

1 Geographic barriers to care persist at the community healthcare level: evidence from
2 rural Madagascar

3

4 Michelle V Evans^{¶1}, Tanjona Andréambeloson^{¶2}, Mauricianot Randriamihaja², Felana Ihantamalala^{2,3},

5 Laura Cordier², Giovanna Cowley², Karen Finnegan², Feno Hanitriniaina², Ann C. Miller³, Lanto

6 Marovavy Ralantomalala², Andry Randriamahaso², Bénédicte Razafinjato², Emeline

7 Razanahanitriniaina², Rado JL Rakotonanahary^{2,3}, Isaïe Jules Andriamiandra⁴, Matthew H Bonds^{2,3},

8 Andres Garchitorena^{1,2}

9

10 1. MIVEGEC, Univ. Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, Montpellier, France

11 2. NGO PIVOT, Ranomafana, Ifanadiana, Madagascar

12 3. Department of Global Health and Social Medicine, Blavatnik Institute at Harvard Medical School,

13 Boston, MA, USA

14 4. Direction de Soins de Santé de Base, Madagascar Ministry of Public Health, Antananarivo,

15 Madagascar

16

17

18 Corresponding Author

19 Email: mv.evans.phd@gmail.com (MVE)

20

21 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work

22

23 **ABSTRACT:**

24 Geographic distance is a critical barrier to healthcare access, particularly for rural communities
25 with poor transportation infrastructure who rely on non-motorized transportation. There is broad
26 consensus on the importance of community health workers (CHWs) to reduce the effects of
27 geographic isolation on healthcare access. Due to a lack of fine-scale spatial data and individual
28 patient records, little is known about the precise effects of CHWs on removing geographic
29 barriers at this level of the healthcare system. Relying on a high-quality, crowd-sourced dataset
30 that includes all paths and buildings in the area, we explored the impact of geographic distance
31 from CHWs on the use of CHW services for children under 5 years in the rural district of
32 Ifanadiana, southeastern Madagascar from 2018-2021. We then used this analysis to determine
33 key features of an optimal geographic design of the CHW system, specifically optimizing a
34 single CHW location or installing additional CHW sites. We found that consultation rates by
35 CHWs decreased with increasing distance patients travel to the CHW by approximately 28.1%
36 per km. The optimization exercise revealed that the majority of CHW sites (50/80) were already
37 in an optimal location or shared an optimal location with a primary health clinic. Relocating the
38 remaining CHW sites based on a geographic optimum was predicted to increase consultation
39 rates by only 7.4%. On the other hand, adding a second CHW site was predicted to increase
40 consultation rates by 31.5%, with a larger effect in more geographically dispersed catchments.
41 Geographic distance remains a barrier at the level of the CHW, but optimizing CHW site location
42 based on geography alone will not result in large gains in consultation rates. Rather, alternative
43 strategies, such as the creation of additional CHW sites or proactive care, should be
44 considered.

45

46

47

48

49 INTRODUCTION

50 In 2012, the UN General Assembly declared universal health coverage key to sustainable
51 human and economic development. However, the majority of the world's population still lacks
52 access to essential health services, including primary care (1). There are multiple barriers to
53 primary care access, including financial costs, low provider to population ratios, and geographic
54 distance (2,3). Geographic distance to primary health clinics (PHCs) is especially problematic in
55 contexts where the transportation network is sparse and the primary mode of transportation is
56 non-motorized (4). In these primarily rural regions, the use of primary care decreases
57 exponentially for populations living at increasing distances from PHCs, known as the "distance-
58 decay" effect (5–9). Low access in turn negatively affects population health metrics such as
59 maternal mortality (10) or hospitalization rates for severe malaria (11).

60 Community health programs, often implemented via community health workers (CHWs),
61 have emerged as a potential solution to increase healthcare access in geographically isolated
62 communities (12). Usually residents of these communities, CHWs are located closer to their
63 patients than PHCs and provide basic maternal and child care, as well as a range of services
64 such as HIV and TB treatment. CHW programs became a focus of international development
65 funding organizations following the Alma Alta declaration in 1978 and were implemented in
66 countries around the world. CHWs have since played an integral role in national health systems
67 and several universal health coverage strategies (13,14). Although located in closer proximity to
68 underserved communities than other levels of the health system (e.g. PHC, district hospital),
69 CHWs can be responsible for large geographic catchments or isolated, rural populations,
70 limiting their ability to adequately serve everyone. As such, the World Health Organization
71 recommends that community health programs adapt CHW catchments according to the local
72 geography, including the proximity of households and population density (15). Yet, it is unknown
73 whether a meaningful 'distance-decay' relationship - similar to that observed for health facilities -
74 can persist at the community health level, where distances to seek care are significantly shorter.

75 Whether this relationship exists has significant implications for how CHW systems are designed
76 geographically, and if and how community health programs should be optimized to the local
77 geography.

78 Measuring the impact of geographic barriers on community health poses particular
79 challenges. Studies on barriers to healthcare typically use data from national surveys, such as
80 Demographic Health Surveys or Multiple Indicators Cluster Surveys (e.g. (16,17)). Household
81 coordinates in these surveys are randomly displaced to protect participants' anonymity (18),
82 preventing the assessment of geographic barriers at small spatial scales (19). Dedicated
83 surveys have measured households' reported time to different health providers and the impact
84 on healthcare access (20,21), but these rarely assess the impact on CHW access (but see
85 Ahmed et al. (22) for a review of the few, existing studies) and could be subject to biases in
86 people's perception of time. An alternative is the use of geographic information from routine
87 health system data. While PHCs typically keep records of a patient's residence to the lowest
88 administrative level (9), this information is not systematically recorded in CHW registries.
89 Studying the impact of geographic barriers at the community level therefore requires new
90 methods and data if we are to optimize community health programs for the local geography of
91 CHW catchments.

92 Madagascar is illustrative of the challenges to and opportunities for achieving universal
93 health coverage by improving the design of community health systems. Following a history of
94 French colonial occupation and political instability post-independence, Madagascar has
95 witnessed little economic growth over the past half-century, severely limiting investment in
96 public health, with negative consequences for healthcare access (23,24). There are fewer than
97 2 medical professionals per 10,000 people in the country (25), and 43% of the population lives
98 more than an hour walking time from a PHC (4). Consequently, healthcare seeking rates for
99 children under 5 years old are low, ranging from 40 - 60% nationally (26), and there is an
100 opportunity for a strengthened community health program to help meet these needs. The

101 national community health policy requires that two volunteer CHWs be locally selected and
102 responsible for each fokontany, the smallest administrative area in Madagascar (mean
103 population of approx. 1200) (27). Fokontany range in size from 1.5 km² to 3747 km². Given this
104 range of catchment sizes, populations in rural Madagascar may continue to face geographic
105 barriers when seeking care at the CHW level.

106 Here, we examined the impact of geographic distance to CHWs on the use of CHW
107 services for children under 5 years in the rural district of Ifanadiana, southeastern Madagascar.
108 Ifanadiana district has been established as a model district for universal health coverage by the
109 government of Madagascar, implemented in partnership with the healthcare non-governmental
110 organization (NGO) Pivot (see the 'Study area and intervention' section), with a particular focus
111 on strengthening community healthcare. In addition, the population of Ifanadiana experiences a
112 strong distance-decay effect on healthcare access at the level of PHCs, particularly for
113 communities further than 5 km from a PHC, which represents over 70% of the population of the
114 district (9). We build on previous work where we obtained accurate estimates of distance to
115 PHCs and CHWs for every household in the district using a high-resolution spatial dataset that
116 includes all households and transportation networks used by residents in the district (28). From
117 this dataset, we calculated an aggregate measure of geographic dispersion from the CHW site
118 for each fokontany in our study area, and we assessed its relationship with all-cause child
119 consultations with CHWs, controlling for relevant factors. We then explored two potential
120 solutions to geographic barriers for isolated communities in Ifanadiana: optimizing a single
121 CHW site location with regards to distance and installing an additional second site per
122 catchment.

123

124 **METHODS**

125 ***Study area and intervention***

126 Ifanadiana is a rural district located in the Vatovavy region in southeastern Madagascar.
127 It has a population of approximately 200,000 people, distributed in 13 communes (subdivision of
128 a district with ~15 000 people, each with at least one PHC), and 195 fokontany (subdivision of a
129 commune with ~1200 people). Following national policy, each fokontany in Madagascar has
130 two community-appointed CHWs that provide integrated community case management for
131 children under 5 years of age (27). Care, including diagnoses and distribution of limited
132 medicines, takes place at the community health site of each fokontany, generally the residence
133 of a CHW in most parts of the country. Per national policy, CHWs are unpaid volunteers and
134 receive monthly supervision at PHCs. In 2014, the Madagascar Ministry of Public Health
135 (MMoPH) and the NGO Pivot began a partnership to strengthen the community health system
136 as part of a broader intervention at all levels of care to achieve universal health coverage in the
137 district. The strengthened community health program revolved around an enhanced standard of
138 care model which included providing CHWs with additional training; frequent on-site supervision
139 by a team of nurses; the construction of a physical building for consultations in partnership with
140 local communities; support to the supply chain, with medicines free of charge; and a modest
141 stipend (27). As of February 2022, this intervention has been implemented in seven communes,
142 equivalent to about half the district, with plans to expand to the entire district by 2023.

143

144 ***Data collection***

145 *Distance to primary health centers and community healthcare workers*

146 For each fokontany, we estimated the average distance of all households in the fokontany to
147 two types of health facilities, primary health centers and community health sites where CHWs
148 are based. For this, we used a high-resolution spatial dataset available on OpenStreetMap,
149 which we collected via participatory mapping (described in detail in Ihantamalala et al. (28)).
150 This dataset includes all paths, roads, buildings, and residential areas (defined as groups of four
151 or more buildings) within Ifanadiana District. Overall, the dataset included over 100,000

152 buildings, 20,000 km of footpaths and more than 5000 residential areas. For each residential
153 area, we estimated the network distance to the nearest health facility of each type using the
154 Open Source Routing Machine algorithm (<http://project-osrm.org/>), along our mapped transport
155 network of roads and paths. We then aggregated these values to the fokontany level by taking a
156 weighted mean for all residential areas within a fokontany (residential areas were weighted by
157 the number of buildings they comprised), resulting in an average household distance to the
158 nearest PHC and community sites. We refer here to the average household distance to the
159 fokontany's community health site as geographic dispersion.

160

161 *Survey data*

162 Household wealth is a strong determinant of access to healthcare in Ifanadiana (29).
163 Therefore, we calculated the average wealth score for each fokontany using data from the
164 IHOPE cohort, which includes longitudinal surveys at 80 clusters (20 households per cluster)
165 across Ifanadiana district, conducted every two years from 2014-2018 (30). The IHOPE cohort
166 is implemented by the Madagascar National Institute of Statistics and is based primarily on the
167 internationally validated Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS). A wealth score was
168 calculated for each of the 1600 households through a principal components analysis of
169 household assets following standard DHS methods (31). Because household wealth scores in
170 Ifanadiana are very stable over time (Figure S1), we summarized this value as the mean for
171 each cluster across survey years. We then used inverse-distance weighting to interpolate these
172 values from 80 clusters across the study area (32), using leave-one-out cross-validation to
173 optimize the power used to weight the distance, via the spatstat package (33). To aggregate
174 this value to the scale of the fokontany, we extracted the wealth score at the coordinates of the
175 four primary residential areas of each fokontany and assigned the mean of these values to the
176 fokontany.

177

178 *Community health system data*

179 To study the impact of geographic barriers on CHW utilization, we obtained the monthly
180 number of CHW consultations for children under 5 years old from the CHW monthly reports to
181 the District Office. We included data from 80 fokontany in seven communes in Ifanadiana, from
182 May 2018 - May 2021, except for one commune (Ambohimanga du Sud), where CHW support
183 began in June 2020. Consultations here refer to all-cause consultations for children under 5
184 years old who are residents of that fokontany. To obtain per capita utilization rates (per child
185 under 5), we used population data collected by Pivot in 2021 as part of the proactive CHW
186 program. We interpolated population estimates to other years assuming a 2.8% growth rate,
187 following MMoPH methods.

188 In addition, we collected information to control for characteristics of the CHWs that may
189 influence healthcare seeking behavior. This included the average age of the CHWs (median:
190 43.5, range: 20 - 63) and the gender of the CHWs in a community site (all men, all women,
191 mixed). This data is routinely collected by the Pivot Community Health team. Because CHW
192 composition was stable over the time period of this study, we assumed that these CHW
193 characteristics were constant for the duration of our study. We also accounted for the
194 introduction of a pilot initiative of proactive care in one of the communes (Ranomafana) in
195 October 2019. In addition to these characteristics, Pivot teams conduct monthly on-site
196 supervisions of CHWs, observing multiple consultations and recording the percentage of cases
197 of malaria, pneumonia, and diarrhea correctly managed (diagnosis, treatment,
198 recommendations, etc.). From these measurements, we calculated the proportion of consults
199 correctly treated across all three diseases as a metric of quality of care. This variable was used
200 in a supplemental analysis to examine the impact of whether the CHW quality of care modified
201 the relationship between our geographic proxies and healthcare access.

202

203 ***Statistical analysis of geographic barriers to community healthcare***

204 We tested for an effect of a fokontany's geographic dispersion from the CHW site on
205 monthly CHW consultation rates using a generalized linear mixed model. To control for factors
206 that are known to influence CHW use rates, we included the fokontany's average household
207 distance to the nearest PHC, the fokontany's wealth score, and characteristics of the CHWs
208 working in the community site (age and sex). All continuous predictor variables were scaled and
209 centered to facilitate model convergence. We standardized counts of consultations per month
210 per fokontany into the number of monthly consultations per 1000 children under 5 years old.
211 The model was fit with a zero-inflated negative binomial distribution with a log-link, including the
212 fokontany and month of sampling as crossed random effects to account for the repeated
213 sampling design of the data (34). We assessed the fitted model for variable collinearity, residual
214 uniformity, and overdispersion. We also conducted a supplemental analysis on the subset of the
215 data for which we had information on the quality of care (80.2%). The statistical analysis was
216 identical to our primary analysis except for the inclusion of the additional quality of care variable.
217 The analyses were conducted using the glmmTMB (35) and DHARMA (36) packages in R v.
218 4.1.1 (37).

219

220 ***Potential solutions to geographic barriers***

221 Following the statistical analysis estimating the relationship between geographic
222 dispersion and consultation rates, we considered two solutions to geographic barriers to CHW
223 access: optimizing the location of a single community health site and installing a second
224 community health site per fokontany in an optimized location. We assessed whether relocating
225 the community health site or optimizing the location of a second site to minimize geographic
226 dispersion could substantially improve CHW consultation rates in the study area. To optimize
227 the location of one CHW site, we identified the location within an existing residential area in that
228 fokontany that resulted in the lowest geographic dispersion value. The optimal location was
229 identified by calculating the geographic dispersion value for the fokontany from each residential

230 area, following the method above, and selecting the residential area with the lowest value. To
231 optimize the location of a second site, we calculated the geographic dispersion value for each
232 fokontany with one site in the current location and the second site within an existing residential
233 area. We assumed each household would use the community site closest to their residence
234 within their fokontany, and calculated the average household distance to the closest community
235 site for each potential new second location. The optimal second location was the residential
236 area that resulted in the lowest average geographic dispersion value for the fokontany. We then
237 used the fit statistical model to predict the change in consultation rates given new optimized site
238 locations and reduced estimates of geographic dispersion, and compared predicted consultation
239 rates at optimized locations to predicted rates at present locations.

240 We created an online dashboard to share the results of these optimization exercises for
241 the full district of Ifanadiana (<https://research.pivot-dashboard.org>). This interactive cartographic
242 tool allows public health stakeholders to identify current, optimal single, and optimal second
243 CHW site locations for all 195 fokontany in Ifanadiana district. In addition, they can explore the
244 predicted change in CHW consultation rates for both potential solutions for the 80 fokontany
245 included in the statistical analysis. To ensure adoption of this tool by CHW supervisors at Pivot,
246 we conducted a training on tool use following its establishment. The tool is available in French.
247

248 ***Ethical Statement***

249 Use of aggregate monthly consultation counts from MMoPH community health data for this study was
250 authorized by the Medical Inspector of Ifanadiana district. It was deemed non-human subjects research by
251 Harvard University's Institutional Review Board. The IHOPE longitudinal survey implemented informed
252 consent procedures approved by the Madagascar National Ethics Committee and the Madagascar Institute
253 of Statistics, specifically including written consent from participants individuals aged 15 years or over.
254 Household-level de-identified data from the IHOPE survey were provided to the authors for the current
255 study.

256 This research was conducted by an international team consisting of researchers, health
257 practitioners, and international development workers with differing relations with and identities
258 relative to the region and community of study. We explore how these power dynamics
259 influenced our research process in a reflexivity statement in the supplement following Morton et
260 al. (38).

261

262 RESULTS

263 *Geographic barriers to community healthcare*

264 CHWs conducted 73,857 consults from May 2018 - May 2021, with an average annual
265 consultation rate of 1.73 (1.51 *sd*) consultations per capita. Data was missing for 62 out of 2436
266 month-fokontany combinations, with one fokontany missing ten months of data, but the majority
267 of fokontany (56) missing none. Geographic dispersion estimates ranged from 0.21 to 4.12 km,
268 with a mean of 2.06 km (Figure 1). Geographic dispersion was a function of both the spatial
269 pattern of residential zones relative to the community health site and the overall absolute size of
270 the fokontany (Figure 1B,C). The fokontany with the lowest geographic dispersion had 93.8% of
271 the population living within 1 km of the community health site, with a maximum distance of 1.65
272 km. In contrast, the fokontany with the highest geographic dispersion had 14.8% of the
273 population living within 1 km of the community health site, with a maximum distance of 8.34 km.

274

275 **Figure 1. Spatial patterns of geographic access to health care at community health sites**
276 **in Ifanadiana.** A) Geographic dispersion of the fokontany population from the CHW (in km),
277 based on the transportation network and location of all residential areas. Panels B) and C) show
278 the routes from residential areas to CHW sites in a fokontany with high geographic dispersion
279 (B) and low geographic dispersion (C). Blue points represent the community health site for that
280 fokontany and shaded squares represent residential areas, with larger squares representing
281 areas with more buildings. CHW: community health worker, PHC: primary health center. Data
282 Sources: MMoPH (administrative boundaries), Pivot (health center locations), OpenStreetMap
283 (transportation routes, buildings). All maps have been created from spatial datasets using the R
284 programming language.

285

286 Our statistical model suggested that the geographic dispersion of a fokontany is
287 associated with CHW consultation rates. Specifically, consultation rates were lower in fokontany
288 where residential areas are more geographically dispersed from CHW sites (Table 1, Figure
289 2A). An increase in geographic dispersion of 1 km corresponded to a decrease in monthly
290 consultation rates of 28.1% (95% CI: 19.0% - 36.2%, Table 1). Holding all variables at their
291 mean value, an increase in geographic dispersion from 1 km to 4 km corresponded to a
292 decrease in annual consultation rates from 2.18 to 0.81 per capita. We also found a trend for
293 higher CHW consultation rates in fokontany that are further from PHCs (Table 1, Figure 2B), but
294 this trend was not significant (IRR = 1.019, 95% CI = 0.988 - 1.052). Wealthier fokontany had
295 lower consultation rates than fokontany with lower socio-economic levels (IRR = 0.686, 95% CI
296 = 0.533 – 0.882, Table 1). Consultation rates were higher in fokontany that had mixed gender
297 CHWs (IRR = 1.514, 95% CI= 1.154 – 1.984) or all men teams (IRR = 1.423, 95% CI = 1.06 –
298 1.919), compared to teams of all women (Table 1). Our supplemental analysis found that these
299 results were robust to the inclusion of the quality of care provided by CHWs in the model (Figure
300 S2).
301
302

303 **Table 1. Results of statistical model estimating effects of geographic barriers on CHW**
 304 **consultation rates. Incidence rate ratios (IRR) of variables included in the model. Following**
 305 **Wasserstein et al. (39), we have chosen to provide 95% confidence intervals and not to**
 306 **dichotomize these continuous measures into thresholds of significance (e.g. p-values). CHW:**
 307 **community health worker, PHC: primary health center**
 308

	Mean IRR	95% CI
Geographic Variables		
CHW Geographic Dispersion (km)	0.719	0.638 - 0.811
Distance to PHC (km)	1.019	0.988 - 1.052
Confounding Variables		
Wealth Score	0.686	0.533 - 0.882
CHW Age (year)	1.000	0.991 - 1.015
CHW Gender- All Men (compared to all women)	1.428	1.062 – 1.919
CHW Gender - Mixed (compared to all women)	1.514	1.115 - 1.984
Proactive Care	1.471	1.297 – 1.668
Model Structure		
Zero-inflation Intercept	0.026	0.020 - 0.033

309

310 **Figure 2. CHW consultation rates for children under 5 years decrease with increasing**
311 **CHW geographic dispersion and increase with increasing distance to the nearest PHC.**
312 *Lines represent the estimated marginal mean effects of each variable with 95% confidence*
313 *intervals from the fitted model, holding all other variables constant at their mean value. Points*
314 *represent the mean annual CHW consultation rate for each fokontany from May 2018 - May*
315 *2021. CHW: community health worker, PHC: primary health center*
316

317 *Impact of single optimized community health site placement on CHW consultations*

318 Given the association between CHW geographic dispersion in a fokontany and CHW
319 consultation rates, we explored whether optimized CHW site placement could be a potential
320 solution to reduce geographic barriers to community health access. Forty-six fokontany (of 80)
321 had an existing community site that was within 500m euclidean distance of the optimal site
322 placement (Figure 3), resulting in an average reduction in geographic dispersion of 0.062 km.
323 For this exercise, we considered these forty-six instances as fokontany where the CHW site was
324 already optimally located. Of the 34 fokontany with an optimal site placement further than 500m
325 from the existing site, four had a PHC located within their borders, and the optimal location was
326 in the same residential area as the PHC. For the remaining 30 fokontany, the optimal CHW site
327 placement was in a different geographic location than the current CHW site or PHC (Figure 3).
328 The quartile of fokontany with the highest geographic dispersion (above 3.3 km) experienced an
329 average reduction in geographic dispersion of 19.1% and absolute change in geographic
330 dispersion of 0.71 km when calculating geographic dispersion using the optimal site placement
331 compared to the current CHW site location. In contrast, the quartile of fokontany with the lowest
332 geographic dispersion (below 0.90 km) experienced an average reduction in geographic
333 dispersion of 15.3% and absolute reduction in geographic dispersion of 0.31 km when
334 calculating geographic dispersion using the optimal site placement compared to the current
335 CHW site location. In some instances, particularly for large fokontany, the distance between
336 optimal and current site locations was several kilometers, but the change in geographic
337 dispersion was small (Figure 3). This was because the size of the fokontany and road network

338 necessarily placed a limit on the lowest geographic dispersion possible when only placing one
339 CHW site.

340 Using the fitted GLMM, the predicted change in annual consultation rates given optimal
341 CHW site location was a modest increase of 0.13 consultations per year per child, or a 7.4%
342 increase in annual consultation rates, across all 80 fokontany. Focusing on only the 30
343 fokontany with an optimal site placement more than 500m from the existing site, we predicted a
344 15.8% increase in consultation rates with optimized CHW site placement. For the quartile of
345 fokontany that had the highest geographic dispersion, optimal CHW site placement resulted in a
346 15.2% increase in consultation rates compared with current CHW site placement (Figure 4). For
347 the quartile of fokontany with the lowest geographic dispersion, optimal CHW site placement
348 resulted in a 12.6% increase in consultation rates compared with current CHW site placement
349 (Figure 4).

350

351 **Figure 3. The majority of existing CHW sites are located near the optimal location.**
352 *Absolute change in CHW geographic dispersion based on optimal CHW site location compared*
353 *to existing CHW site location. The fill color represents the reduction in geographic dispersion*
354 *and points represent existing site locations (gray) and optimal site locations (black). CHW:*
355 *community health worker, PHC: primary health center. Data Sources: MMoPH (administrative*
356 *boundaries), Pivot (health center locations), OpenStreetMap (transportation routes, buildings).*
357 *All maps have been created from spatial datasets using the R programming language.*
358

359 **Figure 4. Both proposed solutions have the strongest predicted improvement in**
360 **consultation rates in the most geographically dispersed fokontany.** *The predicted change*
361 *in annual CHW consultation rates following the optimization of a single CHW site (top row) or*
362 *the addition of a second CHW site in an optimized location (bottom row). Each line represents*
363 *the predicted change for one fokontany and fokontany are grouped into quartiles determined by*
364 *their geographic dispersion estimates (Q1: least dispersed, Q4: most dispersed).*
365

366 *Impact of a second community health site on CHW consultations*

367 The second solution we explored was the addition of an additional community site to each
368 fokontany in a location optimized to reduce the geographic dispersion of that fokontany. The
369 optimal location of the second community site in four fokontany was the same location as a

370 PHC (Figure 5), and so we did not include them in further analyses. The remaining 76 fokontany
371 had a second site on average 2.29 km (0.98 km *sd*) from the existing site. On average, 42.2% of
372 the population of each fokontany lived closer to the second site than the current site,
373 representing the potential population served by a second community health site. The quartile of
374 sites with highest geographic dispersion experienced an average reduction in geographic
375 dispersion of 38.2%, or 1.27 km, following the addition of a second site (Figure 5). The quartile
376 of sites with the lowest geographic dispersion experienced an average reduction in geographic
377 dispersion of 48.8%, or 0.44 km, following the addition of a second site (Figure 5).

378 After applying the fitted GLMM, we found that the addition of a second site was predicted
379 to increase the average annual consultation rate from 1.81 consults per capita to 2.38
380 consultations per capita, an increase of over 30%, for all 76 fokontany. Considering the quartile
381 of fokontany that had the highest geographic dispersion, the creation of a second site resulted in
382 a predicted 49.1% mean increase in consultation rates (Figure 4). For the quartile of fokontany
383 with the lowest geographic dispersion, the creation of a second site resulted in a predicted
384 27.3% mean increase in consultation rates (Figure 4).

385

386 ***Figure 5. The addition of a second community health site reduces geographic dispersion***
387 ***by over 500m for the majority of fokontany. Absolute change in CHW geographic dispersion***
388 ***following addition of a second site in an optimal location compared to current geographic***
389 ***dispersion. The fill color represents the reduction in geographic dispersion and points represent***
390 ***existing site locations (gray) and second site locations (black). CHW: community health worker,***
391 ***PHC: primary health center. Data Sources: MMoPH (administrative boundaries), Pivot (health***
392 ***center locations), OpenStreetMap (transportation routes, buildings). All maps have been created***
393 ***from spatial datasets using the R programming language.***
394

395 **DISCUSSION**

396 Geographic distance to health facilities is one of the main barriers to healthcare access,
397 particularly in rural communities that often live several hours travel time from the nearest clinic.
398 Community health workers (CHWs) have worked for decades within these isolated communities
399 to provide basic health services, especially to children under five years old, and to increase

400 geographic access to primary care. However, even at this finer spatial scale, distance to CHWs
401 may continue to negatively impact healthcare access. A renewed push for community health
402 has translated into updated international guidelines to optimize community health programs in
403 order to maximize their impact, including recommendations to adapt programs to the local
404 geography of CHW catchments. Using a comprehensive transport network dataset, we
405 examined whether geographic barriers persist at the CHW level for child consultation rates in a
406 rural district of Madagascar with a strengthened community health program. We found that
407 consultation rates were lower in fokontany where households lived further from the CHW site
408 (i.e. higher geographic dispersion), even after controlling for factors such as wealth and
409 healthcare provider characteristics. Optimizing the location of these CHW sites to minimize
410 geographic dispersion alone had minimal impact on predicted consultation rates. However, the
411 addition of a second community site was predicted to increase consultation rates by nearly 50%
412 in the most geographically dispersed fokontany. While geographic barriers clearly play a role in
413 limiting healthcare access in our setting, our results suggest that optimizing the location of a
414 single community site will not reduce geographic barriers. Rather, alternative solutions, such as
415 installing additional sites in more dispersed fokontany or the creation of proactive care
416 programs, may be needed to significantly reduce geographic barriers to community health
417 access.

418 We found that geographic barriers to healthcare access persist in Ifanadiana, even at
419 the level of community healthcare. Other studies in Ifanadiana have found that, despite the
420 installation of an intervention that has virtually removed user fees and improved the quality of
421 care at all levels of the health system, geographic barriers persist and negatively impact hospital
422 referrals (40), use of primary health centers (9), child vaccination coverage (41), and malaria
423 case ascertainment (42). In addition, results from the IHOPE cohort in Ifanadiana showed that,
424 while financial inequalities in the intervention catchment had been significantly reduced between
425 2014 and 2018, geographic inequalities persisted for most coverage indicators evaluated (43).

426 This trend is not unique to Madagascar, and negative impacts of geographic accessibility on
427 primary and secondary healthcare access are well studied (see Guagliardo (44) for a review).
428 The findings of this study go one step further and show that geographic isolation remains a
429 barrier for CHW access, where distances to seek care are much smaller. In Madagascar, the
430 existing community health policy requires two CHWs per fokontany regardless of their size or
431 geographic dispersion of the population. Our results have important implications for the design
432 of national community health programs in Madagascar and elsewhere, suggesting that the
433 number and location of CHWs should be adapted to the local geography of CHW catchments,
434 and additional interventions may be necessary to reach isolated communities.

435 Geographic optimization has been proposed as one potential solution to reduce barriers
436 to healthcare (28,45), but our optimization exercise predicts that optimal location of single
437 community health sites would only marginally improve consultation rates. There are several
438 potential explanations for this. First, the majority of fokontany already had CHW sites in
439 geographically optimal locations. Pivot staff reports that CHW site locations in Ifanadiana are
440 usually chosen by the fokontany mayor, and are often in one of the larger villages in the
441 fokontany, if not the largest. Because of this, a significant proportion of the population by default
442 lives within the same residential area as the CHW site, resulting in lower geographic dispersion.
443 This implies that communities are able to identify optimal locations without the use of a complex
444 geographic algorithm, and should be included in decision making regarding community health
445 programs. Second, in Ifanadiana, communities in larger fokontany are necessarily further from
446 community health sites (Figure 1). Given the larger area of these fokontany, there is a limit to
447 how much optimizing placement can reduce geographic dispersion. Installing a second
448 community health site in a geographically optimized location, however, resulted in much higher
449 predicted increases in consultation rates than optimizing one site alone. This effect was greatest
450 in the most dispersed fokontany, and such a solution could be targeted to large, dispersed
451 fokontany where one site cannot adequately serve the whole population (46). Another

452 alternative solution is the creation of proactive community health programs, where CHWs visit
453 all households in their catchment on a regular basis (27,47) Proactive community care programs
454 have been associated with reductions in child mortality rates and increases in access to primary
455 healthcare (47). A pilot proactive community care program is currently being implemented in
456 one commune in Ifanadiana district, with positive initial impacts on consultation rates and quality
457 of care (27). While the limited geographic scale of the program precludes formal statistical
458 analysis, preliminary results show that this program is qualitatively increasing consultation rates
459 in the more dispersed fokontany (Figure S3).

460 In addition to geographic variables, we including several confounding variables
461 describing characteristics of the population and CHWs in our model that warrant discussion. We
462 found that CHW consultation rates were lowest for wealthier populations, counter to the general
463 findings that wealthy populations have higher access to care (48). Indeed, evidence for this
464 positive relationship exists in Ifanadiana at the level of PHCs (43). However, because we
465 focused only on consultation rates with CHWs, we captured healthcare access for lower income
466 populations that may not use PHCs because of financial barriers, and therefore rely more on
467 CHWs for primary care. This suggests that CHWs are meeting their goal of serving vulnerable
468 populations missed by other levels of the health system. In addition, we found that the gender
469 make-up of CHWs influenced consultation rates, with consultation rates highest for all-men or
470 mixed-gender teams. Historically, the majority of CHWs in Ifanadiana have been men, although
471 there has been a focus on increasing gender equality among CHWs following international
472 guidance from the WHO (49). Following this guidance, there has been some concern that
473 established gender norms in a field previously dominated by men could limit the effectiveness of
474 women CHWs (50–52). Our finding that mixed gender teams have the highest consultation
475 rates suggests that including CHWs of multiple genders at each site is a potential way to
476 increase gender equality without negatively impacting healthcare seeking behaviors, as has
477 been suggested elsewhere (50).

478 Here, we advance new methods to study the impact of geographic barriers at the
479 community health level, a topic that is currently under-researched due to intrinsic challenges in
480 the spatial resolution of data at these finer scales. Our use of a comprehensive geographic
481 dataset with all the transportation routes and buildings in the district, publicly available on
482 OpenStreetMap, allowed us to examine spatial patterns of healthcare access within CHW
483 catchments with remarkable accuracy. Ithantamalala et al. (28) found that these methods more
484 accurately represented residents' travel time than cost-distance maps often used to estimate
485 potential access (4). Recent studies of healthcare access (45,53) have made use of fine-scale
486 geographic data from OpenStreetMap or mobile phone data to obtain more accurate
487 estimations of populations' geographical isolation. Given the increasing availability of these
488 data, future studies should leverage this fine-scale data to examine spatial patterns in
489 healthcare inequalities, identifying underserved communities that may be otherwise missed in
490 analyses that aggregate spatial data to coarser scales (54).

491 Our study had several limitations. CHW consultation data was reported at the level of the
492 fokontany and individual visits are not georeferenced to each patient's residence. Therefore, our
493 conclusions are limited to inference at the scale of the fokontany, not the individual. Collecting
494 patient-level data would allow for the consideration of more detailed spatial patterns of
495 healthcare utilization within the fokontany, such as identifying a distance threshold for
496 catchment populations where CHW utilization is lower than average. Additionally, we infer the
497 wealth of 80 fokontany from surveys in a sample of 1600 households that was not necessarily
498 representative of those fokontany. Nevertheless, the distribution of wealth in the eighty spatial
499 clusters of the IHOPE cohort had a very consistent and strong spatial structure (e.g. higher
500 wealth in areas near the paved road and around the larger towns) that justifies our spatial
501 interpolation methods. Finally, we only examined one barrier to healthcare: geographic distance.
502 There are many other factors that influence care-seeking behavior and access to care, including
503 patient perceptions of care and treatment (55), costs of care (48), and CHW gender (56). We

504 partially addressed these other factors in our model by including variables for CHW age and
505 gender and in the supplemental analysis that includes a measure of quality of care. However,
506 the objective of this analysis was an in-depth consideration of geographic barriers, and future
507 studies should consider these other factors in equal detail.

508 In conclusion, our results support WHO's recent guidelines for community health
509 programs, which suggest that the local geography of CHW catchments be taken into account in
510 program design and implementation. We show that geographic barriers to care can persist at
511 the community health level and we advance new methods to better understand these barriers in
512 local settings. More research on geographic access to healthcare at multiple levels of the health
513 system, particularly at finer spatial-scales, is needed to progress towards the collective goal of
514 reaching "everyone, everywhere" included in international UHC policies.

515

516 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

517 We would like to thank Pivot staff whose work in Ifanadiana provides the infrastructure that
518 makes this research possible. We would also like to thank the communities of Ifanadiana for
519 their participation in the IHOPE surveys and the community health workers and supervisors for
520 their efforts contributing to data collection in addition to providing primary health care to their
521 communities.

522

523 REFERENCES

1. Sacks E, Schleiff M, Were M, Chowdhury AM, Perry HB. Communities, universal health coverage and primary health care. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2020 Nov 1;98(11):773–80.
2. O'Donnell O. Access to health care in developing countries: breaking down demand side barriers. *Cad Saúde Pública*. 2007 Dec;23:2820–34.
3. Peters DH, Garg A, Bloom G, Walker DG, Brieger WR, Hafizur Rahman M. Poverty and Access to Health Care in Developing Countries. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2008 Jul 25;1136(1):161–71.
4. Weiss DJ, Nelson A, Vargas-Ruiz CA, Gligorić K, Bavadekar S, Gabrilovich E, et al. Global maps of travel time to healthcare facilities. *Nat Med*. 2020 Dec;26(12):1835–8.
5. Khan AA. An integrated approach to measuring potential spatial access to health care services. *Socioecon Plann Sci*. 1992 Oct 1;26(4):275–87.
6. Noor AM, Zurovac D, Hay SI, Ochola SA, Snow RW. Defining equity in physical access to clinical services using geographical information systems as part of malaria planning and monitoring in Kenya. *Trop Med Int Health TM IH*. 2003 Oct;8(10):917–26.
7. Feikin DR, Nguyen LM, Adazu K, Ombok M, Audi A, Slutsker L, et al. The impact of distance of residence from a peripheral health facility on pediatric health utilisation in rural western Kenya. *Trop Med Int Health TM IH*. 2009 Jan;14(1):54–61.
8. McLaren ZM, Ardington C, Leibbrandt M. Distance decay and persistent health care disparities in South Africa. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2014 Nov 4;14(1):541.
9. Garchitorea A, Ihantamalala FA, Révillion C, Cordier LF, Randriamihaja M, Razafinjato B, et al. Geographic barriers to achieving universal health coverage: evidence from rural Madagascar. *Health Policy Plan*. 2021 Nov 11;36(10):1659–70.
10. Gabrysch S, Campbell OM. Still too far to walk: Literature review of the determinants of delivery service use. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2009 Aug 11;9(1):34.
11. O'Meara WP, Noor A, Gatakaa H, Tsofa B, McKenzie FE, Marsh K. The impact of primary health care on malaria morbidity - defining access by disease burden. *Trop Med Int Health TM IH*. 2009 Jan;14(1):29–35.
12. Berman PA, Gwatkin DR, Burger SE. Community-based health workers: Head start or false start towards health for all? *Soc Sci Med*. 1987 Jan 1;25(5):443–59.
13. World Health Organization, PEPFAR, UNAIDS. Task shifting : rational redistribution of tasks among health workforce teams : global recommendations and guidelines. World Health Organization; 2007.
14. Rifkin SB. Alma Ata after 40 years: Primary Health Care and Health for All—from consensus to complexity. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2018 Dec 1;3(Suppl 3):e001188.

15. World Health Organization. WHO guideline on health policy and system support to optimize community health worker programs. Geneva; 2018.
16. Feldacker C, Emch M, Ennett S. The who and where of HIV in rural Malawi: Exploring the effects of person and place on individual HIV status. *Health Place*. 2010 Sep;16(5):996–1006.
17. Lohela TJ, Campbell OMR, Gabrysch S. Distance to care, facility delivery and early neonatal mortality in Malawi and Zambia. *PloS One*. 2012;7(12):e52110.
18. Rutstein S, Rojas G. *Guide to DHS Statistics*. Calverton, Maryland; 2006. (Demographic and Health Surveys Methodology).
19. Warren JL, Perez-Heydrich C, Burgert CR, Emch ME. Influence of Demographic and Health Survey Point Displacements on Distance-Based Analyses. *Spat Demogr*. 2016 Jul;4(2):155–73.
20. Chayovan N, Hermalin AI, Knodel J. Measuring Accessibility to Family Planning Services in Rural Thailand. *Stud Fam Plann*. 1984;15(5):201–11.
21. Thin Zaw PP, Liabsuetrakul T, Htay TT, McNeil E. Equity of access to reproductive health services among youths in resource-limited suburban communities of Mandalay City, Myanmar. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2012 Dec 15;12:458.
22. Ahmed S, Chase LE, Wagnild J, Akhter N, Sturridge S, Clarke A, et al. Community health workers and health equity in low- and middle-income countries: systematic review and recommendations for policy and practice. *Int J Equity Health*. 2022 Apr 11;21(1):49.
23. Razafindrakoto M, Roubaud F, Wachsberger JM. *Puzzle and Paradox: A Political Economy of Madagascar*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press; 2020.
24. World Health Organization. Global Health Expenditure Database [Internet]. 2022. Available from: <https://apps.who.int/nha/database>
25. World Health Organization. *Global Health Workforce Statistics*. Geneva, Switzerland; 2022.
26. UNICEF. Madagascar Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey version 6 [Internet]. 2018. Available from: <https://mics.unicef.org/>
27. Razafinjato B, Rakotonirina L, Andriantahina JB, Cordier LF, Andriamihaja R, Rasoarivao A, et al. Evaluation of a novel approach to community health care delivery in Ifanadiana District, Madagascar. *bioRxiv*. 2020 Dec 14;2020.12.11.20232611.
28. Ihantamalala FA, Herbreteau V, Révillion C, Randriamihaja M, Commins J, Andréambelason T, et al. Improving geographical accessibility modeling for operational use by local health actors. *Int J Health Geogr*. 2020 Jul 6;19(1):27.
29. Garchitorena A, Miller AC, Cordier LF, Rabeza VR, Randriamanambintsoa M, Razanadrakato HTR, et al. Early changes in intervention coverage and mortality rates following the implementation of an integrated health system intervention in Madagascar. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2018 Jun 1;3(3):e000762.

30. Miller AC, Ramananjato RH, Garchitorena A, Rabeza VR, Gikic D, Cripps A, et al. Baseline population health conditions ahead of a health system strengthening program in rural Madagascar. *Glob Health Action*. 2017 Jan 1;10(1):1329961.
31. Rutstein S, Johnson K. The DHS Wealth Index. Calverton, Maryland: ORC Macro; 2004 Jan. (DHS Comparative Reports). Report No.: 6.
32. Shepard D. A two-dimensional interpolation function for irregularly-spaced data. In: Proceedings of the 1968 23rd ACM national conference. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery; 1968. p. 517–24. (ACM '68).
33. Baddeley A, Rubak E, Turner R. *Spatial Point Patterns: Methodology and Applications with R*. London: Chapman and Hall/CRC Press; 2015.
34. Zuur A, Ieno EN, Walker N, Saveliev AA, Smith GM. *Mixed Effects Models and Extensions in Ecology with R*. Springer Science & Business Media; 2009. 579 p.
35. Brooks M E, Kristensen K, Benthem K J ,van, Magnusson A, Berg C W, Nielsen A, et al. glmmTMB Balances Speed and Flexibility Among Packages for Zero-inflated Generalized Linear Mixed Modeling. *R J*. 2017;9(2):378.
36. Hartig F. DHARMA: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed) Regression Models [Internet]. 2019. Available from: <http://florianhartig.github.io/DHARMA/>
37. R Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing* [Internet]. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
38. Morton B, Vercueil A, Masekela R, Heinz E, Reimer L, Saleh S, et al. Consensus statement on measures to promote equitable authorship in the publication of research from international partnerships. *Anaesthesia*. 2022;77(3):264–76.
39. Wasserstein RL, Schirm AL, Lazar NA. Moving to a World Beyond “ $p < 0.05$.” *Am Stat*. 2019 Mar 29;73(sup1):1–19.
40. Ihantamalala FA, Bonds MH, Randriamihaja M, Rakotonirina L, Herbreteau V, Révillion C, et al. Geographic barriers to establishing a successful hospital referral system in rural Madagascar. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2021 Dec 1;6(12):e007145.
41. Rajaonarifara E, Bonds MH, Miller AC, Ihantamalala FA, Cordier L, Razafinjato B, et al. Impact of health system strengthening on delivery strategies to improve child immunisation coverage and inequalities in rural Madagascar. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2022 Jan 1;7(1):e006824.
42. Hyde E, Bonds MH, Ihantamalala FA, Miller AC, Cordier LF, Razafinjato B, et al. Estimating the local spatio-temporal distribution of malaria from routine health information systems in areas of low health care access and reporting. *Int J Health Geogr*. 2021 Feb 12;20(1):8.
43. Garchitorena A, Miller AC, Cordier LF, Randriamanambintsoa M, Razanadrakato HTR, Randriamihaja M, et al. District-level health system strengthening for universal health coverage: evidence from a longitudinal cohort study in rural Madagascar, 2014–2018. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2020 Dec 1;5(12):e003647.

44. Guagliardo MF. Spatial accessibility of primary care: concepts, methods and challenges. *Int J Health Geogr*. 2004 Feb 26;3(1):3.
45. Oliphant NP, Ray N, Bensaid K, Ouedraogo A, Gali AY, Habi O, et al. Optimising geographical accessibility to primary health care: a geospatial analysis of community health posts and community health workers in Niger. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2021 Jun 1;6(6):e005238.
46. Brunie A, MacCarthy J, Mulligan B, Ribaira Y, Rabemanantsoa A, Rahantanirina L, et al. Practical Implications of Policy Guidelines: A GIS Model of the Deployment of Community Health Volunteers in Madagascar. *Glob Health Sci Pract*. 2020 Sep 30;8(3):466–77.
47. Whidden C, Thwing J, Gutman J, Wohl E, Leyrat C, Kayentao K, et al. Proactive case detection of common childhood illnesses by community health workers: a systematic review. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2019;4(6):e001799.
48. Yates R. Universal health care and the removal of user fees. *The Lancet*. 2009 Jun 13;373(9680):2078–81.
49. Dhatt R, Theobald S, Buzuzi S, Ros B, Vong S, Muraya K, et al. The role of women's leadership and gender equity in leadership and health system strengthening. *Glob Health Epidemiol Genomics*. 2017;2.
50. Feldhaus I, Silverman M, LeFevre AE, Mpembeni R, Moshia I, Chitama D, et al. Equally able, but unequally accepted: Gender differentials and experiences of community health volunteers promoting maternal, newborn, and child health in Morogoro Region, Tanzania. *Int J Equity Health*. 2015 Aug 25;14:70.
51. Steege R, Taegtmeier M, McCollum R, Hawkins K, Ormel H, Kok M, et al. How do gender relations affect the working lives of close to community health service providers? Empirical research, a review and conceptual framework. *Soc Sci Med*. 2018 Jul 1;209:1–13.
52. Raven J, Wurie H, Baba A, Bah AJ, Dean L, Hawkins K, et al. Supporting community health workers in fragile settings from a gender perspective: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open*. 2022 Feb 1;12(2):e052577.
53. Xia T, Song X, Zhang H, Song X, Kanasugi H, Shibasaki R. Measuring spatio-temporal accessibility to emergency medical services through big GPS data. *Health Place*. 2019 Mar 1;56:53–62.
54. Apparicio P, Gelb J, Dubé AS, Kingham S, Gauvin L, Robitaille É. The approaches to measuring the potential spatial access to urban health services revisited: distance types and aggregation-error issues. *Int J Health Geogr*. 2017 Aug 23;16(1):32.
55. Faruqui N, Bernays S, Martiniuk A, Abimbola S, Arora R, Lowe J, et al. Access to care for childhood cancers in India: perspectives of health care providers and the implications for universal health coverage. *BMC Public Health*. 2020 Nov 3;20(1):1641.
56. Viswanathan K, Hansen PM, Rahman MH, Steinhardt L, Edward A, Arwal SH, et al. Can community health workers increase coverage of reproductive health services? *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2012 Oct 1;66(10):894–900.

A)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.08.16.22278862>; this version posted August 18, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).







Figure 1

A



B





Figure 2

Reduction in Geographic Dispersion



Location

- Existing (Black dot)
- Optimal (Grey dot)





Figure 3

Optimized Single CHW Location



Installing Second CHW Location




Figure 4

Location

- Existing
- Second

Reduction in Geographic Dispersion





Figure 5