Rethinking the Human Resource Crisis in Africa's Health Systems: Evidence across Ten Countries

Authors
Ashley Sheffel (Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Department of International Health)
Kathryn G. Andrews (World Bank)
Ruben Conner (World Bank)
Laura Di Giorgio (World Bank)
David K. Evans (Center for Global Development)
Roberta Gatti (World Bank)
Magnus Lindelow (World Bank)
Jigyasa Sharma (World Bank)
Jakob Svensson (Stockholm University, Institute for International Economic Studies)
Anna Welander Tärneberg (Lund University School of Economics and Management, Centre for Economic Demography and Department of Economic History)

Date: May 20, 2022

Abstract: Sub-Saharan Africa has fewer medical workers per capita than any region of the world, and that shortage has been highlighted consistently as a critical constraint to improving health outcomes in the region. This paper draws on newly available, systematic, comparable data from ten countries in the region to explore the dimensions of this shortage. We find wide variation in human resources performance metrics, both within and across countries. Many facilities are barely staffed, and effective staffing levels fall further when adjusted for absenteeism. However, caseloads—while also varying widely within and across countries—are also low in many settings, suggesting that even within countries, deployment rather than shortages, together with barriers to demand, may be the principal challenges. Beyond raw numbers, we observe significant proportions of health workers with very low levels of clinical knowledge on standard maternal and child health conditions. This work demonstrates that countries may need to invest broadly in health workforce deployment, improvements in capacity and performance of the health workforce, and on addressing demand constraints, rather than focusing narrowly on increases in staffing numbers.

Keywords: Human resources for health; Quality of health care; Service delivery indicators; Health care worker knowledge; Sub-Saharan Africa

JEL codes: I10; I11; I15; O20

Highlights

- This study analyzed health worker surveys from ten countries in Sub-Saharan Africa for a deeper understanding of human resource challenges.
- Average staffing across facilities is far below the stated staffing norms for each country.
- Half of health centers and health posts have one or fewer clinical staff assigned to them.
- Staffing is even lower when adjusted for absence, which is highest in small facilities and public facilities.
- Massive within-country variation in caseload suggests that staffing problems may be solved in part by reallocation of clinical staff.
- Health workers lack basic clinical competencies, caseloads are imbalanced, and there is substantial absence of workers from health facilities.

1. Introduction

For decades, experts both on the African continent and those in the international community have highlighted a shortage in human resources for health in Africa (Elkhalifa, 2014; Fieno et al., 2016; Gomes Sambo, 2005; Huddart & Picazo, 2003; World Health Organization, 2006). One analysis projected a shortfall of six million health workers across the continent by 2030 (Tulenko, 2016). African countries—on average—have fewer doctors and other medical workers per capita than any other region in the world.[1] Yet while a shortage of health workers is undoubtedly a concern, it is not the only human resource challenge to Africa's health systems. Recent analysis has highlighted others, including low quality of health worker knowledge and services (Di Giorgio et al., 2020; Okeke, 2021) and low access to and utilization of health services (Abekah-Nkrumah, 2019). Complicating the debate is the fact that all of these factors are endogenous to one another: understaffed or under-skilled health facilities may result in low service utilization, and low service utilization may affect the number of staff assigned to a facility. Much of the literature on the crisis in human resources for health relies on either broad counts of health workers at national levels combined with population numbers or richer analyses that are focused on a single country.

This paper draws on newly available data from ten countries in Sub-Saharan Africa to answer four key questions related to this debate. First, how many health workers are there? Second, are health workers present and what are the implications of worker attendance on effective staffing levels? Third, how heavy are health workers' caseloads? Fourth, how competent are health workers? We use the Service Delivery Indicators (SDI) surveys—rich facility surveys that are designed to be nationally representative and to

[1] According to the World Development Indicators, Sub-Saharan Africa had 0.2 physicians and just 1 nurse or mid-wife per 1,000 people (2017-2018, the most recent date for which data are available). For South Asia—the region with the next lowest concentration of medical workers—those numbers are 0.8 and 1.5, respectively.

provide comparable data across several countries—to demonstrate how challenges tend to be either consistent or divergent across settings. In this study, we focus on within-country description and cross-country comparison to answer these staffing questions, and consider the implications for effective health care delivery in low- and middle-income settings across Africa.

We find that on average, health centers and health posts in our sample have between 2.5 and 3 clinical health workers (i.e., health workers who are authorized to treat patients)—well below the staffing norms in the sampled countries—but that there are many health centers or health posts with one or even no clinical health workers assigned. Thus, even if health facilities are reasonably staffed on average, this masks significant shortages within countries. We find high levels of absence across all types of health facilities, driven by a range of factors. Crucially, effective staffing falls dramatically when absence is incorporated. Absence is highest at the smallest facilities and at public facilities. We observe large variation in caseloads (outpatient daily visits per present health worker), including several countries with per worker daily caseloads of under 16 (i.e., one or fewer cases per half hour in an eight-hour shift). Facilities in rural and urban areas have similar caseloads per effective clinical health worker. This suggests that in many settings, at current patient levels, there is no shortage in the quantity of health workers. Furthermore, the large variation within countries suggests that much of the shortage may be due to inefficiencies or challenges in deployment. While staffing availability may not be a major constraint in many setting, can patients get the care they need? We find that a significant proportion of medical workers scored zero on a series of vignettes about important maternal and child health conditions, from 0.4 percent of doctors and clinical officers in Malawi to 24.3 percent in Niger, with higher numbers for nurses and midwives in each country as compared to doctors.

This paper adds to the existing literature on staffing shortages in Africa and in low- and middle-income countries more broadly by providing comparable analysis across countries that highlights both high-level country averages and essential within-country variation. A cornerstone example of cross-country analysis is World Health Organization (2006), which identifies countries with critical shortages throughout the world. For recent examples of within-country analysis, Okeke (2021) experimentally tests whether staffing shortages or staff ability is the binding constraint in Nigeria, finding evidence in favor of ability; and Fieno et al. (2016) examines the political economy of staffing challenges in Ethiopia, showing that with political will, strong state capacity, and additional resources it is possible to increase the supply of health workers.

The study also complements previous analyses of the SDI surveys. Di Giorgio et al (2020) focuses on overall health center readiness, finding that—on average across countries—the probability that a patient visiting a health center would find at least one staff present with both the competency and essential inputs required to provide child, neonatal and maternity care is just 14 percent. Andrews et al. (2021) demonstrates the variation in the quality of care both between and within communities, which is substantial. Gatti et al. (2021) provides an overview analysis of health worker absence, caseloads, health worker ability, and infrastructure (including equipment, supplies, and medicine). This paper adds to existing work with a comprehensive focus on health workers, including a demonstration of where the data show dramatic staffing gaps (e.g., facilities with only one or even zero clinical health workers) and adjusting staffing and caseloads for health worker absence, which significantly shifts the results relative to previous work.[2]

[2] Zero clinical staff does not mean zero staff. Some facilities have no staff who are classified as those authorized to treat patients (which is how we define clinical staff), but in practice, some other staff (such as a pharmacist) may treat patients.

Obviously, the challenges we explore in this paper are a subset of the broader health care quality provision challenges, as summarized in Das and Hammer (2014). Such quality issues include both other aspects of the health care system, such as medicines and equipment (Cameron et al., 2009), and other aspects of health worker performance, including the difference between what health workers know and what they do in practice (Das et al., 2008; Leonard & Masatu, 2010).

2. Data: The Service Delivery Indicators

The SDI health surveys, led by the World Bank, are health facility assessments used in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) to generate nationally representative data on health service delivery with a focus on primary health care service quality (Bold et al., 2010; Bold et al., 2011). The SDI generates a set of indicators for benchmarking health systems performance and includes a standard set of survey instruments which are adapted to each country context: a facility inventory questionnaire, a staff roster, and clinical vignettes. Using standardized instruments, the SDI collects both facility and health worker level information that includes service availability and readiness, health worker capacity to diagnose and treat common illnesses, and health worker presence through unannounced visits. Data are made publicly available by the World Bank through the SDI data repository (The World Bank, 2021).

The SDI survey has been implemented across numerous countries in Sub-Saharan Africa over the last ten years and is currently being conducted outside the African region as well. This study draws on data from ten countries: Kenya (2018), Madagascar (2016), Malawi (2019), Mozambique (2014), Niger (2015), Nigeria (2013), Sierra Leone (2018), Tanzania (2016), Togo (2013), and Uganda (2013). We included all SDIs conducted in Sub-Saharan Africa to shed light on the state of quality of care in this region. One survey (Senegal 2010) was excluded as it was a pilot survey and not directly comparable and several recently

completed SDIs were not included as the data were not yet available. For countries who have implemented multiple rounds of the SDI, we used the most recent survey (i.e., Kenya 2018 and Tanzania 2016).

All country surveys were representative at the national level except for Nigeria, which, owing to security concerns, covered 12 of 36 states and was representative only at the state level. In addition, several surveys were sub-nationally representative. In Kenya, data were collected to be representative at the county level and in Malawi, a census of facilities was selected for the survey. The surveys used a multistage cluster-sampling approach to ensure that data were representative of rural and urban areas, private and public facilities, and facility type (i.e., primary vs. secondary). The SDI country reports contain comprehensive information on each survey's methodology and questionnaires. Briefly described, all surveyed facilities completed the facility inventory questionnaire. In addition, a health worker roster collected information on the total number of health workers at the facility and was used to randomly sample up to ten health workers for follow-up on a second unannounced visit to the facility to assess health worker absenteeism. Clinical vignettes were presented to up to ten randomly selected health workers who conducted outpatient consultations at the facility. If there were fewer than ten health workers who provided outpatient clinical care, all the health workers were interviewed. Health workers were selected for the absenteeism assessment and the clinical vignettes separately.

In total, the study sample for this analysis includes interviews from 79,441 health workers, observations of absenteeism from 35,896 health workers, assessments of competency from 15,207 health workers, and audits from 8,916 health facilities from across ten countries in Africa. Specifically, for the purposes of this analysis, the term "health worker" refers to all cadres of staff in a facility (e.g., medical staff, nursing staff, community health workers based at the facility). It does not include community health workers

based elsewhere but that report to a health facility, and it does not include non-medical staff. For the purposes of this analysis, the term "clinical staff" refers to cadres of health workers who are expected to provide clinical care, more specifically doctors, clinical officers, nurses, and midwives. It does not include cadres of health workers not expected to provide clinical care such as pharmacists and laboratory technicians. For each country, the specific cadres of health workers included as clinical staff differ. Details of the sample are listed in ***Table 1*** with further information including disaggregation by country, facility type, managing authority, urban/rural, and health worker cadre in ***Supplementary Table S1***. The difference in the number of health workers assessed for absenteeism compared to competency is related to eligibility criteria for inclusion in each assessment.[3] By country, the sample of facilities was smallest in Togo (180 facilities) and largest in Kenya (3,038 facilities) whereas the sample of health workers for absenteeism was smallest in Niger (661 health workers) and largest in Kenya (12,266 health workers) and the sample of health workers for competency was smallest in Togo (303 health workers) and largest in Nigeria (5,014 health workers).

Table 1: Total number of facilities, health workers, health workers assessed for absenteeism, and health workers assessed for competency, by country

Country	Year	Total number of facilities	Total number of health workers - staffing	Total number of health workers - absenteeism	Total number of health workers - competency
Kenya	2018	3,038	24,404	12,266	4,485
Madagascar	2016	444	2,200	1,565	619
Malawi	2019	1,106	13,290	4,305	1,522
Mozambique	2014	195	2,972	936	694

[3] All health workers were eligible for the absenteeism assessment whereas only health workers offering outpatient consultations were eligible for the health worker competency assessment. In many smaller facilities, the scenario arose where there were at least ten health workers on the roster to meet the sampling needs for absenteeism, but only a fraction of those health workers provided outpatient consultations. As a result, the total number of health workers included in the absenteeism assessment is more than twice as large as the number of health workers included in the competency assessment.

Niger	2015	255	1,331	661	514
Nigeria	2013	2,385	21,318	9,764	5,014
Sierra Leone	2018	536	5,055	2,087	829
Tanzania	2016	383	5,160	2,119	498
Togo	2013	180	1,364	917	303
Uganda	2013	394	2,347	1,276	729
Total		**8,916**	**79,441**	**35,896**	**15,207**

3. Empirical strategy

Our main measures have been organized around three dimensions of health workforce performance—availability, productivity, and competency—that are each believed to contribute to the achievement of improved service delivery and health outcomes (World Health Organization, 2006). To assess availability of health workers we examined staffing levels and health worker absenteeism. Specifically, to assess staffing, a complete listing of staff working at the health facility, including each individual's cadre was collected through a staff roster questionnaire. Staff cadres were reviewed and standardized across countries to identify clinical staff, defined as cadres of health workers expected to provide clinical care—doctors/clinical officers and nurses/midwives.[4] In addition, a category for other health workers was created for health workers not expected to provide clinical care such as laboratory technicians, pharmacists, public health officers, and health records information officers.

Absenteeism was defined as the proportion of randomly selected health workers who were absent from the health facility during an unannounced facility visit who were scheduled to be present at the facility. We calculated total clinical staff adjusted for absenteeism by taking the total number of clinical staff from the roster and reducing that number by the proportion of clinical staff absent, based on the results of the

[4] The combined nurse/midwife category was created in light of the different staff categorization between countries and to allow for cross country comparability.

absenteeism assessment.[5] To assess heath worker productivity, we examined caseload. Caseload was defined as the number of outpatient visits recorded in outpatient records in the three months prior to the survey, divided by the number of days the facility was open during the three-month period and the number of health professionals who conduct outpatient consultations. In some of our analysis, this indicator was adjusted for the average absenteeism at the facility-level. For example, if a facility reported having 10 health workers who conduct outpatient consultations, but that facility's absenteeism on an unannounced visit was found to be 40%, then the number of health workers was adjusted down by 40% and only 6 health workers were counted as available for patient care.[6]

To assess health worker competency, we examined diagnostic and treatment accuracy. Data on diagnostic accuracy and treatment accuracy were collected through clinical vignettes which are standardized clinical case simulations developed to assess the health workers' ability to diagnose and treat common outpatient

[5] Not all clinical staff were assessed for absenteeism (up to a total of 10 health workers were assessed for absenteeism per facility). We explored two alternative methods of adjusting for absenteeism. In the first, we took the total number of clinical staff and reduced that by the number of clinical staff absent. Since not all clinical staff were assessed, this method would undercount absence. In the second, we did the same as in the first, but we restricted the analysis to the subset of facilities where all clinical staff were assessed for absenteeism (i.e., mostly smaller facilities). Results for the sensitivity analyses are presented in ***Supplementary Table S9***. The preferred method (in the main text) allows for a reduction in proportion to the actual absence of clinical staff.

[6] Malawi has community level village clinics which report data on service utilization to the health center level. The health center aggregates that data into their monthly reporting forms. This may have led to an inflation in the number of outpatient services delivered at the primary level. While there is evidence of low health worker density and high service utilization as an ongoing problem in Malawi, we could not confirm the validity of the caseload data and therefore have excluded it from the analysis.

conditions (Das et al., 2008). Health workers were tested on five core vignettes: childhood diarrhea with dehydration, childhood pneumonia, adult tuberculosis (TB), adult diabetes mellitus, and childhood malaria with anemia. The SDI surveys were tailored to each country context, but include a number of indicators which were kept constant across countries and over time. Vignettes were administered by two enumerators, who conducted the simulations privately after walking through an example case with the health worker. The first enumerator presented a clinical case with an initial complaint and a basic description of the associated symptoms. The health worker was encouraged to ask follow-up questions around symptoms and presentation of illness, and to request the results of various medical and laboratory tests. The first enumerator offered pre-specified responses to those questions and the second enumerator recorded how well the health worker adhered to clinical guidelines in the questions asked and clinical actions undertaken. At the end of the vignette, the health worker was asked to make a diagnosis and propose a treatment for the clinical case. Diagnostic accuracy was calculated as the percent of vignettes for which the health worker gave the correct diagnosis while treatment accuracy was calculated as the percent of vignettes for which the health worker gave the correct treatment. Correct treatment was not made conditional on correct diagnosis, so health workers could occasionally get the correct treatment without the correct diagnosis. A combined measure of diagnostic and treatment accuracy was calculated as the percent of vignettes for which the health worker gave the correct diagnosis *and* the correct treatment. ***Supplementary Table S2*** provides a detailed description of the vignette requirements by condition used to calculate correct diagnosis and correct treatment.

Several additional facility level and health worker level measures were included in the exploration of the extent to which accounting for health worker characteristics explains differences in health worker performance. Infrastructure availability was calculated as the availability of three components: improved water source, improved sanitation, and electricity. Credit was given if all three infrastructure components

were available. Equipment availability was calculated based on four items being available and functional: a thermometer, a stethoscope, a sphygmomanometer, and a weighing scale (adult, child, or infant). Credit was given if all four components were available. Detailed definitions for each element of the infrastructure and equipment measures can be found in ***Supplementary Table S3***. Mean absenteeism and mean provider competency were calculated at the facility level for use in the facility level regression model. Facility type was reviewed across countries and reclassified into three categories: hospital,[7] health center,[8] and health post.[9] Similarly, managing authority was reviewed across countries and reclassified into two categories: public and private/NGO. Health worker cadre was reviewed across countries and recategorized into three categories: doctors/clinical officers, nurses/midwives, and other. Health worker education was similarly reviewed across countries and recategorized into three broad categories: primary, secondary, and post-secondary education.

Descriptive results, summarized as proportions and means, were calculated for all main measures and disaggregated by facility type, managing authority, and urbanicity where applicable. For health worker level analyses, results were also disaggregated by health worker cadre. For all analyses, survey weights were incorporated to account for the complex survey design.[10] Survey weights were calculated for

[7] Hospital includes hospitals of all levels (district, regional, national)

[8] Health center includes facilities designed to run as outpatient clinics and may include inpatient treatment or a maternity ward. These are facilities characterized by higher level-staff with the ability to diagnose and treat a range of health conditions and responsibility for a larger catchment area (e.g., health center, level 2 basic health center, integrated health center).

[9] Health post includes facilities designed to run as outpatient clinics treating common diseases and offering antenatal care (e.g., dispensary, level 1 basic health center, health hut).

[10] Facility level sample weights were unavailable for Mozambique so unweighted facility level results are reported.

facilities as the inverse of the probability of selection for the facility inventory. Survey weights were calculated for health workers separately for absenteeism and health worker competency. Absenteeism weights were calculated as the inverse of the probability of selection for the absenteeism assessment based on the total number of medical staff recorded on the staff roster times the facility weight. Competency weights were calculated as the inverse of the probability of selection for the competency vignette based on the total number of medical staff who see outpatients recorded on the staff roster times the facility weight. Descriptive analyses are presented separately for each country. In addition, we present the cross-country average calculated as the average of the ten country estimates. We investigated the association of our key health workforce measures (health worker absenteeism, caseload, and diagnostic and treatment accuracy) with facility and health worker characteristics. Multivariable linear and logistic regression models were utilized with standard errors adjusted for clustering of health workers within facilities. The regression analysis was conducted on a pooled dataset of all countries except Uganda which was omitted due to missing data on key regression variables[11]. All analyses were conducted with Stata 15 and R-4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2017; StataCorp, 2017).

4. Results

4.1. How many health workers are there?

Health worker availability encompasses availability in terms of both place and time; it also captures the distribution and attendance of existing workers. When seeking care at a health facility, a patient expects healthcare professionals to be present and available to see patients during regularly scheduled work

[11] For the caseload regression, mean competency scores were missing for 11 facilities (0.2% of data). These missing values were imputed using the country average mean competency score.

hours. To understand how many health workers there are, we first looked at the distribution of health worker cadres by facility type to understand how health workers are distributed within a facility type (***Table 2***). We then looked at staffing patterns to understand the average number of clinical staff per facility as well as the proportion of facilities with limited clinical staff present (***Table 3***). We compare those levels with staffing norms for the countries (***Supplementary Table S4*** and ***Supplementary Table S5***).

When we examined the distribution of health worker cadres by facility type, we found a wide range of variation by country (***Table 2***). In some countries such as Kenya and Uganda, health worker cadres showed a similar distribution across facility types with the nurse/midwife being the primary health worker cadre, followed by a substantial proportion of non-clinical/other workers, and supported by a smaller proportion of doctors/clinical officers. In other countries such as Malawi, Niger, and Nigeria, we found health posts were primarily staffed by non-clinical/other health workers, health centers were primarily staffed by nurses/midwives and non-clinical/other health workers, and hospitals were staffed primarily by nurses/midwives supported by doctors/clinical officers and non-clinical/other health workers. Across all countries combined, we found that hospitals had the largest proportion of doctors/clinical officers (19.4% compared to 14% for health centers and 7.5% for health posts) and the largest proportion of nurse/midwives (47.5% compared to 40.9% for health centers and 33.3% for health posts).

When we examined staffing patterns by country (***Table 3***), we found on average, health centers and health posts had 2.8 clinical staff, but many facilities had one or no clinical staff. This suggests that understaffing may be an issue at primary health care facilities. We found that in Madagascar, Niger, Nigeria, and Sierra

Leone more than half of health centers and health posts had one or no clinical staff.[12] In addition, nearly 70% of health centers and health posts across all countries had two or fewer clinical staff. This lack of clinical staff may not be indicative of no patient care provision at these facilities; however, it may suggest that patient care is being provided by under-qualified individuals which poses concerns about the quality of care being delivered. As stated earlier, zero clinical staff does not mean zero staff. Some facilities have no staff who are classified as those authorized to treat patients; but in practice, some other staff may treat patients.

These average levels of clinical staff are far below staffing norms. Supplementary Table S4 shows staffing norms—by cadre and health facility type—for each country. Supplementary Table S5 shows the average staffing norms across cadres and types, compared with the average staffing levels from Table 3. In every case, the actual staff (without adjusting for absenteeism) is less than half that listed in country staffing plans.

[12] We have chosen not to disaggregate results for facilities with 0 versus 1 clinical health worker as both situations highlight a staffing challenge of concern.

Table 2: Distribution of health worker cadres by facility type, by country (%)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
Hospital											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	19.9	31.1	21.7	39.9	6.2	10.1	3.7	24.3	14.4	22.6	19.4
Nurse/ Midwife	45.4	46.6	57.7	37.7	65.1	31.9	58	43.3	45	44.3	47.5
Other	34.7	22.3	20.5	22.4	28.7	58	38.3	32.4	40.6	33	33.1
Health center											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	18.9	32.5	5.1	26.8	2.9	1.3	0.2	20.5	13.4	18	14
Nurse/ Midwife	45.7	49	32.3	47.5	70.3	10.7	27.2	36.7	42.3	47	40.9
Other	35.4	18.5	62.5	25.7	26.8	88	72.6	42.8	44.3	35	45.2
Health post											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	17.1	3.1	2.1	NA	4.1	0.7	0	20.3	4	15.8	7.5
Nurse/ Midwife	47.1	76.7	17.7	NA	28.6	2.3	12.5	28.6	43.5	42.9	33.3
Other	35.7	20.2	80.2	NA	67.3	97	87.5	51.1	52.5	41.3	59.2

Note: Out of the 79,441 health workers in the dataset, 509 were missing information on cadre. These health workers come from 5 of the 10 countries in the analysis and this represents less than 1% of the sample. We have therefore excluded these health workers from the analysis.

Table 3: Clinical staffing patterns in health centers and health posts, by country (number/proportion and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
	n = 2753	n = 407	n = 1005	n = 157	n = 239	n = 1974	n = 506	n = 353	n = 164	n = 385	n = 7943
Average number of clinical staff in health centers and health posts	3.35 (3.15 - 3.55)	2.17 (1.92 - 2.41)	3.37 (3.12 - 3.62)	5.87 (4.33 - 7.4)	1.38 (0.95 - 1.82)	0.58 (0.5 - 0.67)	1.20 (0.95 - 1.44)	4.36 (3.71 - 5)	2.60 (1.88 - 3.33)	3.42 (3.05 - 3.79)	2.83 (1.69 - 3.97)
Proportion of health centers and health posts with one or fewer clinical staff	33.1 (31.3 – 35.0)	50.0 (40.6 - 59.4)	31.9 (29.1 - 34.8)	37.6 (30.0 - 45.2)	79.2 (73.1 - 85.3)	88.1 (86.4 - 89.8)	77.5 (73.3 - 81.6)	22.0 (16.1 - 28)	48.2 (32.5 - 63.8)	28.7 (23.2 - 34.3)	49.6 (32.7 - 66.6)
Proportion of health centers and health posts with two or fewer clinical staff	62.1 (60.1 - 64)	82.4 (76.8 - 88.1)	53.6 (50.5 - 56.7)	58.6 (50.9 - 66.3)	88.0 (83.5 - 92.4)	93.5 (92.2 - 94.8)	87.4 (83.9 - 90.9)	47.6 (39.9 - 55.4)	67.0 (52.2 - 81.8)	54.5 (48.2 - 60.8)	69.5 (57.5 - 81.5)

4.2. Are health workers present? Absenteeism levels, effective staffing patterns, and correlates

Absenteeism reduces the effectiveness of health care provision and can compromise the quality of services because fewer workers are left on duty, potentially resulting in work overload for the health workers present at the health facility or interrupted service delivery. The definition of absenteeism varies by study, however a typological framework for defining absenteeism has been established which categorizes forms of absenteeism as 1) planned (e.g., annual leave, training) or unplanned (e.g., sickness or transportation problems) and 2) voluntary (occurring due to decisions made by the individual) or involuntary (occurring for reasons outside the control of the individual) or (Belita et al., 2013). We tried to classify absenteeism into sanctioned and unsanctioned leave, however this can be more subjective as an absence may occur for reasons officially allowed or not allowed as per the organization's policies. For example, an unsanctioned absence may be the result of a health worker not coming to work for a sanctioned reason for which they have not obtained official approval for the absence. Ultimately, what is most important for clients seeking health services, is the level of overall health worker absenteeism at a health facility, regardless of the reason for the absenteeism as this is what may impact service delivery. To understand how many health workers are present at facilities, we first looked at health worker absenteeism to understand the extent to which health worker who are expected to be present at health facilities are not present for work (***Supplementary Table S6***). We then examined staffing patterns adjusted for absenteeism to see the impact of absenteeism on the proportion of facilities with limited clinical staff present (**Table 4**). Finally, we explored the relationship between absenteeism and facility and health worker characteristics to further understand if health worker with certain characteristics were more likely to be absent (**Table 5**).

When examining health worker absenteeism, we found the rate of overall health worker absence was, on average, 34.7% (CI: 26.3% - 43%). On average, across all countries, absenteeism was similarly high across

all types of health facilities (hospital 33.6%, health center 35.2%, health post 31.2%), all cadres of health workers (doctors/clinical officers 36.8%, nurses/midwives 34.8%, other workers 31.8%), and in both urban and rural facilities (urban 34.8%, rural 34.6%). Across all countries, on average, a patient was more likely to find a health worker in a private/NGO facility compared to a public facility, but absenteeism was high across facilities of all managing authorities (public 36.4%, private/NGO 29.7%) (***Supplementary Table S6, Figure 1***).

However, there was substantial variation in absenteeism both within and between countries. The proportion of health workers absent from facilities ranged from a high of 53.8 in Kenya to a low of 13.8 in Tanzania. Absenteeism was statistically significantly higher in public facilities than in private facilities in three countries (Nigeria 19 percentage points higher, Kenya 12 percentage points higher, and Malawi 9 percentage points higher). While not statistically significant, five additional countries showed similar trends in higher absenteeism in the public sector, albeit smaller in magnitude. Two countries, Togo and Niger, had diverging findings with absenteeism slightly higher in the private sector (2 and 4 percentage points respectively), although not statistically significant. While overall, absenteeism was similar in urban and rural areas, this varied by country with about half of countries having higher absenteeism in urban areas and half of countries having higher absenteeism in rural areas. However, only one country, Malawi, had a statistically significant difference between absenteeism in urban and rural facilities with absenteeism being higher in urban facilities (urban 43.1%, rural, 32.5%). No strong pattern emerged across countries related to absenteeism by facility type or health worker cadre. We did not see a single facility type or health worker cadre have consistently higher absenteeism compared to other groups across countries (***Supplementary Table S6, Figure 1***).

While absenteeism was fairly widespread, further analysis into the reasons for health worker absences revealed that there was very little unauthorized absence. While absenteeism was directly observed, the reasons for absenteeism were reported by the staff member in charge at the facility. Across all countries, we found the rate of unauthorized health worker absence was, on average, 3.9% (CI: 1.8% - 5.9%) and no country had an unauthorized health worker absence rate above 9% (***Supplementary Table S7***). There was a broad range of reasons given for health worker absences including authorized absence, official mission, outreach or fieldwork, sick or maternity leave, training/ seminar/ meeting, and unauthorized absence (**Supplementary Table S8**). Our findings indicate that high absenteeism is not indicative of a moral failure on the part of health workers and instead is a characteristic of the health system. The many reasons for health worker absenteeism indicate this is a complex health system challenge which may require innovative policy interventions in order to see improvements.

Substantial absenteeism has the potential to exacerbate staffing issues. Given the relatively high levels of absenteeism, we examined staffing patterns adjusted for absenteeism to see the impact of absenteeism on the proportion of facilities with limited clinical staff present (***Supplementary Table S9*, Figure 2**). Due to the different distribution of primary and secondary facilities across countries, this analysis focused on primary care facilities only. After adjusting for absenteeism, the staffing patterns in health centers and health posts were much worse off. Across all countries, the proportion of health centers and health posts with one or no clinical staff increased from 49.6% to 64.1% and the proportion of health centers and health posts with two or fewer clinical staff increased from 69.5% to 79.3% after adjusting for absenteeism. In addition, more than half of health centers and health posts in seven out of ten countries had one or no clinical staff after adjusting for absenteeism (Kenya, Madagascar, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Togo, and Uganda). The countries in which adjusting for absenteeism had the largest impact on the proportion of health centers and health posts with one or no clinical staff include Kenya (33.1% to

63.9%), Togo (48.2% to 68.9%), and Uganda (28.7% to 59.0%). Adjusting for absenteeism had a much smaller impact on countries where many facilities were already lacking clinical staff before adjusting for absenteeism such as in Niger, Nigeria, and Sierra Leone.

Finally, we explored the relationship between absenteeism and facility and health worker characteristics to further understand if health workers with certain characteristics were more likely to be absent (**Table 4**). Results from the logistic regression of health worker absenteeism on facility and health worker characteristics indicate that both facility and health worker level characteristics are associated with absenteeism. The facility level covariates that were statistically significantly associated with absenteeism include facility type and managing authority. Absenteeism was higher for health workers at public facilities ($\beta = 1.399$, p-value <0.001) compared to private facilities and lower for health workers at health posts ($\beta = 0.786$, p-value <0.001) as compared to health workers at hospitals. Interestingly, there was no difference in health worker absenteeism between rural and urban health workers after controlling for other facility and health worker characteristics. The health worker level covariates that were statistically significantly associated with absenteeism include health worker cadre and health worker age. Health worker absenteeism was lower for other workers ($\beta = 0.917$, p-value = 0.037) as compared to doctors while absenteeism was higher for health workers of all age groups compared to health workers less than 30 years. Our findings demonstrate that absenteeism was lowest at the smallest health facilities while being substantially higher at public facilities and slightly higher for older health workers.

Figure 1: National and sub-national variation in absenteeism



Figure 2: Clinical staffing patterns by country, unadjusted and adjusted for absenteeism at primary care level

Table 4: Logistic regression of health worker absenteeism on facility and health worker characteristics

	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value
Facility type (REF = Hospital)			
Health center	0.992	(0.910 - 1.082)	0.863
Health post	0.786	(0.715 - 0.864)	<0.001*
Managing authority (REF = Private/ NGO)			
Public	1.399	(1.295 - 1.512)	<0.001*
Urban/Rural (REF = Urban)			
Rural	1.043	(0.972 - 1.118)	0.245
Health worker cadre (REF = Doctor/Clinical officer)			
Nurse/Midwife	0.936	(0.865 - 1.012)	0.095
Other worker	0.917	(0.846 - 0.995)	0.037*
Health worker sex (REF = Female)			
Male	0.966	(0.917 - 1.018)	0.194
Health worker age (REF = Less than 30 years)			
30-40 years	1.147	(1.079 - 1.219)	<0.001*
40-50 years	1.090	(1.015 - 1.171)	0.018*
More than 50 years	1.113	(1.028 - 1.206)	0.008*
Health worker education (REF = primary)			
Secondary	0.943	(0.820 - 1.084)	0.407
Post-secondary	0.868	(0.748 - 1.007)	0.062
Country (REF = Kenya)			
Madagascar	0.395	(0.341 - 0.457)	<0.001*
Malawi	0.372	(0.328 - 0.421)	<0.001*
Mozambique	0.235	(0.195 - 0.284)	<0.001*
Niger	0.387	(0.320 - 0.468)	<0.001*
Nigeria	0.461	(0.413 - 0.514)	<0.001*
Sierra Leone	0.652	(0.563 - 0.755)	<0.001*
Tanzania	0.178	(0.151 - 0.209)	<0.001*
Togo	0.516	(0.430 - 0.620)	<0.001*
Equipment availability	1.000	(0.999 – 1.000)	0.198
Infrastructure availability	1.000	(0.999 - 1.000)	0.529
(Intercept)	1.089	(0.876 - 1.355)	0.442

4.3. How heavy are health workers' caseloads?

A productive health workforce is one which maximizes effective health services and health outcomes given the existing stock of health workers while simultaneously minimizing waste of staff time or skills (World Health Organization, 2006). Health worker caseload is a measure of productivity that is intended to measure the burden of care placed on each health worker and the relative utilization of each facility. While caseload does capture the primary patient-facing aspect of health worker effort, it does not capture administrative work or other responsibilities. High caseload may be driven by a shortage of health workers, high health worker absenteeism, or high demand and utilization of health care services. There is no global benchmark for daily workload or caseload of health care professionals in LMICs as the type of services provided and the scope of work of each health worker varies significantly by context, making it difficult to set a benchmark. The type of services provided within a health facility and the complexity of care varies and therefore the time required per case varies (World Health Organization, 2010). In addition, the scope of work for each health worker can be very different, particularly as some health workers have significant administrative and non-patient care giving responsibilities such as attending meetings, data recording and reporting, conducting home visits, supervising staff, and attending continuous education trainings (World Health Organization, 2010). However, the amount of time required for support activity duties may vary by facility type, facility location, and health worker cadre and can thus be difficult to incorporate into caseload measures. Health worker caseload provides a "national snapshot" of how many cases staff are seeing to get a broad understanding of health worker caseload; however other approaches are better suited for estimating staffing requirements and assessing workload for health facility management purposes (Doosty et al., 2019; World Health Organization, 2010). In order to understand staffing needs beyond the proportion of facilities with only one or two clinical staff, we first looked at health worker caseload to understand how many patients health workers are seeing per day (***Table 5***). We then examined the proportion of facilities with low and high caseload to understand how many

facilities are potentially not maximizing productivity (***Table 6***). Finally, we explored the relationship between caseload and facility characteristics to further understand if facilities with certain characteristics were more likely to have higher caseloads (***Table 7***). Malawi was excluded from the caseload analysis due to potential discrepancies in the collection of data on outpatient visits. The caseload analysis including Malawi is provided in the supplementary materials (***Supplementary Tables S10, S11, S12 and Supplementary Figures S1a and S1b***).

When examining health worker caseload, we found that on average a health worker attended to 12.5 outpatients per day (CI: 6.9 – 18.1). On average, across all countries, caseload was similar across all types of health facilities (hospital 13, health center 14.7, health post 9.9), in both private/NGO and public facilities (private/NGO 9.1, public 14.3) and in both urban and rural facilities (urban 11.6, rural 12.8). However, health worker caseload varied substantially both across and within countries. Health worker caseload ranged from a low of 2.8 outpatients per day (CI: 2.5 - 3.2) in Nigeria to a high of 23.2 outpatients per day in Mozambique (CI: 20 – 26.5) and 23.1 outpatients per day in Kenya (CI: 21.9 – 24.2). While there is no global benchmark for caseload, some basic assumptions can be made to better contextualize caseload values. Assuming a health worker saw one patient every half hour over the course of an eight-hour shift, this would be a caseload of 16 outpatients per day. Six out of nine countries (Madagascar, Niger, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, and Togo) had an average caseload lower than 16 outpatients per day. Caseload was statistically significantly higher in public facilities than in private facilities in three countries (Kenya 15 percentage points higher, Niger 6 percentage points higher, and Uganda 19 percentage points higher) while one country, Madagascar, had diverging findings with caseload statistically significantly higher in the private sector (7 percentage points). While overall, caseload was similar in urban and rural areas, this varied by country with about half of countries demonstrating trends for higher caseload in urban areas and half of countries demonstrating trends for higher caseload in rural

areas. However, only three countries had a statistically significant difference between caseload in urban and rural facilities with caseload being higher in urban facilities in Madagascar (urban 10.5, rural, 4.9) and higher in rural facilities in Kenya (urban 20.1, rural, 24.6) and Uganda (urban 10.1, rural, 20.2). No strong pattern emerged across countries related to caseload by facility type. We did not see a single facility type have consistently higher caseload compared to other groups across countries (***Table 5***).

We then examined the proportion of facilities with very low and very high caseload. Both very low and very high caseload may be suggestive of health system inefficiencies. The distribution of caseload by country shows that in countries such as Mozambique, Kenya, and Uganda there were some facilities with a much higher caseload than other facilities while in other countries such as Nigeria, Togo, and Madagascar, caseload was quite similar across all facilities. The high inter-quartile range (IQR) for caseload in Mozambique (23.2), Kenya (22.9), and Uganda (19.0) is indicative of substantial within country variation in caseload. Conversely, the low IQR for caseload in Nigeria (2.2), Togo (4.5), and Madagascar (4.7) is indicative of little within country variation in caseload. The distribution of caseload also points to several countries in which most facilities had a rather low caseload (***Figure 3***). In order to further understand what proportion of facilities may have low or high caseload, we assessed the proportion of facilities with a caseload of less than 5 outpatients per day and the proportion of facilities with a caseload greater than or equal to 30 outpatients per day. Across all countries, 42.9% of facilities had a caseload of less than 5 outpatients per day. The proportion of facilities with a caseload of fewer than 5 outpatients per day ranged from 14.0% in Mozambique to 85.9% in Nigeria. More than half of facilities in Madagascar, Nigeria, and Togo had a caseload of less than 5 outpatients per day. In three countries (Kenya, Niger, and Uganda), the proportion of facilities with a caseload of less than 5 outpatients per day was substantially higher for the private/NGO sector as compared to the public sector while in one country, Madagascar, the proportion of facilities with a caseload of less than 5 outpatients per day was substantially higher for the

public sector as compared to the private sector. Across all countries, 10.8% of facilities had a caseload of 30 or more outpatients per day. The proportion of facilities with a caseload of 30 or more outpatients per day ranged from 1.0% in Nigeria to 26.9% in Mozambique. Approximately one-quarter of facilities in Kenya and Mozambique had a caseload of 30 or more outpatients per day while 10% or less of facilities in Madagascar, Niger, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Togo had a caseload of 30 or more. In five countries (Kenya, Mozambique, Niger, Sierra Leone, and Uganda), the proportion of facilities with a caseload of 30 or more outpatients per day was substantially higher for the public sector as compared to the private (***Table 6***).

Finally, we explored associations between caseload and facility characteristics to further understand if facilities with certain characteristics were more likely to have higher or lower caseloads. We first examined the relationship between caseload and basic characteristics (i.e., whether it is a health post or a health center, rural/urban, and public/private) and then included additional explanatory variables such as readiness, absenteeism, and clinical officer competency to gain a deeper understanding of the factors that may be driving caseload.[13] Results from the linear regression of caseload on facility characteristics, readiness, absenteeism, and competency indicate that public facilities have much higher caseloads than private/NGO facilities ($\beta = 9.371$, p-value <0.001). In addition, caseload is modestly higher when both absenteeism ($\beta = 0.189$, p-value <0.001) and competency are higher ($\beta = 0.073$, p-value <0.001). There was no difference in caseload between urban and rural facilities, nor between health centers and hospitals after controlling for other facility characteristics. In addition, increases in readiness were not all associated with caseload, with only increases in equipment availability being associated with a small increase in caseload ($\beta = 0.011$, p-value <0.01) (***Table 7***).

[13] For more on clinic officer competency, see section 4.4.



Figure 3: Caseload distribution[14], by country

[14] Caseload calculations were restricted to facilities offering outpatient services. As such we do not expect differences between hospitals and health centers/health posts and have therefore included all facility types here. However, we have provided graphs presenting hospitals and health centers/health posts separately in the supplementary materials (***Supplementary Figures S1a and S1b***).

Table 5: Average health worker caseload per facility, by country (number and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
National	23.1 (21.9 - 24.2)	6.4 (5.0 - 7.7)	23.2 (20.0 - 26.5)	10.9 (8.6 - 13.2)	2.8 (2.5 - 3.2)	11.3 (10.2 - 12.5)	11.7 (9.6 - 13.8)	6.3 (4.8 - 7.9)	17.0 (14.2 - 19.7)	12.5 (6.9 – 18.1)
Facility type										
Hospital	24.6 (19.9 - 29.2)	5.5 (3.1 - 7.8)	16.7 (7.9 - 25.5)	1.1 (0.6 - 1.7)	4.1 (2.9 - 5.4)	8.0 (6.3 - 9.8)	33.5 (5.5 - 61.4)	6.6 (4.0 - 9.3)	16.6 (2.9 - 30.2)	13.0 (4.7 – 21.2)
Health center	25.0 (22.4 - 27.5)	7.7 (5.5 - 9.9)	24.9 (21.5 - 28.3)	21.6 (17.1 - 26.2)	2.7 (2.3 – 3.0)	11.3 (8.7 - 13.9)	14.2 (7.6 - 20.9)	7.6 (4.5 - 10.6)	17.1 (11.8 - 22.4)	14.7 (8.5 - 20.9)
Health post	22.2 (21 - 23.5)	4.0 (2.8 - 5.2)	NA	6.1 (4.5 - 7.6)	2.0 (1.7 - 2.3)	11.5 (10.1 - 12.9)	10.4 (8.5 - 12.4)	5.8 (4.1 - 7.6)	16.9 (13.7 - 20.2)	9.9 (4.1 - 15.6)
Managing authority										
Private/NGO	15.0 (13.5 - 16.6)	11.8 (9.8 - 13.7)	12.5 (0.0 – 29.0)	5.0 (2.6 - 7.4)	3.2 (1.9 - 4.6)	9.2 (7.1 - 11.3)	11.3 (7.0 - 15.6)	6.8 (4.3 - 9.4)	7.0 (4.7 - 9.4)	9.1 (6.1 - 12.1)
Public	30.4 (28.9 – 32.0)	5.1 (3.6 - 6.6)	23.4 (20.0 - 26.7)	11.2 (8.7 - 13.6)	2.7 (2.5 – 3.0)	11.5 (10.2 - 12.8)	11.9 (9.4 - 14.3)	6.0 (4.0 – 8.0)	26.1 (22.0 - 30.3)	14.3 (6.6 - 21.9)
Urban/Rural										
Urban	20.1 (17.5 - 22.6)	10.5 (8.7 - 12.3)	19.6 (5.6 - 33.6)	8.1 (4.5 - 11.7)	3.2 (2.5 - 3.9)	10.5 (8.5 - 12.5)	15.3 (9.7 - 20.9)	6.6 (4.3 – 9.0)	10.1 (5.7 - 14.6)	11.6 (7.2 – 16.0)
Rural	24.6 (23.4 - 25.7)	4.9 (3.3 - 6.6)	23.7 (20.5 - 26.9)	11.2 (8.7 - 13.8)	2.6 (2.3 - 2.9)	11.7 (10.2 - 13.2)	10.1 (8.4 - 11.8)	6.1 (4.0 - 8.2)	20.2 (16.8 - 23.5)	12.8 (6.5 - 19.1)

Table 6: Proportion of facilities with low and high caseload, by country (% and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
Proportion of facilities with a caseload of <5										
Private/NGO	31.7 (28.7 - 34.6)	30.7 (19.7 - 41.8)	50.0 (0 .0- 119.9)	70.5 (52.6 - 88.3)	83.1 (76.2 - 89.9)	32.5 (16.8 - 48.1)	40.5 (24.7 - 56.4)	53.2 (23.3 - 83.2)	64.1 (54.1 - 74.2)	50.7 (36.3 - 65.1)
Public	5.0 (3.8 - 6.1)	73.1 (64.8 - 81.5)	13.6 (8.6 - 18.6)	40.7 (30.3 - 51.1)	86.5 (84.7 - 88.3)	32.3 (27.6 - 37.1)	35.6 (26.7 - 44.5)	63.9 (50.2 - 77.7)	3.4 (0.5 - 6.3)	39.3 (16.3 – 62.3)
Total	17.8 (16.1 - 19.4)	65.2 (57.0 - 73.4)	14.0 (9.0 – 19.0)	41.8 (31.8 - 51.8)	85.9 (84.0 - 87.8)	32.4 (27.8 - 36.9)	37.0 (29.2 - 44.7)	59.5 (44.9 - 74.1)	32.5 (25.6 - 39.4)	42.9 (25.0 – 60.8)
Proportion of facilities with a caseload of >=30										
Private/NGO	12.8 (10.5 - 15.1)	9.1 (4.3 - 13.9)	0.0 (0.0 - 0.0)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	1.9 (0.0 - 4.4)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	3.7 (0.1 - 7.3)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	4.7 (0.7 - 8.7)	3.6 (0.0 – 7.1)
Public	36.1 (33.4 - 38.7)	1.2 (0.0 - 2.3)	27.2 (20.7 - 33.7)	10.7 (4.1 - 17.2)	0.8 (0.3 - 1.3)	6.2 (4.1 - 8.4)	6.5 (3.8 - 9.2)	3.8 (0.0 - 11.2)	29.8 (22.4 - 37.2)	13.6 (3.1 – 24.0)
Total	24.9 (23.1 - 26.8)	2.6 (1.3 – 4.0)	26.9 (20.5 - 33.3)	10.3 (4.0 - 16.5)	1.0 (0.4 - 1.6)	5.7 (3.7 - 7.7)	5.7 (3.5 - 7.9)	2.2 (0.0 - 6.6)	17.8 (13.2 - 22.3)	10.8 (3.1 – 18.5)

Table 7: Linear regression of caseload on facility characteristics

	Model 1 – facility characteristics on caseload		**Model 2** – Model 1 + readiness		**Model 3** – Model 1 + readiness + absenteeism		**Model 4** – Model 1 + readiness + absenteeism + competency	
Country (REF = Kenya)								
Madagascar	-15.1	***	-14.2	***	-10.5	***	-9.1	***
Mozambique	-5.7	**	-5.1	**	0.0		2.2	
Niger	-16.8	***	-15.9	***	-12.0	***	-9.5	***
Nigeria	-25.3	***	-24.0	***	-21.1	***	-18.3	***
Sierra Leone	-14.0	***	-13.5	***	-11.9	***	-10.5	***
Tanzania	-10.4	***	-10.3	***	-5.9	***	-5.3	***
Togo	-19.5	***	-19.3	***	-17.7	***	-16.3	***
Uganda	-4.7	***	-4.2	***	-4.0	***	-2.0	
Facility type (REF = Hospital)								
Health center	-1.4		-1.1		-1.0		-0.4	
Health post	-3.2	***	-2.4	**	-0.4		0.4	
Managing authority (REF = Private/ NGO)								
Public	10.9	***	11.2	***	9.7	***	9.4	***
Urban/Rural (REF = Urban)								
Rural	-0.9		-0.6		-0.2		-0.2	
Equipment availability			0.0	***	0.0	**	0.01	**
Infrastructure availability			0.0	**	0.0	*	0.01	
Absenteeism					0.2	***	0.2	***
Provider competency							0.1	***
(Intercept)	20.1	***	16.5	***	9.4	***	5.4	***
R-squared	0.2262		0.2284		0.2834		0.2892	

Significance codes: '***' 0.001, '**' 0.01, '*' 0.05

Note: N = 6763; 1047 facilities excluded due to missing data on caseload. Reasons for missing caseload data include:

1) The facility was missing data on the number of staff
2) The facility was missing data on the number of outpatient visits
3) The caseload value was set to missing/omitted because it was greater than 200 which was deemed to be unrealistically high

4.4. How competent are health workers?

In recent years, quality of care has received more attention, with an increasing recognition that health outcomes depend not just on patient access to care but on the competencies of the health worker. Competency encompasses the combination of technical knowledge, skills, abilities and traits to deliver high-quality health services (Kak et al., 2001). Competent care includes patient assessment, prevention and detection of disease, timely management, and other aspects of patient care. In order to understand health worker competency, we first looked at a measure of diagnostic and treatment accuracy. A competent health worker would be expected to correctly diagnose and treat all conditions presented in the vignettes and therefore have a diagnostic and treatment accuracy score of 100%. As diagnostic accuracy and treatment accuracy are highly correlated, we present here (***Table 8***) the combined indicator for both diagnostic and treatment accuracy. Detailed results for diagnostic accuracy and treatment accuracy individually can be found in ***Supplementary Table S13*** and ***Supplementary Table S14***, respectively. We then examined the proportion of health workers with a diagnostic and treatment accuracy score of 50% or less, 20% or less, and equal to 0% (***Table 9***). Finally, we explored the relationship between diagnostic and treatment accuracy and facility and health worker characteristics to further understand if health workers with certain characteristics were more likely to be more competent (**Table 10**).

When examining health worker competency, we found diagnostic and treatment accuracy was, on average, 56.1% (CI: 46% - 66.2%), meaning that on average, health workers gave the correct diagnosis and treatment for just over half of cases. On average, across all countries, diagnostic and treatment accuracy was similar in both urban and rural facilities (58.8% and 52.6%) and public and private/NGO facilities (56.3% and 57.2%). However, it differed by facility type and health worker cadre and a decreasing trend in health worker competency was seen as the facility level decreased from hospital (63.1%) to health

center (56.7%) to health post (47.8%) and as the health worker level of training decreased from doctor/clinical officer (64.2%) to nurse/midwife (52.1%) to other workers (39.8%). Diagnostic and treatment accuracy varied by country and was highest in Malawi (77.1%, CI: 75.3% - 78.8%) and lowest in Nigeria (35%, CI: 32.9% - 37.1%). The range of health worker competency between health worker cadres varied substantially by country. The difference in diagnostic and treatment accuracy between doctors/clinical officers and nurses/midwifes ranged from a 27-percentage point difference in in Tanzania to a 3-percentage point difference in Malawi while the difference in diagnostic and treatment accuracy between nurses/midwives and other workers ranged from a 24-percentage point difference in in Malawi to a 1-percentage point difference in Niger (***Table 8***).

To further understand the proportion of health workers with low competency, we examined the proportion of health worker with a diagnostic and treatment accuracy score of 50% or less, 20% or less, and equal to 0%. Across all countries, 67.9% of health workers (CI: 51.6% - 84.2%) had a diagnostic and treatment accuracy score of 50% or less, 35.9% of health workers (CI: 19.3% - 52.4%) had a diagnostic and treatment accuracy score of 20% or less, and 19.9% of health workers (CI: 9.5% - 30.4%) had a diagnostic and treatment accuracy score equal to 0%. The proportion of health workers with a competency score of 0, was on average, 9.3% for doctors/clinical officers, 22.3% for nurses/midwives, and 39.8% for other workers (***Table 9***). However, the proportion of health workers with a competency score of 0 varied by country, with countries such as Madagascar, Niger, and Nigeria, having more than 10% of doctors/clinical officers and more than 30% of nurses/midwives with a competency score of 0 (***Figure 4***).

Finally, we explored the relationship between diagnostic and treatment accuracy and facility and health worker characteristics to further understand if health workers with certain characteristics were more likely to be more competent and where the health workers with lowest competency are concentrated.

The covariates in the full model explained 42% of the variance seen in health worker diagnostic and treatment accuracy. The facility level covariates that were statistically significantly associated with diagnostic and treatment accuracy include facility type, managing authority, urbanicity, and infrastructure availability. Health worker diagnostic and treatment accuracy was lower for health workers at health centers (β = -5.193, p-value <0.001) and health posts (β = -6.977, p-value <0.001) as compared to health worker at hospitals. However, health worker diagnostic and treatment accuracy was higher for health workers at rural facilities (β = 1.488, p-value = 0.009) compared to urban facilities, for health workers at public facilities (β = 4.901, p-value <0.001) compared to private/NGO facilities, and for facilities with higher levels of infrastructure availability (β = 0.026, p-value = 0.006). Interestingly, equipment availability was the only facility level covariate not statistically significantly associated with health worker diagnostic and treatment accuracy, thus not supporting the idea that better health workers choose to work in better equipped facilities. The health worker level covariates that were statistically significantly associated with diagnostic and treatment accuracy include health worker cadre, health worker age, health worker sex, and health worker education. Health worker diagnostic and treatment accuracy was lower for nurses (β = -7.813, p-value <0.001) and other workers (β = -16.207, p-value <0.001) as compared to doctors as well as for health workers over the age of 50 (β = -1.8313 p-value = 0.007) as compared to those under the age of 30. In addition, health worker diagnostic and treatment accuracy was higher for male health workers (β = 4.579, p-value <0.001) as compared to female health workers and for health workers with post-secondary education (β = 5.622, p-value <0.001) as compared to those with only a primary education (***Table 10***). Our findings demonstrate that health workers in health centers and health posts have lower competency than those in hospitals which means the least qualified health workers are at the frontline of primary health care. In addition, the public sector draws competent health workers as evidenced by the higher competency of public sector health workers as compared to private sector health workers. Finally, rural health workers have slightly higher competency, as do men and younger health workers.

Table 8: Health worker diagnostic and treatment accuracy, by country (% and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
National	74.4 (73.1 - 75.6)	55.9 (51.4 - 60.3)	77.1 (75.3 - 78.8)	46.3 (43.2 - 49.4)	41.0 (38.6 - 43.5)	35.0 (32.9 - 37.1)	57.4 (55.6 - 59.2)	70.1 (66.9 - 73.3)	55.9 (49.5 - 62.4)	47.9 (43.7 - 52.2)	56.1 (46.0 - 66.2)
Facility type											
Hospital	78.9 (75.1 - 82.6)	61.6 (50.2 – 73.0)	79.2 (76.7 - 81.7)	49.5 (45.3 - 53.7)	43.8 (37.7 - 49.8)	47.7 (43.9 - 51.5)	66.4 (60.3 - 72.5)	75.8 (71.1 - 80.5)	56.5 (48.4 - 64.6)	71.4 (67.2 - 75.6)	63.1 (53.6 - 72.6)
Health center	74.4 (72.4 - 76.4)	56.8 (51.1 - 62.5)	74.0 (71.8 - 76.2)	39.5 (36.2 - 42.8)	41.1 (37.3 - 44.9)	24.4 (23.0 - 25.8)	59.6 (56.1 - 63.1)	74.6 (69.4 - 79.7)	65.1 (56.7 - 73.5)	56.9 (52.4 - 61.5)	56.7 (44.5 - 68.8)
Health post	71.8 (70.7 - 72.8)	49.6 (43.1 - 56.1)	64.2 (56.4 - 71.9)	NA	39.6 (35.9 - 43.3)	21.4 (19.3 - 23.5)	55.2 (53.0 - 57.4)	52.1 (48.3 – 56.0)	48.0 (39.5 - 56.5)	28.2 (24.9 - 31.6)	47.8 (35.4 - 60.2)
Managing authority											
Private/NGO	68.7 (67.0 - 70.3)	49.4 (40.5 - 58.2)	75.3 (72.6 – 78.0)	50.8 (40.4 - 61.2)	44.4 (36.9 - 51.9)	46.0 (39.7 - 52.3)	62.3 (57.2 - 67.4)	69.8 (65.0 - 74.6)	57.8 (45.6 – 70.0)	47.3 (39.4 - 55.2)	57.2 (49.1 - 65.2)
Public	77.6 (75.9 - 79.3)	58.0 (52.9 - 63.1)	77.7 (75.5 – 80.0)	46.2 (43.1 - 49.4)	40.8 (38.2 - 43.4)	32.6 (30.7 - 34.4)	56.7 (54.8 - 58.6)	70.3 (66.2 - 74.3)	54.3 (47.6 – 61.0)	48.3 (43.4 - 53.3)	56.3 (45.4 - 67.1)
Urban/Rural											
Urban	73.6 (70.7 - 76.5)	51.0 (45.0 - 57.0)	78.8 (76.2 - 81.5)	52.7 (45.4 – 60.0)	40.0 (36.1 - 43.9)	38.7 (35.7 - 41.8)	60.6 (57.9 - 63.4)	75.3 (72.1 - 78.6)	58.8 (49.6 – 68.0)	58.3 (52.0 - 64.6)	58.8 (48.8 - 68.8)
Rural	74.8 (73.9 - 75.8)	58.6 (52.5 - 64.6)	74.7 (72.6 - 76.8)	43.5 (40.7 - 46.3)	42.0 (38.8 - 45.2)	30.1 (27.3 - 32.9)	54.8 (52.4 - 57.2)	56.3 (51.7 – 61.0)	51.3 (41.7 - 60.8)	39.9 (36.5 - 43.3)	52.6 (42.2 - 63.0)
Health worker cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	77.2 (75.0 - 79.4)	60.0. (54.2 - 65.8)	79.5 (76.6 - 82.4)	51.9 (47.4 - 56.5)	46.3 (30.8 - 61.8)	54.2 (48.8 - 59.7)	67.5 (56.0 – 79.0)	73.9 (70.7 - 77.1)	66.3 (57.3 - 75.3)	64.6 (59.3 – 70.0)	64.2 (56.2 - 72.1)
Nurse / Midwife	71.9 (70.8 – 73.0)	53.0 (46.6 - 59.4)	76.4 (74.1 - 78.6)	38.6 (34.5 - 42.7)	41.0 (37.6 - 44.5)	40.5 (36.4 - 44.6)	59.6 (56.2 - 62.9)	46.8 (39.9 - 53.8)	54.0 (46.0 – 62.0)	39.5 (34.5 - 44.5)	52.1 (42.4 - 61.9)
Other worker	50.8 (43.8 - 57.7)	40.9 (26.5 - 55.3)	52.9 (43.1 - 62.7)	41.2 (34.7 - 47.7)	40.2 (36.7 - 43.6)	22.1 (20.7 - 23.5)	56.0 (53.9 - 58.2)	39.5 (31.1 - 47.9)	31.2 (22.6 - 39.9)	23.5 (19.2 - 27.8)	39.8 (31.5 - 48.1)

Table 9: Proportion of health workers with low competency, by country (% and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
A. PROPORTION OF HEALTH WORKERS WITH DIAGNOSTIC AND TREATMENT ACCURACY 50% OR LESS											
National	57.0 (53.9 - 60.1)	89.3 (84.4 - 94.2)	27.7 (22.4 - 33.0)	74.1 (68.2 – 80.0)	91.9 (88.9 - 94.9)	85.8 (82.7 - 88.9)	76.8 (73.5 - 80.2)	30.2 (20.5 - 40.0)	70.4 (58.1 - 82.8)	75.8 (67.2 - 84.3)	67.9 (51.6 - 84.2)
Health worker cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	47.2 (42.1 - 52.3)	85.4 (77.7 - 93.1)	20.4 (10.7 - 30.1)	64.1 (54.9 - 73.4)	75.6 (57.7 - 93.6)	70.5 (61.0 - 79.9)	52.4 (30.2 - 74.5)	22.8 (12.3 - 33.3)	41.0 (20.9 - 61.1)	58.8 (40.7 - 77)	53.8 (38.4 - 69.2)
Nurse / Midwife	67.4 (65.2 - 69.6)	92.1 (85.7 - 98.6)	32.0 (26.5 - 37.6)	87.7 (82.1 - 93.3)	92.2 (88.0 - 96.5)	85.9 (80.7 - 91.1)	76.5 (70.5 - 82.5)	80.9 (70.9 - 90.8)	79.0 (66.1 - 92.0)	85.2 (75.9 - 94.5)	77.9 (65.2 - 90.6)
Other worker	83.4 (74.1 - 92.8)	100.0 (100.0 - 100.0)	58.0 (41.3 - 74.7)	83.5 (72.7 - 94.2)	94.1 (90.0 - 98.2)	94.4 (92.8 - 95.9)	77.7 (73.6 - 81.9)	80.8 (68.0 - 93.6)	93.7 (81.2 - 100.0)	98.7 (96.8 – 100.0)	86.4 (77.4 - 95.5)
B. PROPORTION OF HEALTH WORKERS WITH DIAGNOSTIC AND TREATMENT ACCURACY 20% OR LESS											
National	6.3 (4.2 - 8.4)	24.2 (16.2 - 32.2)	7.8 (5.8 - 9.8)	44.3 (38.4 - 50.2)	71.1 (65.7 - 76.6)	66.6 (62.8 - 70.5)	49.6 (45.5 - 53.7)	13.3 (8.3 - 18.4)	32.9 (22.2 - 43.6)	42.5 (34.5 - 50.5)	35.9 (19.3 - 52.4)
Health worker cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	5.2 (1.3 – 9.0)	10.7 (4.9 - 16.5)	2.6 (1.0 - 4.2)	34.3 (25.9 - 42.8)	32.6 (8.9 - 56.3)	33.6 (23.2 - 43.9)	36.0 (11.2 - 60.8)	6.9 (2.3 - 11.5)	29.3 (12.1 - 46.6)	11.9 (5.7 – 18.0)	20.3 (10.4 - 30.3)
Nurse / Midwife	6.8 (5.6 - 8.1)	34.6 (21.8 - 47.3)	10.4 (7.3 - 13.5)	57.1 (48.9 - 65.4)	68.1 (60.1 - 76.1)	64.0 (57.9 - 70.2)	41.6 (34.3 - 48.8)	53.4 (38.3 - 68.6)	32.5 (18.9 - 46.1)	59.9 (51.1 - 68.6)	42.8 (27.4 - 58.3)
Other worker	31.2 (21.3 - 41.2)	48.1 (18.7 - 77.5)	38.2 (23.5 – 53.0)	55.3 (40.3 - 70.2)	81.6 (75.0 - 88.1)	86.2 (84.1 - 88.2)	53.6 (48.6 - 58.6)	63.9 (48.3 - 79.6)	56.0 (17.6 - 94.4)	82.8 (74.1 - 91.5)	59.7 (46.2 - 73.2)
C. PROPORTION OF HEALTH WORKERS WITH DIAGNOSTIC AND TREATMENT ACCURACY EQUAL TO 0%											
National	6.3 (4.2 - 8.4)	24.2 (16.2 - 32.2)	2.7 (1.8 - 3.7)	14.4 (10.4 - 18.4)	39.1 (33.1 - 45.2)	46.7 (43.3 - 50.2)	22.4 (18.9 - 26.0)	4.8 (2.8 - 6.9)	13.5 (7.3 - 19.8)	24.8 (19.5 - 30.1)	19.9 (9.5 - 30.4)
Health worker cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	5.2 (1.3 - 9)	10.7 (4.9 - 16.5)	0.4 (0.1 - 0.7)	9.1 (3.6 - 14.6)	24.3 (0.1 - 48.6)	19.9 (10 - 29.7)	5.5 (0 - 13.8)	1.5 (0.5 - 2.5)	12.3 (0.1 - 24.4)	4.1 (1.1 - 7.1)	9.3 (3.7 - 14.9)
Nurse / Midwife	6.8 (5.6 - 8.1)	34.6 (21.8 - 47.3)	2.9 (1.4 - 4.4)	22.0 (14.9 - 29.1)	30.4 (22.8 - 38.0)	36.8 (31.4 - 42.2)	17.5 (11.8 - 23.2)	27.1 (13.0 - 41.1)	12.6 (5.1 - 20.1)	32.5 (25.5 - 39.5)	22.3 (13.8 - 30.9)
Other worker	31.2 (21.3 - 41.2)	48.1 (18.7 - 77.5)	33.0 (19.2 - 46.8)	18.8 (9.3 - 28.2)	53.6 (44.3 - 62.9)	65.5 (63.2 - 67.9)	25.2 (20.7 - 29.7)	27.8 (12.7 - 42.8)	32.6 (5.7 - 59.6)	62.6 (52.8 - 72.3)	39.8 (28.1 - 51.5)



Figure 4: Proportion of health workers with a score of zero on a series of vignettes

Table 10: Linear regression of diagnostic and treatment accuracy on facility and health worker characteristics

	Estimate	Std. Error	p-value
Facility type (REF = Hospital)			
Health center	-5.193	0.835	<0.001*
Health post	-6.977	0.893	<0.001*
Managing authority (REF = Private/ NGO)			
Public	4.901	0.680	<0.001*
Urban/Rural (REF = Urban)			
Rural	1.488	0.569	0.009*
Health worker cadre (REF = Doctor/Clinical officer)			
Nurse/Midwife	-7.813	0.645	<0.001*
Other worker	-16.207	0.942	<0.001*
Health worker sex (REF = Female)			
Male	4.579	0.445	<0.001*
Health worker age (REF = Less than 30 years)			
30-40 years	0.759	0.535	0.156
40-50 years	-0.077	0.603	0.898
More than 50 years	-1.833	0.678	0.007*
Health worker education (REF = primary)			
Secondary	1.952	1.350	0.148
Post-secondary	5.622	1.436	<0.001*
Country (REF = Kenya)			
Madagascar	-20.422	1.165	<0.001*
Malawi	3.915	1.111	<0.001*
Mozambique	-25.324	1.245	<0.001*
Niger	-27.156	1.200	<0.001*
Nigeria	-27.330	1.053	<0.001*
Sierra Leone	-9.043	1.202	<0.001*
Tanzania	-5.886	1.475	<0.001*
Togo	-18.479	1.569	<0.001*
Equipment availability	0.007	0.006	0.203
Infrastructure availability	0.026	0.006	<0.001*
(Intercept)	49.581	1.935	<0.001*
R-squared	0.4202		

5. Discussion

5.1 Implications of these findings

Health staffing challenges in African health systems are complex, multi-faceted, and unique to individual country contexts, as demonstrated by the significant between- and within-country variation across all human resources for health (HRH) performance measures. However, some challenges are ubiquitous: health workers lack basic clinical competencies, caseloads are imbalanced, and there is substantial absence of workers from health facilities; all of which contribute to sub-standard service delivery to patients and inefficient health systems. With expanding populations and large unmet need, health systems in Africa will require a significant expansion of the health workforce. However, widespread staffing shortages do not appear to be the principal constraint in the short term. Importantly, our findings are descriptive statistics and associations, and so should form the basis for further study rather than confident policy action in and of themselves.

Three key findings from this study merit highlighting. First, primary health care facilities, the backbone of universal health coverage (UHC) and a primary access point for the most vulnerable population groups, are the most affected by the health workforce challenges. The majority of these frontline facilities lack clinical staff and have the least qualified health workers. This has important implications for the quality of primary care in the region and the way health systems are designed. Only when high quality primary care is available can systems build in gatekeeping mechanisms to improve the efficiency of the health sector.

Second, although there is noteworthy variation across countries and health worker types, the starkest finding is the low level of competence of health workers. This has implications for both the stock and flow of health workers. For existing cadres, creative solutions are needed to improve the quality of care, including new models for in-service training, use of technology to support diagnosis and treatment, and

supportive supervision. The findings also suggest that there is a crisis in medical and nursing education. Addressing this will also require a systemic approach, including reform of curricula and pedagogical approaches, leveraging technology, improved oversight of both public and private training institutions, and stricter competency requirements for graduating students. Focusing on expanding the workforce without addressing these issues and ensuring that there will be job opportunities for graduating health workers would be futile. A related implication of our findings is that given the low caseload, a health workforce strategy cannot be devised in isolation of understanding and addressing the reasons for low levels of utilization of health services, including poor physical access, financial barriers, low quality, and lack of trust.

Finally, we did not see a single facility type or health worker cadre have consistently higher absenteeism compared to other groups across countries, and unauthorized absence was very low (under 10%). The findings from this study indicate that high absenteeism is a human resource management issue that can and must be improved if countries are to provide the best possible access and quality care to patients. While activities beyond providing health services at the health facility are an important part of a health worker's job, such as attending training, facilities must be able to ensure that quality care can be provided to patients in need at anytime a patient would reasonably expect to receive it (i.e., during business hours as per country protocols).

5.2 Limitations of this work

Some limitations of the SDI surveys and this study warrant discussion. First, we use health worker caseload as a proxy for workload, acknowledging that this is not a perfect measure of each health worker's workload, especially in smaller health facilities where health workers are often in charge of administrative tasks such as data entry and various reporting systems. The differences in the way health systems are

organized across countries—e.g., in terms of services provided, complexity of care, data reporting systems, presence of vertical programs—also limit the cross-country comparability of this measure. Nevertheless, the large variation in caseload does highlight significant differences in the number of patients seen by each health worker which cannot be solely explained by such health system differences.

Second, to assess health workers' clinical competency, we use clinical vignettes, which also present some limitations: they assess what a health worker *knows* about the selected clinical *scenarios* but fail to capture what health workers *do in practice*. Understanding the latter is a complex, multi-dimensional issue that requires an in-depth understanding of the factors enabling the delivery of quality services and the factors motiving health workers. There are trade-offs when it comes to selecting the best methodology to assess health workers' clinical competency, as some more advanced methods such as the use of standardized patients are not suitable for nationally representative studies at scale that allow for cross country comparison. Hence, we believe that the use of clinical vignettes on common clinical cases is a useful methodology to increase measurement, monitoring and comparability of health workers' clinical competencies.

Third, the SDI data are a valuable resource for documenting challenges, but richer, qualitative data are an important complement for understanding why challenges take place (Agweyu et al., 2020).

Fourth, as mentioned above, our analysis consists of a series of descriptive statistics and correlations. It can serve as a complement to quasi-experimental and experimental work to understand how changing factors in health systems translate into better outcomes for patients.

5.3 Conclusions

As countries continue to strive for UHC, solutions to health staffing challenges will become increasingly vital for success. Our findings highlight the need to shift focus from simply counting the number of health workers in a country to routinely monitoring the number of *skilled health workers working efficiently to deliver quality health services to the population* in order to make substantial gains towards solving the health workforce crisis in Africa. There is an opportunity for countries to reconfigure health systems for greater efficiency and quality, but this will require a greater evidence base for country planning as each country faces unique health workforce challenges.

This analysis demonstrates how data from the SDI surveys may be useful to explore challenges among health workforce both within and across countries. It also points the way to future research that can help countries to develop evidence-informed health workforce strategies and policies; such as the need to better understand the low demand for health care and the bottlenecks to improve health workers' clinical capacity, combined with the role played by human resource policies and regulations, and real world decision making on staffing presence/absence and how these impact the demand for care and the quality of care received by patients, among others. It also highlights the need for nimble approaches to routinely monitor health worker performance through fast and cost effective data collection and analysis methods to provide timely information to decision makers. Such timely data is also paramount to better identity effective interventions to improve the availability and quality of health workers in the region and monitor progress over time against pre-determined health worker performance objectives. Future efforts are needed to further study staffing challenges in Sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere. These studies will need to also investigate (i) the know-do gap—i.e., the difference between what health workers know and what they actually do; (ii) the cyclical causality of low staffing, high absenteeism, low competency, and low demand/caseload levels; and (iii) the best interventions to reduce health worker absence and increase

competency overall, both by improving the production and retainment of health workers across the board.

REFERENCES

Abekah-Nkrumah, G. (2019). Trends in utilisation and inequality in the use of reproductive health services in Sub-Saharan Africa. *BMC Public Health, 19*(1), 1-15, Article 1541. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7865-z

Agweyu, A., Masenge, T., & Munube, D. (2020). Extending the measurement of quality beyond service delivery indicators. *BMJ Global Health, 5*(12), Article e004553. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-004553

Andrews, K., Conner, R., Gatti, R., & Sharma, J. (2021). *The Realities of Primary Care: Variation in Quality of Care Across Nine Countries in Sub-Saharan Africa* (Policy Research Working Paper, Issue WPS 9607). World Bank. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/35402

Belita, A., Mbindyo, P., & English, M. (2013, Jul 17). Absenteeism amongst health workers--developing a typology to support empiric work in low-income countries and characterizing reported associations. *Hum Resour Health, 11*, 34. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4491-11-34

Bold, T., Gauthier, B., Svensson, J., & Wane, W. (2010). *Delivering service indicators in education and health in Africa: a proposal* (Policy Research Working Paper, Issue WPS 5327). World Bank. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/3812

Bold, T., Svensson, J., Gauthier, B., Maestad, O., & Wane, W. (2011). *Service delivery indicators: pilot in Education and Health care in Africa*. CMI Report. https://www.cmi.no/publications/file/4284-service-delivery-indicators.pdf

Cameron, A., Ewen, M., Ross-Degnan, D., Ball, D., & Laing, R. (2009). Medicine prices, availability, and affordability in 36 developing and middle-income countries: a secondary analysis. *The Lancet, 373*(9659), 240-249. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61762-6

Das, J., & Hammer, J. (2014). Quality of Primary Care in Low-Income Countries: Facts and Economics. *Annual Review of Economics, 6*(1), 525-553. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080213-041350

Das, J., Hammer, J., & Leonard, K. (2008). The quality of medical advice in low-income countries. *Journal of Economic perspectives, 22*(2), 93-114. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.22.2.93

Di Giorgio, L., Evans, D. K., Lindelow, M., Nguyen, S. N., Svensson, J., Wane, W., & Welander Tärneberg, A. (2020). Analysis of clinical knowledge, absenteeism and availability of resources for maternal and child health: a cross-sectional quality of care study in 10 African countries. *BMJ Global Health, 5*. https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003377

Doosty, F., Maleki, M. R., & Yarmohammadian, M. H. (2019). An investigation on workload indicator of staffing need: A scoping review. *J Educ Health Promot, 8*, 22. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_220_18

Elkhalifa, G. O. (2014). The current crisis in human resources for health in Africa. *South Sudan Medical Journal, 7*(1), 7-8. http://www.southsudanmedicaljournal.com/archive/february-2014/the-current-crisis-in-human-resources-for-health-in-africa.html

Fieno, J. V., Dambisya, Y. M., George, G., & Benson, K. (2016). A political economy analysis of human resources for health (HRH) in Africa. *Human Resources for Health, 14*(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s12960-016-0137-4

Gatti, R., Andrews, K., Avitabile, C., Conner, R., Sharma, J., & Chang, A. Y. (2021). *The Quality of Health and Education Systems Across Africa: Evidence from a Decade of Service Delivery Indicators Surveys.* World Bank,. https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/36234

Gomes Sambo, L. (2005). Message of the Regional Director on the occasion of World Health Day 2006 "Working Together For Health". *African Health Monitor, 7*. https://www.afro.who.int/sites/default/files/2017-06/African%20Health%20Monitor%20Crisis%20in%20Human%20Resources%20for%20Health%20in%20the%20African%20Region.pdf

Huddart, J., & Picazo, O. (2003). *The health sector human resource crisis in Africa*. https://allafrica.com/download/resource/main/main/idatcs/00010259:6691f1058f995c3a02cb79c82cd757b7.pdf

Kak, N., Burkhalter, B., & Cooper, M.-A. (2001). *Measuring the Competence of Healthcare Providers* (Operations Research Issue Paper, Issue. https://www.urc-chs.com/sites/default/files/MeasuringCompetenceofHealthcareProviders_July2001.pdf

Leonard, K. L., & Masatu, M. C. (2010). Professionalism and the know-do gap: exploring intrinsic motivation among health workers in Tanzania. *Health Economics, 19*(12), 1461-1477. https://doi.org/http://doi.org/10.1002/hec.1564

Okeke, E. N. (2021). *When a doctor falls from the sky: The impact of easing physician supply constraints on mortality*. https://www.rand.org/pubs/working_papers/WRA1414-1.html

R Core Team. (2017). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.* In R Foundation for Statistical Computing. https://www.R-project.org/

StataCorp. (2017). *Stata Statistical Software: Release 15.* In Stata-Corp LLC.

The World Bank. (2021). *Service Delivery Indicators Microdata Library*. Retrieved August 28 from https://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/sdi#_r=&collection=&country=&dtype=&from=1890&page=1&ps=&sid=&sk=&sort_by=nation&sort_order=&to=2021&topic=&view=s&vk=

Tulenko, K. (2016). *Africa Will Be Short 6 Million Health Workers by 2030*. IntraHealth. Retrieved October 15 from https://www.intrahealth.org/vital/africa-will-be-short-6-million-health-workers-2030

World Health Organization. (2006). *Working together for health: The World Health Report 2006*. World Health Organization. http://www.who.int/whr/2006/whr06_en.pdf?ua=1

World Health Organization. (2010). *Workload indicators of staffing need*. World Health Organization. https://www.who.int/workforcealliance/knowledge/toolkit/17/en/

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the many data collectors, survey experts, researchers, and country partners who have worked on the country surveys that made this cross-country paper possible. We are grateful to the World Bank, and in particular the Service Delivery Indicators Trust Fund (funded in large part by the Hewlett Foundation) for supporting the underlying data collection, of which this paper reports secondary analysis. Svensson also gratefully acknowledges financial support from Handelsbankens forskningsstiftelser. The authors thank participants at the International Health Economic Associations 2021 meeting for suggestions. The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this paper are entirely those of the authors. They do not necessarily represent the views of the World Bank and its affiliated organizations, or those of the Executive Directors of the World Bank or the governments they represent.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Each of the SDI surveys were carried out in collaboration with the Ministry of Health in each country. All survey participants gave consent to participate in the survey. Details regarding the ethics approval are available in each country survey report. The current study is a secondary analysis of Service Delivery Indicators data.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets generated and/or analyzed during the current study are available in the World Bank data repository, https://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/sdi

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Supplementary Information

Supplementary Table S1: Total number of facilities, health workers, health workers assessed for absenteeism, and health workers assessed for competency, by facility type, managing authority, urban/rural, cadre, and country

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	Total
Facilities											
Facility type											
Hospital	285	37	101	38	16	411	30	30	16	9	**973**
Health center	594	316	847	157	67	1458	109	91	46	133	**3818**
Health post	2159	91	158	0	172	516	397	262	118	252	**4125**
Managing authority											
Private/NGO	1276	155	531	2	35	182	43	117	37	158	**2536**
Public	1762	289	575	193	220	2203	493	266	143	236	**6380**
Urban/rural											
Urban	789	226	306	23	63	950	159	161	54	109	**2840**
Rural	2249	218	800	172	192	1435	377	222	126	285	**6076**
Total	**3038**	**444**	**1106**	**195**	**255**	**2385**	**536**	**383**	**180**	**394**	**8916**
Health workers											
Facility type											
Hospital	10381	517	3770	1733	606	9463	1706	1244	360	114	**29894**
Health center	5971	1522	8793	1239	416	10654	1190	2216	564	1359	**33924**
Health post	8052	161	727	0	309	1201	2159	1700	440	874	**15623**
Managing authority											
Private/NGO	8692	968	4722	57	153	1535	590	2035	326	842	**19920**
Public	15712	1232	8568	2915	1178	19783	4465	3125	1038	1505	**59521**
Urban/rural											
Urban	10247	1697	3916	623	1010	12362	3050	3341	746	791	**37783**
Rural	14157	503	9374	2349	321	8956	2005	1819	618	1556	**41658**
Cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	4408	683	1228	1023	94	960	62	1181	142	381	**10162**
Nurse/ Midwife	11134	1084	2039	1242	5066	1553	1874	609	1067	29424	**5066**
Other	8861	433	9659	707	15169	3440	2090	613	893	39346	**15169**
Total	**24404**	**2200**	**13290**	**2972**	**1331**	**21318**	**5055**	**5160**	**1364**	**2347**	**79441**
Health workers - Absenteeism											
Facility type											
Hospital	1832	245	802	322	126	2417	227	227	137	30	**6365**
Health center	3549	1160	3138	614	270	6237	604	676	352	625	**17225**
Health post	6885	160	365	0	265	1110	1256	1216	428	621	**12306**
Managing authority											
Private/NGO	4790	617	1653	16	101	668	258	731	238	413	**9485**
Public	7476	948	2652	920	560	9096	1829	1388	679	863	**26411**
Urban/rural											
Urban	3644	1084	1131	168	345	4569	946	1087	382	283	**13639**
Rural	8622	481	3174	768	316	5195	1141	1032	535	993	**22257**
Cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	2111	525	424	423	53	371	23	481	82	290	**4783**
Nurse/ Midwife	5638	729	1771	305	351	1624	553	745	388	621	**12725**
Other	4517	311	2110	208	257	7765	1511	890	447	361	**18377**
Total	**12266**	**1565**	**4305**	**936**	**661**	**9764**	**2087**	**2119**	**917**	**1276**	**35896**
Health workers- Competency											
Facility type											
Hospital	586	70	425	278	121	1097	84	70	46	16	**2793**
Health center	1032	454	1018	416	178	3231	217	134	110	314	**7104**
Health post	2867	95	79	0	215	686	528	294	147	399	**5310**
Managing authority											
Private/NGO	1697	211	680	11	58	320	94	152	67	242	**3532**
Public	2788	408	842	683	456	4694	735	346	236	487	**11675**
Urban/rural											
Urban	1178	343	520	130	248	2337	343	241	121	162	**5623**
Rural	3307	276	1002	564	266	2677	486	257	182	567	**9584**
Cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	1764	350	441	283	35	462	30	366	64	186	**3981**
Nurse/ Midwife	2624	256	1001	288	263	919	264	86	211	367	**6279**
Other	97	13	80	123	216	3631	535	46	28	173	**4942**
Total	**4485**	**619**	**1522**	**694**	**514**	**5014**	**829**	**498**	**303**	**729**	**15207**

Supplementary Table S2: Diagnostic accuracy and treatment accuracy detailed definitions

Disease	Diagnostic accuracy	Treatment accuracy
Diarrhea with dehydration	The integrated management of childhood illness (IMCI) guidelines suggest that this case should be classified as diarrhea with severe dehydration due to the presence of three warning signs: lethargy, sunken eyes, and skin pinch going back very slowly.[15] Clinicians should arrive at the dual diagnosis of diarrhea and dehydration but are allowed a broader range of classifications than suggested by the IMCI guidelines. These diagnoses include any mention of diarrhea ("diarrhea" or "acute diarrhea") and any mention of dehydration ("dehydration," "moderate dehydration," or "severe dehydration"). In Mozambique and Niger, the child was listed as unable to drink or drinking poorly, another risk sign for severe dehydration. The way that the diagnosis for diarrhea with dehydration was recorded varied slightly from country-to country. For example, Nigeria and Uganda listed "acute diarrhea with severe dehydration" as the only possible diagnosis. Madagascar listed "diarrhea with moderate dehydration" and "diarrhea with severe dehydration." Togo listed "diarrhea with severe dehydration." All of these answers are counted as correct. For these countries, it is not possible to provide an accurate estimate of how many doctors diagnosed diarrhea alone; it is only possible to calculate the joint diagnosis rate.	The World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines on the integrated management of childhood illness (IMCI) note that the correct treatment of diarrhea with severe dehydration is to give intravenous fluid immediately, to insert a nasogastric (NG) tube if that is not possible, and to refer the patient to a higher-level facility if neither treatment is available. If the child has only some dehydration, then oral rehydration salts (ORS) are the recommended treatment. Given the symptoms, the correct treatment should be rehydration with an intravenous (IV) line or an NG tube. However, the use of ORS plus zinc is also counted as correct. Because the child was able to drink in most vignettes, the providers may have incorrectly believed that the dehydration was less severe. Correct treatment rates would be much lower if only IV fluids or an NG tube was counted as correct (13% correct). Uganda did not include an option for ORS, so only treatment with IV fluids or an NG tube is taken as a correct response. Kenya did not include an option for IV fluids or NG tube, so only ORS with zinc is taken as a correct response.
Pneumonia	A diagnosis of pneumonia is counted as the correct response.	The IMCI guidelines suggest oral amoxicillin for five days as treatment for pneumonia. Severe pneumonia can be treated with "the first dose of an

[15] World Health Organization. 2014. "IMCI Chart Booklet." Geneva, Switzerland. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/mca-documents/imci-chart-booklet.pdf?sfvrsn=f63af425_1&download=true.

Disease	Diagnostic accuracy	Treatment accuracy
		appropriate antibiotic" and urgent referral to a hospital. In addition, children had a fever of 38.5 in the vignette, and IMCI guidelines recommend an antipyretic in this case. Correct treatment is counted as treatment with amoxicillin, a first-line antibiotic, and any antipyretic.
Diabetes	Based on the characteristics presented in this vignette, a diagnosis of type 2 diabetes is the correct response. However, the option of diabetes (type not specified) was available in Kenya, Madagascar, Mozambique, Niger, Sierra Leone, and Tanzania. Clinicians were not prompted to select a specific type if they answered diabetes. Although treatment varies for different types of diabetes, the general diabetes response is also classified as correct. This practice results in higher correct diagnosis rates, an improvement by 14–50 percentage points depending on the country.	The WHO package of essential noncommunicable disease interventions (PEN) protocols states, "Individuals with persistent fasting blood glucose >6 mmol/l despite diet control should be given metformin and/or insulin as appropriate."[16] Correct treatment is counted as any hypoglycemic (including insulin) or referral to a specialist. Referral to a higher level is the recommended protocol for diabetes at the primary level in multiple countries so that option is counted as correct. Although PEN protocol suggests diet control before prescribing hypoglycemics, here prescriptions on first presentation are counted as correct.
Tuberculosis	A diagnosis of tuberculosis is counted as the correct response.	The WHO guidelines for treatment of tuberculosis recommend combination therapy, ideally with a fixed-dose combination.[17] Providers are simply required to mention combination therapy. Knowledge of correct duration and dosage is not necessary, and providers would score worse if this knowledge were required. For example, 23% of providers prescribed combination therapy, but only 8% accurately recalled the correct dosage and timing (this comparison is possible in Madagascar, Mozambique, Niger, Sierra Leone, and Tanzania). However, Nigeria and Uganda recorded "correct duration and dose" as one option, so providers are assessed on

[16] World Health Organization. 2019. "WHO Package of Essential Noncommunicable (PEN) Disease Interventions: Noncommunicable Diseases and Their Risk Factors." Geneva, Switzerland. www.who.int/ncds/management/pen_tools/en/.

[17] World Health Organization. 2018. "Guidelines for Treatment of Drug-Susceptible Tuberculosis and Patient Care (2017 Update)." Geneva, Switzerland. www.who.int/tb/publications/2017 /dstb_guidance_2017/en/

Disease	Diagnostic accuracy	Treatment accuracy
		having gotten the correct dosage and timing. This likely creates a downward bias for provider treatment abilities in these two countries. Kenya did not record any information on whether providers got the correct duration and dosage.
Malaria with anemia	This case should be classified as malaria with anemia, and clinicians are required to arrive at this dual diagnosis. All countries except Togo included “malaria” as an option, and all countries except Nigeria and Uganda included “simple malaria” as an option. Both of these diagnoses are counted as correct. All countries also included “severe malaria” as an option, and this nonspecific diagnosis is not counted as correct because the case does not meet the definition of severe, and severe malaria would require different treatment. Anemia was listed simply as “anemia” without specifying severity. Providers therefore received credit for specifying malaria or simple malaria and anemia. Kenya excluded this module entirely, so it is omitted and its diagnostic accuracy is counted as the average of the four other vignettes.	IMCI guidelines recommend that children with a positive malaria test should be given “recommended first-line antimalarial” and “one dose of paracetamol in clinic” for fever reduction. In addition, iron should be given for treatment of anemia. The questions on malaria treatment varied a bit between countries, and credit is given for treatment with any artemisinin combination therapy or artemether-lumefantrin (coartem). In addition to antimalarials, the provider must prescribe paracetamol and iron for the anemia. Kenya did not include the malaria vignette and is excluded. Nigeria and Uganda did not include questions about iron and are excluded for the sake of comparability.

Supplementary Table S3: Additional facility level measures detailed definitions

Domain	Item	Definition
Infrastructure	Improved sanitation	Credit is given if facility reports and enumerator confirms facility has one or more functioning flush toilets or ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrines, or covered pit latrine (with slab).
Infrastructure	Improved water source	Credit is given if facility reports their main source of water is piped into the facility, piped onto facility grounds, or comes from a public tap/standpipe, tubewell/borehole, a protected dug well, a protected spring, bottled water, or a tanker truck. This definition is based on the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene.
Infrastructure	Electricity	Credit is given if facility reports using electric power grid, fuel-operated generator, battery-operated generator, or a solar powered system as their main source of electricity.
Equipment	Thermometer	Credit is given if a facility reports and the enumerator observes that the facility has one or more functioning thermometers (used for measuring patient body temperature).
Equipment	Stethoscope	Credit is given if a facility reports and the enumerator observes that the facility has one or more functioning stethoscopes.
Equipment	Sphygmomanometer	Credit is given if a facility reports and the enumerator observes that the facility has one or more functioning sphygmomanometers.
Equipment	Weighing scale	Credit is given if a facility reports and the enumerator observes that the facility has one or more functioning adult, child or infant weighing scale.

Supplementary Table S4: Staffing norms by cadre of clinical staff and health facility type

		Doctor	Clinical officer	Doctor/clinical officer	Nurse/Midwife	Nurse	Midwife	**Total**
Kenya	Health center	2	11		37			**50**
	Dispensary	0	2		8			**10**
Malawi	Urban health center			12	14			**26**
	Rural health center			3	8			**11**
Nigeria	Health center	0	0		3			**3**
Niger	Health center II	1			6			**7**
	Health center I	0			4			**4**
	Health post	0			1			**1**
Uganda	Health center IV	2	4		11			**17**
	Health center III	0	2		6			**8**
	Health center II	0	0		2			**2**
Tanzania	Health center (minimum number)	2	2		10			**14**
	Health center (maximum number)	2	3		15			**20**
	Dispensary (minimum number)	0	1		4			**5**
	Dispensary (maximum number)	0	2		7			**9**
Togo	Primary healthcare center I	0				2	1	**3**
	Primary healthcare center II	1				4	3	**8**

Notes: Roman numerals after facility types refer to the size of the facility (i.e., health center II is larger than health center I). Staffing norms were not available for all countries.

Sources: These numbers are drawn from the following documents (see the reference list at the end of this supplementary appendix for more information): Kenya Ministry of Health (2014); Malawi Ministry of Health and Population (2018); Nigeria Federal Ministry of Health (2007); Ministère de la Santé Publique du Niger (2016); Uganda Ministry of Public Service (No date); Tanzania Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (2013); Ministère de la Santé du Togo (2013).

Supplementary Table S5: Average staffing norms compared to actual staffing levels

	EXPECTED average number of clinical staff	ACTUAL average number of clinical staff in HCs and HPs
Kenya	30	3.35
Malawi	18.5	3.37
Nigeria	3	0.58
Niger	5.5	1.38
Uganda	12.5	3.42
Togo	5.5	2.6
Tanzania	12	4.36

Notes: The "expected" average number of clinical staff is the average across cadres and facility types from Supplementary Table S4. The "actual" number of clinical staff is from Table 3.
Source: Authors' construction.

Supplementary Table S6: Health worker absenteeism - total, by country (% and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
National	53.8 (52.0 - 55.6)	26.0 (22.5 - 29.6)	36.5 (34.0 - 39.1)	23.3 (19.0 - 27.6)	31.1 (26.4 - 35.9)	34.4 (32.5 - 36.3)	39.9 (36.8 - 42.9)	13.8 (11.0 - 16.5)	43.8 (37.1 - 50.5)	43.8 (38.7 - 48.9)	34.7 (26.3 - 43)
Facility type											
Hospital	58.9 (55.0 - 62.8)	19.2 (13.0 - 25.5)	43.3 (37.6 – 49.0)	23.9 (18.0 - 29.8)	38.2 (27.1 - 49.4)	30.3 (26.6 - 34.1)	34.0 (26.4 - 41.5)	12.6 (6.6 - 18.6)	47.6 (38.9 - 56.4)	27.7 (6.0 - 49.4)	33.6 (23.6 - 43.5)
Health center	52.3 (50.0 - 54.6)	29.1 (24.3 - 33.9)	34.3 (32.2 - 36.5)	22.3 (16.7 - 27.9)	35.0 (28.1 – 42.0)	38.2 (36.5 - 39.9)	39.0 (33.2 - 44.8)	14.9 (9.4 - 20.3)	40.9 (31.1 - 50.8)	46.2 (38.9 - 53.5)	35.2 (27.4 - 43.1)
Health post	48.5 (47.0 - 49.9)	24.0 (14.3 - 33.6)	9.2 (5.4 - 12.9)	NA	20.4 (13.5 - 27.3)	32.5 (29.3 - 35.6)	43.0 (39.1 - 46.9)	13.7 (11.2 - 16.3)	45.9 (35.7 - 56.1)	43.5 (37.6 - 49.4)	31.2 (19.8 - 42.6)
Managing authority											
Private/NGO	46.3 (43.6 – 49.0)	25.5 (20.4 - 30.5)	30.7 (27.8 - 33.7)	11.4 (0.0 - 30.2)	34.7 (22.2 - 47.2)	19.6 (15.4 - 23.7)	33.9 (26.6 - 41.3)	11.9 (8.0 - 15.8)	44.5 (33.2 - 55.8)	38.7 (31.0 - 46.5)	29.7 (20.8 - 38.6)
Public	58.6 (56.2 - 60.9)	26.3 (21.6 - 31.1)	39.2 (35.8 - 42.7)	23.6 (19.2 - 27.9)	30.9 (25.9 - 35.9)	38.9 (37.0 - 40.8)	40.8 (37.5 - 44.1)	14.9 (11.2 - 18.6)	43.0 (35.8 - 50.3)	47.5 (40.9 - 54.2)	36.4 (27.3 - 45.5)
Urban/Rural											
Urban	55.1 (51.8 - 58.4)	24.5 (21.0 - 28.1)	43.1 (37.5 - 48.7)	23.2 (13.2 - 33.2)	34.8 (28.0 - 41.5)	33.4 (30.5 - 36.3)	37.8 (33.5 – 42.0)	14.3 (10.3 - 18.2)	45.5 (35.9 - 55.1)	36.5 (26.9 - 46.1)	34.8 (26.3 - 43.3)
Rural	52.6 (50.8 - 54.4)	27.7 (21.3 - 34.2)	32.5 (30.4 - 34.6)	23.4 (19.0 - 27.9)	27.6 (21.1 - 34.2)	35.8 (33.8 - 37.8)	42.7 (38.5 - 46.9)	12.8 (10.1 - 15.4)	41.0 (32.7 - 49.3)	49.3 (45.0 - 53.7)	34.6 (25.8 - 43.3)
Health worker cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	56.1 (51.8 - 60.5)	32.6 (25.5 - 39.6)	41.4 (31.8 – 51.0)	24.3 (18.2 - 30.4)	38.3 (20.4 - 56.2)	28.9 (21.4 - 36.5)	24.9 (3.9 – 46.0)	21.1 (13.6 - 28.6)	58.2 (37.0 - 79.4)	42.5 (31.7 - 53.3)	36.8 (27.6 - 46.1)
Nurse / Midwife	55.8 (52.9 - 58.8)	24.9 (19.9 - 29.9)	33.1 (29.2 – 37.0)	24.7 (17.3 - 32.1)	32.3 (25.9 - 38.6)	38.7 (33.1 - 44.4)	31.9 (26.2 - 37.6)	10.5 (7.4 - 13.5)	48.4 (38.3 - 58.5)	47.7 (41.9 - 53.5)	34.8 (25.2 - 44.4)
Other worker	49.6 (47.2 - 52.1)	18.5 (12.8 - 24.1)	38.8 (36.2 - 41.3)	18.8 (11.5 - 26.2)	28.2 (20.5 - 35.9)	33.6 (31.9 - 35.3)	43.7 (40.0 - 47.3)	12.3 (7.9 - 16.6)	36.5 (26.9 – 46.0)	38.3 (32.1 - 44.5)	31.8 (23.2 - 40.5)

Supplementary Table S7: Health worker absenteeism - unauthorized, by country (% and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
National	2.9 (2.4 - 3.5)	1.8 (0.6 – 3.0)	2.1 (1.6 - 2.5)	1.1 (0.4 - 1.8)	5.1 (2.5 - 7.8)	3.8 (3.3 - 4.3)	4.8 (3.4 - 6.2)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.3)	7.9 (4.8 - 10.9)	8.9 (6.5 - 11.3)	3.9 (1.8 - 5.9)
Facility type											
Hospital	2.3 (1.2 - 3.4)	0.8 (0.0 - 1.8)	0.3 (0.0 - 0.6)	0.7 (0.0 - 1.5)	4.1 (0.0 - 8.2)	2.6 (1.8 - 3.4)	3.2 (0.4 – 6.0)	0.2 (0.0 - 0.5)	12.0 (6.3 - 17.8)	4.0 (0.0 – 9.0)	3.0 (0.5 - 5.5)
Health center	2.6 (2.0 - 3.2)	1.9 (0.5 - 3.2)	3.2 (2.5 - 3.9)	1.9 (0.5 - 3.2)	3.3 (0.0 - 6.7)	4.7 (4.0 - 5.4)	5.5 (2.6 - 8.4)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.4)	9.0 (3.0 - 14.9)	10.3 (6.6 - 14.1)	4.3 (1.9 - 6.6)
Health post	3.9 (3.4 - 4.5)	3.4 (0.0 - 9.5)	2.2 (0.0 - 4.8)	NA	8.8 (2.9 - 14.7)	5.1 (3.6 - 6.5)	5.0 (3.0 – 7.0)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.3)	6.3 (3.6 – 9.0)	7.6 (4.7 - 10.4)	4.7 (2.6 - 6.8)
Managing authority											
Private/NGO	1.6 (1.3 - 1.9)	0.5 (0.0 - 1)	1.3 (0.8 - 1.9)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	1.9 (0.0 - 4.3)	2.2 (0.8 - 3.5)	1.9 (0.0 – 4.0)	0.0 (0.0 - 0.1)	7.7 (2.2 - 13.3)	3.9 (1.5 - 6.3)	2.1 (0.5 - 3.7)
Public	3.8 (2.9 - 4.6)	2.5 (0.7 - 4.3)	2.4 (1.8 – 3.0)	1.1 (0.4 - 1.9)	5.4 (2.6 - 8.1)	4.3 (3.8 - 4.8)	5.2 (3.6 - 6.9)	0.2 (0.0. - 0.4)	8.0 (5.5 - 10.5)	12.5 (8.8 - 16.3)	4.5 (2.0 - 7.1)
Urban/Rural											
Urban	2.4 (1.4 - 3.4)	1.2 (0.6 - 1.8)	0.8 (0.3 - 1.3)	1.3 (0.0 - 2.8)	1.8 (0.2 - 3.3)	3.2 (2.5 – 4.0)	4.8 (2.9 - 6.8)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.3)	7.5 (2.9 – 12.0)	5.6 (1.2 - 9.9)	2.9 (1.2 - 4.6)
Rural	3.5 (3.0 - 3.9)	2.5 (0.1 - 4.9)	2.8 (2.2 - 3.4)	1.0 (0.2 - 1.8)	8.4 (3.6 - 13.2)	4.6 (3.9 - 5.2)	4.7 (2.5 - 6.9)	0.2 (0.0 - 0.5)	8.5 (5.4 - 11.7)	11.4 (8.8 - 13.9)	4.8 (2.2 - 7.3)
Health worker cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	2.8 (1.5 - 4.2)	1.1 (0.2 – 2.0)	0.1 (0.0 - 0.3)	1.2 (0.2 - 2.2)	4.7 (0.0 - 12.2)	0.5 (0.0 – 1.0)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	3.4 (0.0 - 7.8)	8.8 (3.7 - 13.8)	2.3 (0.3 - 4.3)
Nurse / Midwife	2.0 (1.6 - 2.4)	2.7 (0.4 – 5.0)	1.0 (0.6 - 1.5)	0.7 (0.0 - 1.4)	3.9 (0.5 - 7.2)	2.0 (1.2 - 2.8)	3.9 (2.0 - 5.8)	0.2 (0.0 - 0.5)	9.9 (4.4 - 15.4)	9.8 (6.8 - 12.8)	3.6 (1.1 - 6.1)
Other worker	4.3 (3.1 - 5.5)	0.8 (0.0 - 1.5)	4.1 (3.1 – 5.0)	1.2 (0.0 - 2.6)	7.0 (2.3 - 11.7)	4.8 (4.1 - 5.4)	5.3 (3.4 - 7.2)	0.2 (0.0 - 0.4)	6.8 (3.0 - 10.7)	7.1 (4.5 - 9.8)	4.2 (2.3 – 6.0)

Supplementary Table S8: Reasons for health worker absenteeism, by country (% and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
Authorized absence	40.5 (37.8 - 43.2)	35.7 (28.4 - 43.1)	22.9 (18.7 - 27.1)	26.3 (17.0 - 35.7)	34.0 (25.7 - 42.4)	32.7 (29.8 - 35.5)	17.5 (13.8 - 21.2)	29.6 (21.1 – 38.0)	26.8 (18.3 - 35.3)	24.2 (18.6 - 29.8)	30.0 (22.5 - 37.4)
Official mission	8.7 (7.6 - 9.8)	13.1 (7.9 - 18.3)	7.9 (5.1 - 10.7)	20.8 (12.7 – 29.0)	6.1 (2.5 - 9.7)	15.9 (13.8 - 17.9)	8.2 (5.7 - 10.8)	4.0 (2.0 - 5.9)	11.0 (3.6 - 18.5)	11.4 (6.6 - 16.2)	11.5 (6.6 - 16.4)
Outreach or fieldwork	1.4 (1.1 - 1.7)	0.2 (0.0. - 0.7)	21.9 (19.0 - 24.8)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	2.8 (2.1 - 3.5)	11.2 (9.0 - 13.4)	50.0 (0.0 - 12.5)	0.0 (0.0 - 0.0)	3.5 (2.0 - 5.0)	5.4 (2.3 - 13.1)
Sick or on maternity leave	5.2 (4.1 - 6.3)	5.1 (2.9 - 7.2)	3.9 (2.4 - 5.3)	14.7 (7.6 - 21.9)	19.7 (12.2 - 27.1)	11.1 (9.3 - 12.9)	9.1 (6.9 - 11.4)	23.5 (15.3 - 31.6)	9.4 (2.7 – 16.0)	7.9 (5.2 - 10.6)	9.8 (4.4 - 15.2)
Training, seminar, meeting	7.7 (6.2 - 9.2)	24.8 (18.7 - 30.8)	18.5 (14.5 - 22.5)	21.4 (11.7 - 31.1)	11.3 (6.0 - 16.6)	8.8 (7.3 - 10.3)	6.3 (3.7 – 9.0)	35.7 (24.5 - 46.9)	34.7 (23.6 - 45.8)	30.6 (25.2 – 36.0)	14.1 (7.3 - 20.9)
Unauthorized absence	5.4 (4.5 - 6.4)	7.1 (2.6 - 11.5)	5.6 (4.4 - 6.9)	4.7 (1.7 - 7.8)	16.5 (8.8 - 24.3)	11.4 (9.9 - 12.9)	12.0 (8.6 - 15.4)	1.1 (0.0 - 2.1)	18.0 (11.1 - 24.9)	21.9 (16.7 - 27.2)	9.0 (4.9 - 13.1)
Other	31.0 (28.7 - 33.3)	14.0 (10.0 - 18.1)	19.3 (15.2 - 23.5)	12.0 (6.2 - 17.8)	12.3 (6.5 - 18.2)	17.4 (13.2 - 21.7)	35.5 (31.5 - 39.6)	1.2 (0.3 - 2.2)	0.2 (0.0 - 0.4)	0.4 (0.1 - 0.8)	20.2 (11.6 - 28.9)

Supplementary Table S9: Clinical staffing patterns in health centers and health posts adjusted for absenteeism, by country (number/proportion and 95% CI)

		Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
		n = 2753	n = 407	n = 1005	n = 157	n = 239	n = 1974	n = 506	n = 353	n = 164	n = 385	n = 7943
Proportion of health centers and health posts with one or fewer clinical staff adjusted for absenteeism	A: Total number of clinical staff reduced by proportion of clinical staff absent	63.9 (61.9 - 65.8)	69.2 (61.4 – 77.0)	39.4 (36.4 - 42.4)	47.8 (39.9 - 55.6)	85.3 (80.4 - 90.3)	92.4 (91.0 - 93.7)	84.4 (80.7 - 88.2)	31.0 (24.3 - 37.8)	68.9 (54.3 - 83.5)	59.0 (52.8 - 65.2)	64.1 (49.6 - 78.7)
	B: Total number of clinical staff reduced by subtracting number of clinical staff absent	63.1 (61.1 – 65.0)	69.2 (61.5 – 77.0)	36.2 (33.2 - 39.2)	47.8 (39.9 - 55.6)	85.3 (80.4 - 90.3)	91.8 (90.4 - 93.2)	84.2 (80.4 - 87.9)	30.9 (24.1 - 37.7)	68.3 (53.7 – 83.0)	56.2 (49.9 - 62.5)	63.3 (48.5 - 78.1)
	B1: Subset of facilities where all clinical staff were assessed for absenteeism	n = 2238	n = 341	n = 117	n = 331	n = 97	n = 308	n = 206	n = 135	n = 183	n = 214	n = 4170
		75.8 (73.9 - 77.8)	73.2 (65.2 - 81.2)	61.3 (56.1 - 66.6)	56.4 (47.4 - 65.4)	79.7 (70.3 - 89.2)	89.8 (85.7 - 93.9)	81.6 (75.6 - 87.6)	41.8 (32.3 - 51.3)	70.7 (54.4 – 87.0)	80.0 (73.8 - 86.3)	71.1 (60.9 - 81.2)
Proportion of health centers and health posts with two or fewer clinical staff adjusted for absenteeism	A: Total number of clinical staff reduced by proportion of clinical staff absent	82.7 (81.2 - 84.3)	89.3 (85.1 - 93.5)	61.6 (58.6 - 64.6)	67.5 (60.2 - 74.9)	91.9 (88.4 - 95.4)	95.6 (94.5 - 96.7)	91.7 (88.7 - 94.8)	60.6 (53.0 - 68.2)	79.7 (67.3 - 92.1)	72.7 (66.8 - 78.6)	79.3 (70.0 - 88.7)
	B: Total number of clinical staff reduced by subtracting number of clinical staff absent	81.0 (79.4 - 82.6)	88.9 (84.7 - 93.2)	58.1 (55.1 - 61.2)	67.5 (60.2 - 74.9)	91.2 (87.4 - 94.9)	94.7 (93.5 - 95.9)	91.2 (88.1 - 94.2)	59.8 (52.2 - 67.4)	79.7 (67.3 - 92.1)	68.1 (62.0 - 74.1)	78.0 (68.2 - 87.8)
	B1: Subset of facilities where all clinical staff were assessed for absenteeism	n = 2238	n = 341	n = 117	n = 331	n = 97	n = 308	n = 206	n = 135	n = 183	n = 214	n = 4170
		93.7 (92.6 - 94.8)	93.8 (89.9 - 97.6)	88.5 (85.1 – 92.0)	82.1 (75.1 – 89.0)	92.9 (87.3 - 98.5)	96.8 (94.0 - 99.6)	95.7 (92.7 - 98.7)	82.9 (76.5 - 89.3)	83.0 (69.4 - 96.6)	93.4 (89.8 - 97.1)	90.3 (86.2 - 94.3)

Note: This table presents clinical staffing adjusted for absenteeism using two alternative methods of adjustment, as outlined in endnote 5 of the main paper.

Supplementary Table S10: Average health worker caseload per facility, by country (number and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
National	23.1 (21.9 - 24.2)	6.4 (5.0 - 7.7)	47.5 (43.7 - 51.3)	23.2 (20.0 - 26.5)	10.9 (8.6 - 13.2)	2.8 (2.5 - 3.2)	11.3 (10.2 - 12.5)	11.7 (9.6 - 13.8)	6.3 (4.8 - 7.9)	17.0 (14.2 - 19.7)	16.0 (6.7 - 25.3)
Facility type											
Hospital	24.6 (19.9 - 29.2)	5.5 (3.1 - 7.8)	27.2 (19.9 - 34.5)	16.7 (7.9 - 25.5)	1.1 (0.6 - 1.7)	4.1 (2.9 - 5.4)	8.0 (6.3 - 9.8)	33.5 (5.5 - 61.4)	6.6 (4.0 - 9.3)	16.6 (2.9 - 30.2)	14.4 (6.5 - 22.3)
Health center	25.0 (22.4 - 27.5)	7.7 (5.5 - 9.9)	49.5 (45.2 - 53.9)	24.9 (21.5 - 28.3)	21.6 (17.1 - 26.2)	2.7 (2.3 – 3.0)	11.3 (8.7 - 13.9)	14.2 (7.6 - 20.9)	7.6 (4.5 - 10.6)	17.1 (11.8 - 22.4)	18.2 (8.6 - 27.7)
Health post	22.2 (21.0 - 23.5)	4.0 (2.8 - 5.2)	64.2 (49.1 - 79.3)	NA	6.1 (4.5 - 7.6)	2.0 (1.7 - 2.3)	11.5 (10.1 - 12.9)	10.4 (8.5 - 12.4)	5.8 (4.1 - 7.6)	16.9 (13.7 - 20.2)	15.9 (1.1 - 30.7)
Managing authority											
Private/NGO	15.0 (13.5 - 16.6)	11.8 (9.8 - 13.7)	23.8 (19.5 - 28.1)	12.5 (0.0 - 29)	50 (2.6 - 7.4)	3.2 (1.9 - 4.6)	9.2 (7.1 - 11.3)	11.3 (7.0 - 15.6)	6.8 (4.3 - 9.4)	7.0 (4.7 - 9.4)	10.6 (6.3 - 14.8)
Public	30.4 (28.9 - 32)	5.1 (3.6 - 6.6)	58.0 (53.2 - 62.8)	23.4 (20.0 - 26.7)	11.2 (8.7 - 13.6)	2.7 (2.5 – 3.0)	11.5 (10.2 - 12.8)	11.9 (9.4 - 14.3)	6.0. (4.0 – 8.0)	26.1 (22.0 - 30.3)	18.6 (6.7 - 30.6)
Urban/Rural											
Urban	20.1 (17.5 - 22.6)	10.5 (8.7 - 12.3)	36.7 (27.2 - 46.1)	19.6 (5.6 - 33.6)	8.1 (4.5 - 11.7)	3.2 (2.5 - 3.9)	10.5 (8.5 - 12.5)	15.3 (9.7 - 20.9)	6.6 (4.3 – 9.0)	10.1 (5.7 - 14.6)	14.1 (7.2 - 20.9)
Rural	24.6 (23.4 - 25.7)	4.9 (3.3 - 6.6)	49.3 (45.2 - 53.5)	23.7 (20.5 - 26.9)	11.2 (8.7 - 13.8)	2.6 (2.3 - 2.9)	11.7 (10.2 - 13.2)	10.1 (8.4 - 11.8)	6.1 (4.0 - 8.2)	20.2 (16.8 - 23.5)	16.4 (6.5 - 26.4)

Supplementary Table S11: Proportion of facilities with low and high caseload, by country (% and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
Proportion of facilities with a caseload of <5											
Private/NGO	31.7 (28.7 - 34.6)	30.7 (19.7 - 41.8)	22.1 (15.3 - 28.8)	50.0 (0 - 119.9)	70.5 (52.6 - 88.3)	83.1 (76.2 - 89.9)	32.5 (16.8 - 48.1)	40.5 (24.7 - 56.4)	53.2 (23.3 - 83.2)	64.1 (54.1 - 74.2)	47.8 (33.6 - 62.1)
Public	5.0 (3.8 - 6.1)	73.1 (64.8 - 81.5)	2.4 (0.8 - 4.1)	13.6 (8.6 - 18.6)	40.7 (30.3 - 51.1)	86.5 (84.7 - 88.3)	32.3 (27.6 - 37.1)	35.6 (26.7 - 44.5)	63.9 (50.2 - 77.7)	3.4 (0.5 - 6.3)	35.7 (13.8 - 57.5)
Total	17.8 (16.1 - 19.4)	65.2 (57 - 73.4)	8.5 (5.9 - 11)	14.0 (9 - 19)	41.8 (31.8 - 51.8)	85.9 (84 - 87.8)	32.4 (27.8 - 36.9)	37.0 (29.2 - 44.7)	59.5 (44.9 - 74.1)	32.5 (25.6 - 39.4)	39.4 (21.9 - 57)
Proportion of facilities with a caseload of >=30											
Private/NGO	12.8 (10.5 - 15.1)	9.1 (4.3 - 13.9)	26.2 (19.0 - 33.4)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	1.9 (0.0 - 4.4)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	3.7 (0.1 - 7.3)	0.0 (0.0 – 0.0)	4.7 (0.7 - 8.7)	5.8 (0.0 - 11.8)
Public	36.1 (33.4 - 38.7)	1.2 (0.0 - 2.3)	68.6 (63.6 - 73.6)	27.2 (20.7 - 33.7)	10.7 (4.1 - 17.2)	0.8 (0.3 - 1.3)	6.2 (4.1 - 8.4)	6.5 (3.8 - 9.2)	3.8 (0.0 - 11.2)	29.8 (22.4 - 37.2)	19.1 (3.6 - 34.5)
Total	24.9 (23.1 - 26.8)	2.6 (1.3 – 4.0)	55.6 (51.1 - 60.1)	26.9 (20.5 - 33.3)	10.3 (4.0 - 16.5)	1.0 (0.4 - 1.6)	5.7 (3.7 - 7.7)	5.7 (3.5 - 7.9)	2.2 (0.0 - 6.6)	17.8 (13.2 - 22.3)	15.3 (3.1 - 27.4)

Supplementary Table S12: Linear regression of caseload on facility characteristics

	Model 1 – facility characteristics on caseload		**Model 2** – Model 1 + readiness		**Model 3** – Model 1 + readiness + absenteeism		**Model 4** – Model 1 + readiness + absenteeism + competency	
Country (REF = Kenya)								
Madagascar	-15.4	***	-14.4	***	-10.3	***	-9.0	***
Malawi	21.9	***	22.6	***	26.5	***	26.2	***
Mozambique	-6.3	***	-5.6	**	-0.2		1.9	
Niger	-17.5	***	-16.4	***	-12.3	***	-9.9	***
Nigeria	-25.9	***	-24.4	***	-21.4	***	-18.7	***
Sierra Leone	-14.8	***	-14.2	***	-12.6	***	-11.3	***
Tanzania	-10.7	***	-10.6	***	-5.9	***	-5.3	***
Togo	-19.9	***	-19.6	***	-18.0	***	-16.6	***
Uganda	-4.8	***	-4.4	***	-4.2	***	-2.3	*
Facility type (REF = Hospital)								
Health center	0.1		0.5		0.7		1.2	
Health post	-1.6		-0.7		1.5		2.3	*
Managing authority (REF = Private/ NGO)								
Public	12.8	***	13.2	***	11.7	***	11.5	***
Urban/Rural (REF = Urban)								
Rural	-1.3	*	-0.9		-0.5		-0.5	
Equipment availability			0.01	**	0.01		0.01	
Infrastructure availability			0.02	***	0.02	**	0.01	*
Absenteeism					20.1	***	20.2	***
Provider competency							0.1	***
(Intercept)	17.8	***	14.0	***	6.1	***	2.3	
R-squared	0.2884		0.2901		0.3359		0.3397	

Significance codes: '***' 0.001, '**' 0.01, '*' 0.05

Note: N = 7236; 1680 facilities excluded due to missing data on caseload. Reasons for missing caseload data include:

1) The facility was missing data on the number of staff
2) The facility was missing data on the number of outpatient visits
3) The caseload value was set to missing/omitted because it was greater than 200 which was deemed to be unrealistically high



Supplementary Figure S1a: Caseload distribution for health centers and health posts, by country



Supplementary Figure S1b: Caseload distribution for hospitals, by country

Supplementary Table S13: Health worker diagnostic accuracy, by country (% and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
National	66.8 (65.6 – 68.0)	48.1 (43.3 - 52.9)	71.5 (69.6 - 73.5)	58.4 (56.0 - 60.7)	39.9 (37.4 - 42.4)	40.9 (38.6 - 43.3)	49.1 (47.0 - 51.2)	69.2 (64.4 – 74.0)	50.3 (45.1 - 55.6)	56.3 (52.7 – 60.0)	55.1 (47.0 - 63.2)
Facility type											
Hospital	70.6 (66.8 - 74.4)	54.5 (50.3 - 58.7)	74.3 (71.9 - 76.8)	62.4 (59.5 - 65.4)	44.7 (39.6 - 49.9)	52.0 (47.4 - 56.7)	60.5 (54.7 - 66.3)	71.5 (63.3 - 79.6)	50.1 (41.5 - 58.7)	71.3 (60.2 - 82.3)	61.2 (53.7 - 68.7)
Health center	67.1 (65.6 - 68.6)	49.9 (43.5 - 56.4)	67.5 (64.6 - 70.5)	49.6 (46.2 - 53.0)	44.3 (40.9 - 47.6)	31.7 (30.4 – 33.0)	54.1 (50.3 – 58.0)	75.1 (65.3 - 84.8)	56.3 (47.9 - 64.7)	64.2 (60.1 - 68.3)	56.0 (46.7 - 65.2)
Health post	64.5 (63.5 - 65.4)	38.5 (31.4 - 45.5)	54.7 (47.8 - 61.7)	NA	30.3 (26.4 - 34.3)	29.3 (27.1 - 31.5)	45.4 (42.9 - 47.9)	56.8 (51.7 – 62.0)	45.3 (38.9 - 51.8)	40.8 (37.2 - 44.5)	45.1 (35.9 - 54.2)
Managing authority											
Private/NGO	65.4 (64.1 - 66.6)	51.7 (45.8 - 57.6)	67.6 (65.4 - 69.9)	59.7 (44.7 - 74.8)	46.2 (40.9 - 51.6)	52.6 (46.2 – 59.0)	56.8 (51.7 – 62.0)	74.6 (64.4 - 84.8)	54.5 (44.2 - 64.8)	56.2 (51.3 - 61.1)	58.5 (52.5 - 64.6)
Public	67.6 (65.9 - 69.3)	46.9 (40.9 - 52.9)	73.0 (70.6 - 75.5)	58.3 (55.9 - 60.7)	39.5 (36.9 - 42.1)	38.4 (36.3 - 40.4)	48.1 (45.9 - 50.3)	66.8 (61.4 - 72.1)	46.9 (41.2 - 52.5)	56.4 (51.3 - 61.5)	54.2 (45.5 - 62.9)
Urban/Rural											
Urban	67.1 (64.5 - 69.7)	52.1 (47.7 - 56.5)	74.6 (71.9 - 77.4)	67.4 (63.4 - 71.3)	46.5 (43.4 - 49.7)	44.4 (40.8 – 48.0)	54.3 (51.2 - 57.4)	74.2 (68.5 - 79.9)	53.2 (45.5 - 60.9)	64.6 (59.4 - 69.9)	59.8 (51.9 - 67.8)
Rural	66.6 (65.7 - 67.5)	45.9 (39.0 - 52.8)	67.4 (65.0 - 69.8)	54.4 (51.9 - 56.9)	34.1 (30.7 - 37.4)	36.5 (33.7 - 39.2)	45.1 (42.4 - 47.7)	56.0 (49.6 - 62.5)	45.7 (38.2 - 53.3)	49.9 (46.6 - 53.2)	50.2 (42.1 - 58.2)
Health worker cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	70.6 (68.5 - 72.7)	57.4 (54.1 - 60.6)	74.6 (71.6 - 77.6)	63.3 (60.2 - 66.3)	57.2 (51.2 - 63.1)	57.6 (50.4 - 64.8)	59.3 (49.4 - 69.1)	72.6 (67.0 - 78.2)	64.3 (54.5 - 74.1)	71.7 (67.4 - 75.9)	64.8 (59.9 - 69.8)
Nurse / Midwife	63.0 (62.0 - 64.1)	41.1 (33.5 - 48.6)	70.0 (67.4 - 72.5)	51.7 (48.3 - 55.1)	43.2 (39.9 - 46.4)	44.4 (41.1 - 47.8)	52.0 (48.6 - 55.4)	45.7 (39.4 - 52.1)	46.3 (40.8 - 51.8)	50.2 (46.8 - 53.5)	50.8 (44.2 - 57.3)
Other worker	48.5 (41.1 - 55.9)	30.2 (16.4 – 44.0)	54.4 (42.2 - 66.6)	53.7 (46.8 - 60.6)	32.7 (29.0 - 36.4)	30.2 (28.8 - 31.7)	47.5 (44.9 - 50.1)	46.5 (37.7 - 55.2)	39.2 (24.1 - 54.4)	28.7 (24.3 – 33.0)	41.2 (33.9 - 48.4)

Supplementary Table S14: Health worker treatment accuracy, by country (% and 95% CI)

	Kenya	Madagascar	Malawi	Mozambique	Niger	Nigeria	Sierra Leone	Tanzania	Togo	Uganda	All
National	74.4 (73.1 - 75.6)	55.9 (51.4 - 60.3)	77.1 (75.3 - 78.8)	46.3 (43.2 - 49.4)	41.0 (38.6 - 43.5)	35.0 (32.9 - 37.1)	57.4 (55.6 - 59.2)	70.1 (66.9 - 73.3)	55.9 (49.5 - 62.4)	47.9 (43.7 - 52.2)	56.1 (46.0 - 66.2)
Facility type											
Hospital	78.9 (75.1 - 82.6)	61.6 (50.2 – 73.0)	79.2 (76.7 - 81.7)	49.5 (45.3 - 53.7)	43.8 (37.7 - 49.8)	47.7 (43.9 - 51.5)	66.4 (60.3 - 72.5)	75.8 (71.1 - 80.5)	56.5 (48.4 - 64.6)	71.4 (67.2 - 75.6)	63.1 (53.6 - 72.6)
Health center	74.4 (72.4 - 76.4)	56.8 (51.1 - 62.5)	74.0 (71.8 - 76.2)	39.5 (36.2 - 42.8)	41.1 (37.3 - 44.9)	24.4 (23.0 - 25.8)	59.6 (56.1 - 63.1)	74.6 (69.4 - 79.7)	65.1 (56.7 - 73.5)	56.9 (52.4 - 61.5)	56.7 (44.5 - 68.8)
Health post	71.8 (70.7 - 72.8)	49.6 (43.1 - 56.1)	64.2 (56.4 - 71.9)	NA	39.6 (35.9 - 43.3)	21.4 (19.3 - 23.5)	55.2 (53.0 - 57.4)	52.1 (48.3 – 56.0)	48.0 (39.5 - 56.5)	28.2 (24.9 - 31.6)	47.8 (35.4 - 60.2)
Managing authority											
Private/NGO	68.7 (67.0 - 70.3)	49.4 (40.5 - 58.2)	75.3 (72.6 – 78.0)	50.8 (40.4 - 61.2)	44.4 (36.9 - 51.9)	46.0 (39.7 - 52.3)	62.3 (57.2 - 67.4)	69.8 (65.0 - 74.6)	57.8 (45.6 – 70.0)	47.3 (39.4 - 55.2)	57.2 (49.1 - 65.2)
Public	77.6 (75.9 - 79.3)	58.0 (52.9 - 63.1)	77.7 (75.5 – 80.0)	46.2 (43.1 - 49.4)	40.8 (38.2 - 43.4)	32.6 (30.7 - 34.4)	56.7 (54.8 - 58.6)	70.3 (66.2 - 74.3)	54.3 (47.6 – 61.0)	48.3 (43.4 - 53.3)	56.3 (45.4 - 67.1)
Urban/Rural											
Urban	73.6 (70.7 - 76.5)	51.0 (45.0 – 57.0)	78.8 (76.2 - 81.5)	52.7 (45.4 – 60.0)	40.0 (36.1 - 43.9)	38.7 (35.7 - 41.8)	60.6 (57.9 - 63.4)	75.3 (72.1 - 78.6)	58.8 (49.6 – 68.0)	58.3 (52.0 - 64.6)	58.8 (48.8 - 68.8)
Rural	74.8 (73.9 - 75.8)	58.6 (52.5 - 64.6)	74.7 (72.6 - 76.8)	43.5 (40.7 - 46.3)	42.0 (38.8 - 45.2)	30.1 (27.3 - 32.9)	54.8 (52.4 - 57.2)	56.3 (51.7 – 61.0)	51.3 (41.7 - 60.8)	39.9 (36.5 - 43.3)	52.6 (42.2 - 63.0)
Health worker cadre											
Doctor/ Clinical officer	77.2 (75.0 - 79.4)	60.0 (54.2 - 65.8)	79.5 (76.6 - 82.4)	51.9 (47.4 - 56.5)	46.3 (30.8 - 61.8)	54.2 (48.8 - 59.7)	67.5 (56.0 – 79.0)	73.9 (70.7 - 77.1)	66.3 (57.3 - 75.3)	64.6 (59.3 – 70.0)	64.2 (56.2 - 72.1)
Nurse / Midwife	71.9 (70.8 – 73.0)	53.0 (46.6 - 59.4)	76.4 (74.1 - 78.6)	38.6 (34.5 - 42.7)	41.0 (37.6 - 44.5)	40.5 (36.4 - 44.6)	59.6 (56.2 - 62.9)	46.8 (39.9 - 53.8)	54.0 (46.0 – 62.0)	39.5 (34.5 - 44.5)	52.1 (42.4 - 61.9)
Other worker	50.8 (43.8 - 57.7)	40.9 (26.5 - 55.3)	52.9 (43.1 - 62.7)	41.2 (34.7 - 47.7)	40.2 (36.7 - 43.6)	22.1 (20.7 - 23.5)	56.0 (53.9 - 58.2)	39.5 (31.1 - 47.9)	31.2 (22.6 - 39.9)	23.5 (19.2 - 27.8)	39.8 (31.5 - 48.1)

Supplementary Materials References

Kenya Ministry of Health. (2014). *Human Resources For Health Norms and Standards: Guidelines For The Health Sector*. https://www.health.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/16th%20october%20WHO%20Norms%20and%20Standarnds%20%20Book.pdf

Malawi Ministry of Health and Population. (2018). *Human Resources for Health Strategic Plan, 2018-2022*.

Ministère de la Santé du Togo. (2013). Normes Sanitaires du Togo.

Ministère de la Santé Publique du Niger. (2016). Normes et Standards des Infrastructures, Equipements et Ressources Humaines du Systeme de Sante.

Nigeria Federal Ministry of Health. (2007). *National Human Resources for Health Strategic Plan, 2008 to 2012*. https://pdf4pro.com/cdn/nigeria-hrhstrategicplan-2008-2012-who-2b01b2.pdf

Tanzania Ministry of Health and Social Welfare. (2013). *Staffing Levels for Ministry of Health and Social Welfare Departments, Health Service Facilities, Health Training Institutions and Agencies, 2014-2019*. https://www.jica.go.jp/project/tanzania/006/materials/ku57pq00001x6jyl-att/REVIEW_STAFFING_LEVEL_2014-01.pdf

Uganda Ministry of Public Service. (No date). Staffing Schedules for Health Centres II, III, and IV.