverage of the estimated under-five deaths in 2020 beyond 5 km of the existing CSCom and CSRef network covered within a 30-minute catchment area (walking) by the CHW network, according to CHW scale-up scenario; C) Geographic coverage of the estimated *Pf* malaria cases in 2020 beyond 5 km of the existing CSCom and CSRef network covered within a 30-minute catchment area (walking) by the CHW network, according to CHW scale-up and deployment approach. All analyses at 1kmx 1km resolution.

**Comparison with the existing network of CHW**

Table 3 compares the number of CHWs needed by region and district according to a) the full hypothetical scaled-up network of CHWs prioritizing the estimated population (n=15843) b) the first 4500 CHWs within the hypothetical scaled-up network of CHW (a subset of (a)) and c) the existing CHW network (n=3401). Column (d) provides the difference in the number of CHW between the full hypothetical network of CHW prioritizing the estimated population and the existing CHW network. Column (e) provides the difference in the number of CHWs between the first 4500 CHW within the hypothetical network of CHW and the existing CHW network. Deficits in terms of CHWs are shown in red and surpluses are shown in blue.

**Table 3: Estimated number of CHW needed by region and district**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>a) Accessmod full CHW network (n=15843)</th>
<th>b) Accessmod first 4500 CHW</th>
<th>c) Existing CHWs</th>
<th>d) Difference c-a</th>
<th>e) Difference c-b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kayes</td>
<td>Bafoulabe</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-184</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diema</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-294</td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kayes</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-372</td>
<td>-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenieba</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-298</td>
<td>-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kita</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-380</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nioro</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-245</td>
<td>-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oussoubidiagnan</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-160</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sagabari</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sefeto</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-72</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yelimane</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-89</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Total 2380</td>
<td>Total 663</td>
<td>Total 247</td>
<td>Difference 2133</td>
<td>Difference -416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kayes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banamba</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-214</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioila</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>-309</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fana</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-233</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalabancoro</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-132</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangaba</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-116</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kati</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-346</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolokani</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-472</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koulikoro</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-214</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nara</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-344</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouelessebougou</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-218</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Koulikoro Total</strong></td>
<td>3233</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>-2598</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sikasso</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bougouni</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>-631</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadiolo</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-175</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kigman</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolondieba</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-240</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koutiala</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-494</td>
<td>-61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nena</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-187</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selingue</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikasso</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-358</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanfolila</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorosso</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-211</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sikasso Total</strong></td>
<td>3187</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>-2517</td>
<td>-243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ségou</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baraoueli</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-248</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bla</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-309</td>
<td>-67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macina</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-328</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markala</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-98</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niono</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-318</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-401</td>
<td>-96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ségou</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-575</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tominian</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-399</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ségou Total</strong></td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>-2676</td>
<td>-460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mopti</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandiagara</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-415</td>
<td>-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankass</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>-206</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djenne</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-195</td>
<td>-107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douentza</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-306</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koro</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-597</td>
<td>-243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mopti</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-277</td>
<td>-83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenenkou</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-220</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youwarou</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-171</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mopti Total</strong></td>
<td>2914</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>-2387</td>
<td>-479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gao</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almoustrat</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansongo</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourem</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-93</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gao</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, there was a deficit of 12739 CHWs between the existing CHW network (n=3401) and the full hypothetical CHW network (n=15843). The largest deficits were in the regions of Kayes, Koulikoro, Sikasso, and Ségou. Compared to the first 4500 CHWs of the hypothetical CHW network, there was a deficit of 1397 CHWs. For the latter comparison, the deficit was again concentrated in the regions of Kayes, Koulikoro, Sikasso, and Ségou but there were surpluses in certain districts, most notably in Commune VI of Bamako, Ansongo (region of Gao), and Bankass (region of Mopti). We provide results for the estimated deficits and surpluses of CHWs at the subdistrict level for each CSCom in Mali in S3 Appendix, tab “CSCom_Comparison”, located in the Public Data Repository.
resolution.

The 30-minute catchment area (blue) of the hypothetical CHW network prioritising geographic coverage of the estimated population in 2020 based on a walking scenario and the maximum population capacity of the CHW site. Text boxes for example CSCom indicate existing CHWs, estimated need based on the full model, estimated need based on the first 4500 model, and deficits/surpluses comparing the existing CHW network with the models.

The image depicts the area around the Tiguila CSCom in the Douentza district, region of Mopti, Mali.

**DISCUSSION**

WHO’s global strategy on human resources for health, normative guidance on optimising health policy and system support for CHWs, the WHO and UNICEF operational framework for PHC, and the Working for Health Action Plan 2022-2030 call for optimising the distribution of the health and care workforce, including CHWs.\(^5,18,23-24\) However only three previous studies have used geospatial analysis to assess the efficiency of CHW deployment at national scale using robust modelling approaches.\(^20-22\) Champagne _et al._ compared the efficiency of various CHW deployment scenarios in terms of optimising geographic coverage of the estimated population in Haiti.\(^22\) Oliphant _et al._ (2021) and Oliphant _et al._ (2022) compared the efficiency of CHW deployment of the existing CHW network compared to three hypothetical optimised CHW networks designed to optimise geographic coverage of the estimated population, under-five deaths, and _P._falciparum malaria cases, respectively, and found that the existing CHW networks were inefficiently deployed across all three targeting metrics.\(^20,21\) However, unlike our study, these previous studies did not compare the efficiency of approaches for optimising the scale and deployment of CHWs nationally across each of these outcomes of interest.\(^20,21\) Our study is the first to do so, providing new insight on the trade-offs (or lack thereof) between approaches and a roadmap for optimising the scale and deployment of CHWs in Mali. At the time of writing, policymakers, and planners in Mali (including authors of this study) were using our results to inform decisions on future scale-up and deployment of CHWs. As an intermediary milestone, the MSDS aims to progressively fill the gap between the existing CHW network and the first 4500 CHWs of the optimised scale-up network that prioritized geographic coverage of the estimated population (given the negligible differences in efficiency between the hypothetical optimised networks). We support this approach as it is a practical and feasible near-term target given anticipated funding and it will maximize the value for money of
available resources for integrated primary health care at community level within the context of
the current health system reform led by the MSDS. Recently, the Council of Ministers in Mali
signed a decree officially recognizing CHWs as part of the health system. This is a remarkable
milestone as it effectively lays the foundation for the possibility of domestic financing – and
thereby sustainable financing – of CHWs in the future. Also of note, the WHO, at the time of
writing, was planning a health labour market assessment in Mali and our results will be useful
for informing that assessment as part of broader national HRH planning.

The fact that we found no important differences in geographic coverage between the
approaches for scaling up and deploying CHWs has important implications for decisions on
CHW deployment, as well as service integration. For example, policymakers and planners in
Mali can be confident that their decision to scale up and deploy CHWs based on geographic
coverage of the population adequately addresses other important concerns such as targeting
the estimated burden of under-five deaths and Pf malaria cases. This type of analysis could be
conducted in other contexts and may be particularly relevant where policymakers and
planners would like to consider multiple criteria for scale-up and deployment.

While our analysis does not directly address gender equity – plans for the scale-up of CHWs
and the dedicated supervisors\(^54\) needed to effectively support the CHWs should aim to
maximize gender equity of these two workforces. This could be done through, for example,
secondary analysis of the CHWML for the existing CHW network using a gender lens and
considering affirmative action to preferentially select women during recruitment of new
CHWs, following WHO guidance.\(^6\) Planning for the scale-up of the CHW network should
consider the comprehensive needs of CHWs (and their dedicated supervisors) so that they can
be most effective. For example, the participation of communities in the selection of
candidates, competency-based pre-service training and accreditation, fair remuneration,
dedicated supervision, equipment, job-aids and digital tools, commodities, means of
transportation/funding for transportation costs for the CHWs and the dedicated supervisors
for facilitated referral of patients, as well as quality improvement at CSCom and CHW
levels.\(^6,55\) Cost savings realized through the optimal deployment of additional CHWs in the
future can be invested in ensuring the system components above are well-supported.

While our results point to certain CSCom and districts with an estimated surplus of CHWs
according to current MSDS policy on CHW deployment, we do not recommend changing the
deployment of the existing CHW network. The number of CSCom with a surplus of CHWs is
small (102 CSCom) and the surplus is also small (553 CHWs). Changing the deployment of
the existing CHW networks would be disruptive to the communities served, could negatively
impact the trust of the affected communities in the health system, would have important
negative socioeconomic impacts on the affected CHWs and their families, and would ignore
the documented positive impact of CHWs in certain peri-urban areas (e.g., Yirimadio in
Bamako). Instead, we support the MSDS’ focus on using the results to inform future scale-
up and deployment of new, additional CHWs as noted above.

As noted above 22.7% of the population remained uncovered by the hypothetical scaled-up
network of CHWs. This population was in small, dispersed settlements of less than 150
people per 1 km². To cover this population, the MSDS will need to consider the cost-benefits
of different approaches e.g., 1) further expansion of the number of CHWs to such
communities 2) targeting certain CHWs with motorbikes to facilitate mobile outreach by the
CHWs to such communities, and 3) a combination of and 1 & 2, depending on local context.

Lastly and perhaps most importantly, to maximize the value of this kind of analysis it needs
to be integrated into and updated as part of national health sector reviews and planning
processes. Ideally, this kind of modelling approach would inform not only decisions on the
scale-up and deployment of CHWs but also health facilities, such as the CSCom, and be
considered in broader HRH and health sector strategy development and planning. As the
health system expands through scaling-up CHWs and CSCom, informed by this kind of
modelling, policymakers and planners in Mali will need to periodically update the modelling
as part of national reviews to account for actual health system expansion and updates to other
key datasets (e.g., population). Integration of this kind of modelling into national processes as
described above will be challenging. The modelling approach is data-intensive, takes time,
requires a country-led approach with leadership from the MSDS, strengthening national
institutional capacity, flexibility to adapt to national processes and subnational contexts, and a
clear understanding of its limitations and how it can complement/be complemented by other
sources of information and considerations that may be important in the decision-making
process (e.g., values, political priorities). Mali has embarked on this process with this first
analysis and the use of the outputs to inform national planning for the scale-up and
deployment of CHWs. At the time of writing, the MSDS and development partners –
including co-authors – were discussing a plan for institutional capacity building and planning
the first institutional capacity building workshop to be conducted in 2022.
Limitations

There are several important limitations of our study. First, our analysis is limited by the completeness and quality of the publicly available road and river network data. More complete and/or higher quality data on roads and rivers may be available outside the public domain. Second, estimates of the uncertainty of the estimated population counts for Mali were not available, limiting our ability to account for this source of uncertainty in measures of physical accessibility to services. Availability of this kind of data will be important for improving future modelling efforts. Third, for our targeting analysis, we resampled the modelled estimates of U5 mortality rates and Pf malaria incidence from 5 km x 5 km resolution to 1 km x 1 km resolution due to lack of estimates at 1 km resolution, assuming the values for these parameters at the finer 1 km x 1 km resolution. However, this limitation is moot given that the aim is to optimise the order of cell prioritisation (which location for a CHW should be prioritised over another), cell prioritisation is concerned with the relationship between cells (not the absolute value of cells) and the relationship between cells at 5 km x 5 km resolution was maintained at 1 km x 1 km resolution. Third, our analysis is based on estimated travel speeds from other studies in the region, not empirical data from Mali or local expert knowledge, and does not account for uncertainty. Similarly, our analysis does not account for variation in walking speeds or common modes of transportation used across population groups or subnational areas. For example, pregnant women, people with illness, caregivers of ill children, the elderly population, and people with disabilities may walk slower than the general population, and predominant modes of transport may differ by geographic area or socioeconomic status. Future iterations of this analysis should attempt to address the limitations above regarding travel speeds and modes of transportation by incorporating information derived from sub-national level workshops with local experts. Fourth, our analysis did not account for the possibility of accessing health services across national boundaries, an important consideration for border communities and migrant populations. Fifth, our analysis did not account for social and economic barriers to care-seeking which may impact access to and use of health services independently of physical accessibility or through interactions with physical accessibility. Lastly, our analysis did not consider the stockouts of equipment, supplies or commodities, quality of services and the potential for bypassing.
CONCLUSION

A network of 15843 CHWs in Mali, if optimally deployed, would ensure 77.3% of the population beyond 5 km of a CSCom or CSRef were within a 30-minute walk of a CHW. There were no important differences in geographic coverage across a range of outcomes when prioritizing scale-up based on the estimated population, estimated U5 deaths, or estimated Pf malaria cases. Our geospatial analysis provides useful information to policymakers and planners in Mali for optimising the scale-up and deployment of CHWs and, in turn, for maximizing the value-for-money of resources for community-based primary health care in the context of the country’s health sector reform. Countries with similar interests in optimising the scale and deployment of their CHW workforce may look to Mali as an exemplar model from which to learn.
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