Toward building a master health facility list database in Senegal: approaches and outputs from triangulating secondary health facility data

Daouda M Gueye[1], Alioune Badara Ly,[2] Babacar Gueye[3], Papa Ibrahima Ndour[3,4], Nancy Fullman[5,6*], Patrick Y Liu[5], Khadim Mbaye[4], Aliou Diallo[7], Ibrahima Diatta,[2] Saly Amos Diatta[1], Mouhamadou Moustapha Mane[1], Gloria Ikilezi[5], Moussa Sarr[1]

[1]Institut de Recherche en Santé de Surveillance Epidémiologique et de Formations (IRESSEF), Dakar, Senegal
[2]Centre des Opérations d'Urgence Sanitaire (COUS), Ministère de la Santé et de l'Action Sociale (MSAS), Dakar, Senegal
[3]Direction de la Planification, de la Recherche et des Statistiques (DPRS), MSAS, Dakar, Senegal
[4]Agence Nationale de la Démographie et de la Statistique (ANSD), Dakar, Senegal
[5]Exemplars in Global Health, Gates Ventures, Seattle, Washington, USA
[6]Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA
[7]Expanded Programme on Immunisation Unit, WHO Country Office Senegal, Dakar, Senegal

*Corresponding author: Nancy Fullman: nancy.fullman@gatesventures.com

Abstract

Having a consolidated, geolocated list of all facilities in a country – a "master facility list" (MFL) – can provide critical inputs for health program planning and implementation. To the best of our knowledge, Senegal has never had a centralized MFL, though many data sources currently exist within the broader Senegalese data landscape that could be used to work toward building a full MFL. We collated 12,965 facility observations from 16 separate datasets and lists in Senegal, and applied matching algorithms, manual checking and revisions as needed, and verification processes to identify unique facilities and triangulate corresponding GPS coordinates. Our resulting consolidated facility list was a total of 4,685 facilities with 51.7% having at least one GPS coordinate (n=2,423). Key challenges included accounting for variable spelling across datasets, distinguishing between facility type changes (e.g., health huts being upgraded to health posts with the same name) and separate facilities that shared the same name, GPS verification, among others. Developing approaches to leverage existing data for MFL establishment can help bridge data demands and inform more targeted approaches for completing a full facility census based on areas and facility types with the lowest coverage. Going forward, it is crucial to ensure routine updates of current facility lists, and to strengthen government-led mechanisms around such data collection demands and the need for timely data for health decision-making.

Key words: master facility list, health facility data, secondary data use, data triangulation, Senegal

Background and Summary

Having comprehensive, routinely updated data on how many health facilities exist – and where they are – is critical for health agency's planning and programming operations. From determining investments for new or modified service provision and how to optimally reach underserved communities to supporting efficient medical supply chain and delivery logistics to facility providers,[1–3] many components of health system functioning and performance at least benefit from – if not rely upon – granular health facility data. Furthermore, gaps in such facility information can hinder effective coordination across and within health systems. Beyond important financial and broader resource losses associated with inadequate health system coordination, consequences can quickly escalate when undertaking emergency responses to natural disasters (e.g., 2010 Haiti earthquake[4]) and infectious disease outbreaks.[5] Nonetheless, relatively few countries have systematically developed and maintained comprehensive health facility registries, or what is often referred to as a master facility list (MFL),[1,3] or have done so with corresponding geolocation data (e.g., GPS) and identifiers to support direct linkages across national health information and data systems. In many ways, this gap between a recognized need – national health facility registries or digitized MFLs – and its implementation is not surprising. After all, the investment case for comprehensive facility data collection and maintenance may often be viewed as less than clear-cut, especially given the high cost and time required to conduct health facility censuses (arguably the 'gold standard' for establishing an MFL) and challenges in ensuring full representation across public, private, and informal health sectors with regular updates. Accordingly, efforts to leverage and triangulate existing health facility data sources offer a vital bridge toward building a full national health facility registry or MFL.

Past work demonstrates the utility of triangulating various data sources and supplementary inputs to establish geolocated databases of health facilities.[6–9] In many ways, Maina and colleagues initially pioneered this approach by assembling a range of government-established MFLs, facility data portals, reports, and other lists to generate a spatial database of publicly managed health facilities for 50 countries in sub-Saharan Africa.[6] This spatial database offered many strengths, including its well-documented data synthesis process and standardized outputs; at the same time, its comprehensiveness understandably varied by country. For countries where formal MFLs existed as of 2019, this geospatial database directly reflected the equivalent of a national registry for publicly managed facilities. For Senegal, a country with a reported 3,967 health facilities in 2018,[10] only 1,347 facilities were included and no *case de santes* (health huts), a key publicly managed facility type which offers basic primary care services at the community level, were expressly listed. Country-specific initiatives have drawn from routine health information systems, such as the DHIS2, and sought to harmonize parallel or duplicate facility lists being maintained by disparate entities with formal centralization and verification processes.[11–13] Data-focused organizations including GRID3 and Bluesquare have both directly supported such triangulation work streams, and then augmented identified gaps or discrepancies in reported GPS coordinates with primary data collection.[8] Each of these approaches also have strengths, particularly in terms of jumpstarting infrastructure for updating and adding new health facility data over time; however, they require upfront – and longer-term – financial and political commitments to fully implement. Lastly, global platforms such as Human Data Exchange (HDX) and healthsites.io have sought to provide open-sourced health facility data repositories, combining OpenStreetMap functionalities with volunteer-provided information on health facilities.[14,15] This open-source data approach has various advantages, especially its potential use cases for a wide set of audiences; at the same time, its

comprehensiveness is strongly affected by volunteer engagement and participation. A recent WHO endeavor, the Geolocated Health Facility Data (GHFD) initiative, aims to draw from these various approaches and support the establishment of geolocated MFLs for each of the 194 WHO member states by 2027.[16] To achieve this ambition, particularly for countries without a formal MFL to date, it is important to document approaches used and lessons learned across different resource settings and data contexts.

Senegal has demonstrated regular use of facility-level information and cultivated strong demand for data use in health service planning; however, to the best of our knowledge, Senegal has never had a centralized MFL or comprehensive database of health facilities with directly linkable geolocated information.[6,7] Many potential use cases and applications for such a consolidated facility list have already been identified, such as strengthening strategic planning and monitoring of health program activities, optimizing resource deployment and logistics to health facilities, and streamlining health service referral systems. Total facility counts, by health region and/or facility type are routinely updated through the Annual Health Map Monitoring Report (*Rapport Annuel de Suivi de la Carte Sanitaire*), as produced by Cellule de la Carte sanitaire et sociale, de la Santé digitale et de l'Observatoire de la Santé (CSSDOS).[17,18] Furthermore, facility lists known as facility frames have been updated at various times between 2012 and 2019 for Senegal's continuous Service Provision Assessment (SPA) series to support survey sampling procedures.[10,19–24] Myriad facility data are publicly available, as well as supported and updated within the country (e.g., COUS facility surveys, regional facility lists); however, few efforts have occurred to systematically identify and triangulate this range of secondary data into a consolidated facility list.

Here we describe the approach and process used to triangulate 16 different data sources to build a consolidated and, where possible, geolocated facility list in Senegal from March 2021 to May 2023. These results can serve as a contemporary foundation for a MFL in Senegal, identifying areas or facility types with higher levels of georeferencing and those where further (but more targeted) data collection efforts may be most beneficial.

Methods

Overview

Our overall approach for involved four main steps: 1) identify and collate all available facility lists and facility data with GPS; 2) standardize each facility observation across sources and match facilities found in more than one list to each other, with the aim of generating a consolidated list of unique facility observations through a combination of fuzzy-name and geolocation matching, and then manual matching and revision where needed; 3) assign GPS coordinates to each unique facility observation; and 4) conduct additional verification, including review by regional focal points. From January 31-February 1, 2023, a facility list workshop was co-hosted in Dakar by the Institut de Recherche en Santé de Surveillance Epidémiologique et de Formations (IRESSEF) and Centre des Opérations d'Urgence Sanitaire (COUS) to garner feedback and next steps toward establishing a MFL or equivalent facility database in Senegal.

Going forward, we refer to the resulting facility list from our triangulation and collation procedures as a consolidated facility list, or CFL. Such designation is meant to reflect the extensive efforts made to

consolidate facility information into a list of unique observations while recognizing that the output should not be classified as a formalized MFL.

We focused on four main types of health facilities in the formal health sector in Senegal:[25] hospitals, health centers, health posts, and health huts. All other facilities were excluded from the CFL.

Data sources

From March 2021 to May 2022, facility-level data were identified and collated from a combination of publicly available data sources, data initiatives such as the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) program[10,20–24] or ESRI,[26] published facility-level datasets such as those by Maina and colleagues,[6] and data shared by Senegalese government entities such as COUS and Agence Nationale de Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD) (Table 1). 13 datasets were identified and collated during this time, with Table 1 providing more information on each source, GPS availability and coverage, date of data access, and any additional relevant information. An additional three datasets were incorporated after the facility workshop in Dakar, bringing the total input facility lists or datasets to 20 by May 2023.

Table 1. Data sources used for triangulation for a consolidated facility list in Senegal. ANSD=Agence Nationale de la Démographie et de la Statistique. COUS=Centre des Opérations d'Urgence Sanitaire. DGES=Direction Générale des Etablissements de Santé. DHS=Demographic and Health Survey. GPS=Global positioning system. HDX=Human Data Exchange. MSAS=Ministère de la santé et de l'Action Sociale. SPA=Service Provision Assessment.

Data	Year of representation	Total facilities*	Total facilities with GPS**	Time of access	Mode of access	Additional notes
ANSD	2017-2018	3,962	N/A	March 2022	Data file shared via personal communication	This data file was reported being used for the SPA 2017-2018 sampling frame.
MSAS	Unknown	1,555	N/A	May 2021	Data file shared via personal communication	This data file included health centers and health posts
COUS	2021	1,488	1,481	March 2021	Data file shared via personal communication	
HDX[14]	Unknown	1,270	322	April 2021	Downloaded data from https://data.humdata.org/dataset/senegal-healthsites	
ESRI[26]	Unknown	241	241	July 2021	Downloaded data from https://esrisenegal-esrisenegal.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/carte-sanitaire-kaolack	Data were for Kaolack region only
Maina et al 2019[6]	Unknown	1,347	1,256	April 2021	Downloaded data from https://www.nature.com/articles/s41597-019-0142-2	These data included hospitals, health centers, and health posts, and was reported to be limited to public facilities.
SPA 2014[20]	2014	464	422	March 2021; April 2023	Applied for from DHS program	Facility names were included in facility district files, which were requested separately from the original DHS application.
SPA 2015[21]	2015	483	434	March 2021; April 2023	Applied for from DHS program	Facility names were included in facility district files, which were requested separately from the original DHS application.

Data	Year of representation	Total facilities*	Total facilities with GPS**	Time of access	Mode of access	Additional notes
SPA 2016[22]	2016	484	448	March 2021; April 2023	Applied for from DHS program	Facility names were included in facility district files, which were requested separately from the original DHS application.
SPA 2017[23]	2017	794	783	March 2021; April 2023	Applied for from DHS program	Facility names were included in facility district files, which were requested separately from the original DHS application.
SPA 2018[10]	2018	466	N/A	March 2021; April 2023	Applied for from DHS program	Facility names were included in facility district files, which were requested separately from the original DHS application.
SPA 2019[24]	2019	454	N/A	March 2021; April 2023	Applied for from DHS program	Facility names were included in facility district files, which were requested separately from the original DHS application.
Tambacounda region	2022	268	N/A	May 2022	Data file shared via personal communication	This regional data file included health centers, health posts, and health huts.
Louga region	2023	550	N/A	February 2023	Data file shared after Dakar workshop (January 31-February 1)	This regional data file included health centers, health posts, and health huts.
Sedhiou region	Unknown	180	N/A	February 2023	Data file shared after Dakar workshop (January 31-February 1)	This regional data file included hospitals, health centers, health posts, and health huts, as well as other facility types (e.g., pharmacies).
DGES	Unknown (potentially 2023)	41	N/A	February 2023	Document shared after Dakar workshop (January 31-February 1)	This document included a list of hospitals in Senegal.

*Total facilities reported here do not account for facility duplicates or facilities that were excluded due to being facility types outside of scope for this work (e.g., pharmacies, laboratories); reported values here reflect facility totals as presented in the original data. **Total facilities with GPS reported here only include facility types within scope of the CFL: hospitals, health centers, health posts, and health huts.

Data processing, matching, and verification steps

Fig. 1 provides an overview of the key steps involved in data processing, facility matching, and verification steps undertaken for this CFL.

Fig 1. Overview of facility list data processing, matching, and verification steps.



For each data source, we extracted and standardized the following facility attributes: facility name, facility type, facility ownership, and first-level administrative unit (region). When not provided in the original dataset, facility type was identified by the facility name string (e.g., “PS Nemataba” or “Nemataba Poste de Santé” in Kolda). Duplicate facilities within sources were removed.

We then combined all facility observations into a pooled database (n=12,965 facility observations). Within the pooled, de-duplicated facility database, we used a fuzzy-matching algorithm to group facility names within each region as potential matches. This algorithm was operationalized as a Jaro-Winkler distance,[27] with a threshold score of 0.2. To optimize the matching process, we first pre-processed the facility name string by removing non-Latin characters, removing facility type strings (e.g., “CS”, “Case de

Santé), expanding common acronyms (e.g., "St." to "Saint"), and standardizing facility numbering (e.g., "Facility iii" to "Facility 3"). Matches that met the fuzzy-string threshold were then manually verified and corrected for any false positive and false negative matches.

The matched lists underwent additional technical and manual verification. For the technical verification, we identified and reviewed all facility matches where the implied distance between observations, as defined by the Haversine distance between GPS points,[28] exceeded 1 kilometer, as well as matches with multiple or conflicting facility types across sources. The entire database was then carefully reviewed to assess the accuracy of matches and identify facilities where additional verification was needed by national and/or regional health system experts in Senegal. While identified verification needs varied, the most common areas for further confirmation included:

- *Same facility name with different facility types in a given region (and often department and health district)* Facilities with the same name but different facility types can be distinct facilities that should be treated as unique observations in a CFL (e.g., CS Fatick and Hopital de Fatick in the region of Fatick). However, more frequently these facilities were once classified as a lower-level facility that have been subsequently upgraded to a higher level facility type (e.g., a health hut being upgraded to a health post). Accordingly, they are technically the same facility (with the same GPS), and should be treated as a single facility observation for the CFL.
- *Same facility name and type in a given region but different departments and/or health districts*. Facilities with the same name and facility type but are listed under different second-level administrative units usually fall into one of two scenarios. First, they are in fact distinct facilities and a given region has more than one of the same facility type with the same name (e.g., PS Mlomp in the health districts of Oussouye and Thionk Essyl in the region of Ziguinchor); subsequently these facilities should be treated as unique observations in a CFL. Second, differences in second-level administrative unit names may actually reflect different administrative categorizations that both technically comprise the "second-level" geographic groupings after Senegal's 14 regions: departments (n=45) and health districts (n=77 to 79). Departments are the formal second-level administrative boundaries in Senegal, whereas health districts reflect the geographies at which peripheral health authorities operate the country's health system structure.[25] Although we mapped health districts to corresponding departments for 98% facility observations, further reconciliation is needed.
- *Same facility type in a given region (and often department and/or health district) with similar but 'different enough' names*. Facilities with similar but 'different enough' names usually are not matched via algorithms. When GPS are available for a set of facilities in question, manual matches can be ascertained based on how similar their locations are. However, unless additional triangulation can be done, these facilities are flagged for further verification.

The next step involved assigning GPS coordinates for each 'unique' facility observation. If a singular facility had linked GPS coordinates or a matched group of facilities across sources only had one set GPS associated with them, the corresponding GPS coordinates were used. If multiple GPS coordinates were reported across sources for a given facility group, we applied a preferential algorithm for source-specific GPS: COUS, and if no GPS from COUS, then non-2017 SPA (2016, 2015, 2014), then SPA 2017, then ESRI, then HDX, and then Maina and colleagues. This hierarchy was based on the degree to which source-

specific GPS coordinates appeared to vary and prioritizing government-associated sources (COUS and then SPA, which was co-implemented by ANSD) over external datasets. Last, we supplemented GPS assignment with Google Maps for 9 hospitals from DGES, most of which had opened since 2020.

Three rounds of additional data verification occurred by sharing the CFL and corresponding inquiries to regional focal points for each of Senegal's 14 medical regions and health system experts. All regions participated in the first round of verification, which occurred from June 2022 to August 2022. After incorporating the initial feedback provided by regional focal points, we sought to conduct follow-up verification efforts to address the remaining flagged facilities. Four regions (Dakar, Diourbel, Fatick, and Thies) provided second-round feedback from November to December 2022. The initial version of this CFL was disseminated by IRESSEF, COUS, and Direction de la Planification, de la Recherche et des Statistiques (DPRS) at a two-day workshop in Dakar, Senegal from January 31-February 1, 2023; the workshop report is available in Supplementary file 1. Nine out of 14 medical regions were in attendance, with Sedhiou and Louga focal points providing additional feedback and facility lists for verification purposes. A representative from the Direction Générale des Etablissements de Santé (DGES) also provided an up-to-date list of hospitals in Senegal; in combination, these three additional data sources were used as a third round of verification.

Facility list outputs

After data processing and verification procedures, we generated a CFL of 4,685 unique facility observations (Fig. 2a-b, Supplementary table 1).[29] Nationally, 51.7% of these unique facility observations had at least one set of linked GPS coordinates (*n*=2,423), though the relative percentage of GPS representation varied by region. Diourbel had 87.3% of facilities with at least one set of GPS coordinates, whereas Louga and Kolda had the lowest levels of facility-level GPS (32.8% and 39.8%, respectively). By facility type, hospitals and health centers generally had the highest proportion of GPS coverage (Fig. 2c-f). For hospitals, the main exceptions were Kaolack, where 25% of hospitals had GPS. For health centers, 88.3% of facilities had GPS assigned through the triangulation process. Seven regions had 100% of identified health centers as also geolocated while five regions had GPS coverage for health centers at less than 80%: Louga (56.7%), Kaffrine (66.7%), Sedhiou (71.4%), and Diourbel (72.7%). For Louga and Sedhiou, at least some of the lower GPS coverage is likely related to the inclusion of very recent facility data sources without geolocation (e.g., 2023 for Louga). Health posts, which serve as the backbone of primary care service delivery in Senegal, averaged 67.9% GPS coverage nationally (Fig. 2g-h) such coverage was largely skewed by Dakar, where only 32.5% of facilities designated as health posts had GPS coordinates. This is likely associated with the high prevalence of private clinics in Dakar,[30] for which more granular facility information can be more challenging to access. Outside of Dakar, GPS coverage ranged from 91.9% in Saint-Louis to 72.8% in Tambacounda; it is worth noting that the lower GPS coverage for Tambacounda is likely associated with the inclusion of a non-geolocated regional facility list of health centers, health posts, and health huts for 2022. For health huts, GPS coverage was comparatively low nationwide (26.8%) (Fig. 2i-j); the exception was Diourbel, where 28 of the 33 identified health huts had at least one set of GPS. At least some portion of this low GPS coverage is likely related to outstanding facility verification needs around health posts and health huts sharing the same name in a given region. Based on prior iterations of verification with regional focal points, the vast majority of such flagged facilities are confirmed as "current" health posts that were upgraded from health huts at some point in the past.

Fig. 2. Distribution of geolocated health facilities in Senegal.



c

Saint-Louis
Louga
Région de Saint-Louis
Région de Louga
Région de Matam
Sénégal
Kaolack
Banjul
Gambia
Médina Gounass
Kolda
Région de Sédhiou
Région de Ziguinchor
Bissau
Guinée-Bissau
Kayes

d


Dakar
Diourbel
Fatick
Kaffrine
Kaolack
Kedougou
Kolda
Louga
Matam
Saint−Louis
Sedhiou
Tambacounda
Thies
Ziguinchor
0
10
20
30

e

Saint-Louis
Louga
Région de Saint-Louis
Région de Louga
Région de Matam
Région de Diourbel
Région de Thies
Kaolack
Sénégal
Kayes
Région de Tambacounda
Banjul
Gambia
Médina Gounass
Région de Kolda
Kolda
Région de Sédhiou
Région de Ziguinchor
Région de Kédougou
Kéniéb
Região de Oio
Região de Gabu
Bissau
Guiné-Bissau
Labé

f


Dakar
Diourbel
Fatick
Kaffrine
Kaolack
Kedougou
Kolda
Louga
Matam
Saint-Louis
Sedhiou
Tambacounda
Thies
Ziguinchor
0
20
40
60
80

g


Saint-Louis
Région de Saint-Louis
Région de Louga
Région de Matam
Sénégal
Kayes
Banjul
Gambia
Medina Gounass
Bissau
Guiné-Bissau
Lobé

h


Dakar
Diourbel
Fatick
Kaffrine
Kaolack
Kedougou
Kolda
Louga
Matam
Saint-Louis
Sedhiou
Tambacounda
Thies
Ziguinchor
0
200
400
600

i



j



a All geolocated facilities mapped**. b** Percentage of all facilities with at least one set of GPS coordinates (dark blue) relative to total counts of facilities (full bar) by region. **c** All geolocated hospitals. **d** Percentage of hospitals with at least one set of GPS coordinates (purple) relative to all hospitals (full bar) by region. **e** All geolocated health centers. **f** Percentage of health centers with at least one set of GPS coordinates (dark teal) relative to all health centers (full bar) by region. **g** All geolocated health posts. **h** Percentage of health posts with at least one set of GPS coordinates (light teal) relative to all health posts (full bar) by region. **i** All geolocated health huts. **j** Percentage of health huts with at least one set of GPS coordinates (orange) relative to all health pots (full bar) by region. Facility counts and percentages with GPS, nationally and by region, for all facilities and by facility type can be found in Supplementary table 1.

Data Records

The CFL and full facility list described here are available publicly and freely at the following repository through both the figshare repository and GitHub:[29] https://github.com/iressef-egh/senegal-cfl The datasets available through figshare will remain in their original form, while the data hosted at GitHub will be updated as further data validation or updates occur. Table 2 details variables in the CFL data file, while Table 3 lists variables and descriptions in the full facility list dataset, both of which are available in .xlsx formats; equivalent codebooks in French and English are on GitHub.[29]

Table 2. Variable descriptions for the consolidated facility list in Senegal.

Consolidated facility list dataset	
File name	senegal_consolidated_facilitylist.xlsx
Total observations	4,685
Consolidated facility list variables	
Variable name	**Variable description**
region	Region in Senegal.
match_id	Facility id assigned for each unique facility grouping identified in the consolidated facility list. This identifier links the unique observations found in this dataset to the 'full' version of this dataset where all facilities for a given match_id have been matched into match groups. *Note*: this id does not correspond with a particular data source or formal health information system (e.g., DHIS2).
match_name	This is the processed version of health facility name used for matching, excluding special characters and variations found across sources. Original facility names, as included by source, can be found under "fac_name_orig" in the "senegal_full_facilitylist.xlsx" dataset.
group_fac_type	This is the facility type assigned to a unique facility observation. Original facility types may vary by source, of which are listed under "fac_type_orig" in the "senegal_full_facilitylist.xlsx" dataset. Facility types included in this dataset are as follows in French (without special characters), with English translations: - hopital = hospital - centre de sante = health center - poste de sante = health post - case de sante = health hut - autre = other
group_latitude	Assigned latitude coordinates.
group_longitude	Assigned longitude coordinates.
group_gps_source	Source of assigned facility GPS.
n_gps	Number of linked sources with GPS for a unique facility observation.
n_source	Number of linked sources for a unique facility observation.
source_list	List of sources for a unique facility observation.
data_flagged	Variable whereby "1" indicates outstanding verification needs or follow-up questions.
data_notes	Further detail about outstanding verification needs or follow-up questions about the given facility. *All notes are in English at present.*

Table 3. Variable descriptions for the full facility list in Senegal.

Full facility list dataset	
File name	senegal_full_facilitylist_full.xlsx
Total observations	12,965
Full facility list variables	

Variable name	Variable description
region	Region in Senegal.
department	Formal second-level administrative unit for Senegal, with n=45. *Note:* Data sources varied in their reporting of departments or health districts (and did not always specify which was included). Mapping capturing department information and accounting for inaccuracies occurred where possible, but some facility-source observations may not have a department included.
health_district	The peripheral level of Senegal's health sector, with an n=77 to 79. *Note:* Data sources varied in their reporting of departments or health districts (and did not always specify which was included). Mapping from district to department and accounting occurred where possible, but some facility-source observations may not have a health district included.
match_id	Facility id assigned for each unique facility grouping identified in the consolidated facility list. This identifier links facility groups in this dataset to unique observations found in the consolidated facility list. *Note:* this id does not correspond with a particular data source or formal health information system (e.g., DHIS2).
match_name	Processed version of the health facility name used for matching, excluding special characters, variations found across sources.
fac_name_orig	Original health facility name, as found in a given facility data source.
group_fac_type	This is the facility type assigned to a unique facility observation. Original facility types may vary by source, of which are listed under "fac_type_orig." Facility types included in this dataset are as follows in French (without special characters), with English translations: - hopital = hospital - hentre de sante = health center - poste de sante = health post - case de sante = health hut - autre = other
fac_type_orig	Original facility type, as provided in a given facility data source.
group_fac_own	Processed version of the managing authority for a given facility. Types included in this dataset are as follows in French (without special characters), with English translations: - publique = public - prive = private - ong ou mission/confessionnel = NGO or mission/faith-based - paramilitaire = paramilitary
fac_own_orig	Managing authority for the health facility, as provided in a given facility data source.
latitude	Latitude coordinates, as provided in a given data source.
longitude	Longitude coordinates, as provided in a given data source.
max_gps_dist	Maximum Haversine distance in kilometers between GPS coordinates for each unique facility grouping. If a facility has only set of GPS coordinates (n_gps==1), this variable is blank
source	Facility data source.
data_flagged	Variable whereby "1" indicates outstanding verification needs or follow-up questions.
data_notes	Further detail about outstanding verification needs or follow-up questions about the given facility. All notes are in English at present. If there is information in "data_notes" but the facility is not flagged (data_flagged==1), these notes are meant to provide additional detail or information about a given facility without immediate action items or follow-up.
decision_notes	Further detail about decisions made for matching facilities and feedback from regional focal points. *All notes are in English at present.*
last_updated	Date of last update in YYYYMMDD format. For instance, 20230518 is 18 May 2023. These updates are meant to reflect changes to previous facility matches since the Dakar facility list workshop that occurred from 31 January to 1 February 2023.
update_notes	Further detail on the updates that occurred for a unique facility observation. *All notes are in English at present.*
n_gps	Number of linked sources with GPS for each matched facility group.

n_source	Number of linked sources for each matched facility group.
source_list	List of sources for each matched facility group.
fac_id	Unique facility id, either directly provided from its original data source or generated in order to provide a unique identifier for each facility observation
fac_id_orig	Original facility id, as provided in a given facility data source. *Note*: most non-survey data sources did not have an original facility id, and thus this variable is blank for them
fac_id_orig_var	Variable name in which facility ids are contained, as found in a given facility data source. *Note:* most non-survey data sources did not have an original facility id, and thus this variable is blank for them.
n_geos	Number of department-health district combinations within a matched facility group. This variable was included to more easily identify which matched facilities need further geographic variation, such that: - If n_geos==0, then no department or health district information were included for these facilities. - If n_geos==1, department-health district combinations for a matched facility group exist and are consistent. - If n_geos >1, department-health district combinations vary within a matched facility group and further verification is needed.

Technical validation

In addition to the verification processes describe earlier, we identified five sources against which to benchmark the CFL's total numbers of facilities, nationally and by region (and facility type): reported facility frame numbers as extracted from the SPA 2012-2013, SPA 2017, and SPA 2019 reports,[19,23,24] and the CSSDOS Health Map reports for 2019 and 2021.[17] We summarize comparisons below, with more detailed data provided in Supplementary file 3.

At the national level, the CFL had more total facilities that of all other previously published lists (Table 4); however, the Health Map 2021 report only reported on public facilities. There was much more variation across previous lists by facility type, which likely reflects differences or changes in facility classifications over time.

Table 4. Comparing number of facilities in the consolidated facility list with facility numbers reported in previously published facility lists by facility type at the national level.

Data source	All facilities	Hospitals	Health centers	Health posts	Health huts
Consolidated facility list	**4,685**	**81**	**257**	**2,349**	**1,998**
SPA 2012-2013 facility frame	3,084	86	242	1,250	1,506
SPA 2017 facility frame	3,764	68	148	1,853	1,695
SPA 2019 facility frame	3,967	80	153	1,859	1,875
Health Map 2019		39	293	2,563	
Health Map 2019 (public only)		36	99	1,478	
Health Map 2021 (public only)	3,964	40	110	1,531	2,283

At the regional level (Fig. 3), even greater variation emerged. For all facilities (Fig. 3a), prior SPA facility frames were almost always lower than the number of facilities in the CFL. However, the Health Map

2021 report – which only reported on public facilities – had noticeably higher total facility counts in Diourbel, Kaffrine, Saint-Louis, and Matam. Given the prevalence of facility duplicates found across CFL input data sources, it is possible that at least some the discrepancies found here could be due to duplicate observations (e.g., not accounting for facility upgrades and thus including the same facility twice in each facility type for a given year).

Among hospitals (Fig. 3b) and health centers (Fig. 3c), variable patterns occurred, suggesting there may be inconsistent classification of different health centers and/or hospitals across regions. For instance, SPA sampling frame hospital counts were higher in many regions, whereas the Health Map 2019 report counts for health centers were often markedly higher; the latter was particularly pronounced in regions with larger urban centers (e.g., Dakar, Saint-Louis, Thies). Of note, CFL counts for health centers in Kaolack were much higher than other sources, whereas CFL counts for hospitals were generally lower. Because ESRI Kaolack was a key region-specific source for the CFL,[26] further verification may be warranted against to confirm appropriate classification.

For health posts (Fig. 3d), the CFL's facility counts were generally similar or a bit higher than most sources, particularly relative to SPA facility frames. In contrast, health post totals from the Health Map 2019 report were often at least somewhat higher than the CFL; this particularly pronounced in Thies. Health hut patterns were more heterogenous (Fig. 3e), though counts from the SPA 2017 facility fame and Health Map 2021 reports were often higher regional totals from the CFL. This is likely due to our verification processes wherein regional focal points confirmed that many health huts with the same names as health posts are currently classified as health posts. In Louga and Tambacounda, CFL health hut counts were higher than the SPA 2017 frame and the Health Map 2021 report; this may be due to the incorporation of regional lists of health centers, health posts, and health huts. Lastly, the Health Map 2021 report includes some number of health huts in Dakar, whereas all other sources indicated no health huts being present in the region. Further verification of these facilities would be important in the future, particularly as health huts traditionally are constructed in rural areas.

Lastly, we compared the number and distribution of health facilities with GPS from the CFL to those compiled in a spatial database of public facilities by Maina and colleagues (Supplementary file 4).[6] At the national level, the CFL provides nearly twice as many geolocated facilities (n=2,423) than facilities with GPS in Maina and colleagues (n=1,256). The inclusion of health huts, with 530 geolocated, accounts for a substantive portion of these differences. Another main contributor to these differences was the exclusive focus on public facilities. For instance, in Dakar, the CFL included 797 total facilities, with 328 having GPS; in contrast, 121 facilities with GPS were included for Dakar in the Maina and colleagues' database.

Fig. 3. Comparing number of facilities in the consolidated facility list with facility numbers reported in previously published facility lists by facility type.

a)



b)


Number of facilities
0
5
10
15
20
25
30
35
40
Dakar
Diourbel
Fatick
Kaffrine
Kaolack
Kedougou
Kolda
Louga
Matam
Saint−Louis
Sedhiou
Tambacounda
Thies
Ziguinchor
Source
SPA 2012 frame
SPA 2017 frame
SPA 2019 frame
Health Map 2019 (all)
Health Map 2019 (public)
Health Map 2021 (public)

c)


Number of facilities
0
10
20
30
40
50
60
70
80
90
100
Dakar
Diourbel
Fatick
Kaffrine
Kaolack
Kedougou
Kolda
Louga
Matam
Saint−Louis
Sedhiou
Tambacounda
Thies
Ziguinchor
Source
SPA 2012 frame
SPA 2017 frame
SPA 2019 frame
Health Map 2019 (all)
Health Map 2019 (public)
Health Map 2021 (public)

d)


Number of facilities
0
200
400
600
Dakar
Diourbel
Fatick
Kaffrine
Kaolack
Kedougou
Kolda
Louga
Matam
Saint−Louis
Sedhiou
Tambacounda
Thies
Ziguinchor
Source
SPA 2012 frame
SPA 2017 frame
SPA 2019 frame
Health Map 2019 (all)
Health Map 2019 (public)
Health Map 2021 (public)



a All facilities. **b** hospitals. **c** health centers. **d** health posts. **e** health huts. Facility lists included here are facility frames used for SPA sampling[19,23,24] and reported numbers in the CSSDOS Health Map publications in 2019 and 2021;[17,18] of note, only public facilities are reported in the Health Map 2021 report.

Usage Notes

With this dataset, we offer consolidated list of health facilities in Senegal and thus an important step toward building a full MFL. With 52% of facilities with at least one set of GPS coordinates, there is ample need for further prioritizing geolocation efforts if more geospatially targeted health service planning and delivery is to be better supported nationwide. This is particularly important for health huts, which serve as critical connectors between rural communities and higher levels of care. We view this CFL as not only a data product on its own, but also a potential tool that can inform future efforts around where (and which types of facilities) likely have the lowest GPS coverage to date. In looking to the future, an essential next step likely involves augmenting government infrastructure and processes around developing – and routinizing – a MFL.

This CFL has a number of potential applications and use cases in Senegal, of which would only be bolstered by the establishment of a full MFL. At a high level, more targeted and responsive planning could occur, as well as more coordinated public health programming. As highlighted elsewhere,[8,31] building a geolocated MFL or registry equivalent can provide vital inputs into more geospatially tailored service provision and delivery, such as optimizing community care site placements and microplanning for vaccination services, Another example could involve addressing physical access barriers for antenatal or delivery care; with over 60% of in-facility births occurring at health posts in 2019,[32] having a more precise understanding of how close – or how far away – maternal health services are could augment models of care and referral networks. By establishing linkages between a geolocated MFL and health information systems like DHIS2, more granular assessments of facility capacity relative to population need can be performed. For instance, this CFL and eventual MFL in Senegal could inform estimates of COVID-19 vaccination administration capacity, per Africa CDC targets of vaccinating 60-70% of currently eligible populations.[33] This CFL also can serve as an important input into onward assessments of disease risk (e.g., malaria risk stratification maps[34]), as well as analyses quantifying proximity or access to the nearest facility.[35] In addition, linking estimates of maternal and neonatal mortality relative to facility-level variations and measures of quality could further inform national efforts around meeting Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) targets for maternal and child health.[36–38]

Beyond the Senegal context, it is possible that other groups – regionally, within sub-Saharan Africa, and/or more globally – could foster cross-country learning opportunities to learn about different approaches to triangulating existing data and implementing more targeted geolocation efforts. This kind of knowledge exchange could facilitate adaptations or innovations in the ways that facility data are routinely collected, verified, and updated for MFLs or registries. Lastly, the confluence of these work streams could support WHO's GFHD initiative,[16] including inputs into the GHFD's global facility database.

In addition to the more discrete obstacles to establishing a MFL (e.g., geolocating the full range of health facility types and managing authorities), it is vital to determine the best ways to routinize MFL data collection, maintenance, and linkages to current health data infrastructure. Establishing formal data governance mechanisms and leadership by governmental department(s) or agencies are likely among the most crucial steps in this process. In additional, parallel collaboration at the national and subnational levels around health facility list verification and updating is essential, particularly in more decentralized health systems and settings where a mixture of data systems operate (e.g., some combination of digital or centrally databased health information and individual or paper-based file systems).

Limitations and future improvements

The current version of this CFL is subject to several limitations, of which can be considered potential areas for future improvements. First, this dataset should not be viewed as an MFL, contemporaneously or at a given time in the past. This CFL could not be calibrated against a full facility sampling frame, facility census, or documentation of currently (or ever) operational facilities. While we sought to conduct such benchmarking with the ANSD 2017-2018 dataset, the facility file did not match facility counts by type or region for either the SPA 2017 or SPA 2018 facility frames.[23,24] As such, the CFL presented here contributes toward establishing a future MFL in Senegal and can help identify key areas where further investment in geolocation may be needed.

Second, it is likely that the private sector remains under-represented in this CFL, both in terms of total facilities and those with GPS. This is at least partly due to the composition of available facility data inputs (i.e., several data inputs included only public facilities), as well as higher missingness or non-reporting of GPS among private facilities in facility surveys. We sought to derive GPS locations based on facility addresses provided through a 2016-2017 assessment of private facilities in Senegal;[30] however, nearly all of the addresses included insufficient information for Google-based tools to appropriately assign reasonable GPS coordinates. Progress toward a full MFL with GPS will require improving the health data landscape for the private sector, particularly in areas with a higher prevalence of private health service delivery (e.g., Dakar).

Third, this CFL does not systematically track the evolution of facility type changes and/or name changes over time. Since this endeavor sought to identify unique facility observations across datasets, merged facilities that were reported as having been upgraded or changed facility types were assigned their most recent facility type in the CFL. Original facility types, when available, were retained in the 'full' version of the CFL.[29] In terms of name changes, we sought to account for these instances wherever possible; however, they were opportunistic adjustments rather than a systematic undertaking of revisions.

Fourth, the current CFL does not comprehensively capture the opening and closures of facilities over time. Such information would be important to incorporate into future efforts to routinize such facility data. Master facility registries in Malawi[39] and Ethiopia[40], as well as prior facility data collected in Ethiopia,[37] include information on facility opening dates; accordingly, facility cohorts can be constructed over time and support more granular tracking of facility service availability and their contributions to intervention coverage.[37]

Fifth, 347 facilities are still flagged for further review or confirmation. Most of these facilities are either facilities with different facility types with the same name or facilities with the same name associated with different second administrative units; in the absence of GPS to cross-reference a potential match, they are being treated as separate facilities at present. Further engagement with focal points in five regions (Dakar, Diourbel, Fatick, and Thies) from November-December 2022 supported additional reconciliation for at least some flagged facilities, as did the sharing of regional datasets from Louga and Sedhiou after the Dakar-based workshop. In the dataset published alongside this paper,[29] we have sought to clearly identify facilities for which further review should occur.

Sixth, further reconciliation is needed for discordant GPS coordinates across data sources in the CFL. At present, when multiple GPS coordinates are linked to a facility, we use a fairly subjective algorithm to assign GPS. The 'full' version of the facility list provides all GPS associated for a given facility,[29] which could support more sophisticated geospatial testing and verification of discordant GPS coordinates.

Last, subjective decisions were made throughout this work, including data availability, inclusion, and processing. While we have sought to provide as much documentation as possible around each step, it is possible that errors or miscoding of information occurred (especially around manual revisions and re-matching). In the 'full' version of the facility list, we provide additional information on decisions made and original facility names and sources so that onward revisions or updates can occur based on the source inputs.

With this CFL, we provide a foundation from which a more comprehensive, geolocated MFL can be developed in Senegal – an important first step toward strengthening data-informed health planning and programs throughout the country.

Code Availability

Matching algorithms were developed in R,[41] while manual review and verification occurred using MS Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, USA). Figures were also created in R. All code can be found on GitHub, under ~/resources/code:[29] https://github.com/iressef-egh/senegal-cfl

References

1. McFarlane, T. D., Teesdale, S. & Dixon, B. E. Chapter 12 - Facility Registries: Metadata for Where Care Is Delivered. in *Health Information Exchange* (ed. Dixon, B. E.) 183–201 (Academic Press, 2016). doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-803135-3.00012-8.
2. Noor, A. M., Gikandi, P. W., Hay, S. I., Muga, R. O. & Snow, R. W. Creating spatially defined databases for equitable health service planning in low-income countries: the example of Kenya. *Acta Trop* **91**, 239–251 (2004).
3. World Health Organization (WHO). *Master facility list resource package: guidance for countries wanting to strengthen their master facility list: facilitator guide for the MFL training*. (WHO, 2019).
4. Rose-Wood, A. *et al.* Development and use of a master health facility list: Haiti's experience during the 2010 earthquake response. *Global Health: Science and Practice* **2**, 357–365 (2014).

5. Noor, A. M. *et al.* Mapping the distribution and risk of epidemics in the WHO African Region/Cartographie de la distribution et des risques d'epidemie dans la Region africaine de l'OMS. *Weekly Epidemiological Record* **93**, 251–257 (2018).
6. Maina, J. *et al.* A spatial database of health facilities managed by the public health sector in sub Saharan Africa. *Sci Data* **6**, 134 (2019).
7. South, A. *et al.* A reproducible picture of open access health facility data in Africa and R tools to support improvement. *Wellcome Open Res* **5**, 157 (2020).
8. Geo-referenced Infrastructure and Demographic Data for Development (GRID3). *Mapping Health Facilities*. https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/d8-v5kc-5227/download (2021).
9. Burstein, R. Mapping child health: statistical applications for high-resolution estimation of child mortality and healthcare utilization. (2018).
10. Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD) & ICF. *Senegal: Enquête Continue sur la Prestation des Services de Soins de Santé (ECPSS) 2018*. https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-SPA32-SPA-Final-Reports.cfm (2020).
11. Darcy, N. *et al.* Case Study: The Tanzania Health Facility Registry. in *Healthcare Policy and Reform: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* 339–368 (IGI Global, 2019). doi:10.4018/978-1-5225-6915-2.ch017.
12. Makinde, O. A. *et al.* Development of a Master Health Facility List in Nigeria. *Online J Public Health Inform* **6**, e184 (2014).
13. Mishra, A. & Sahay, S. Building a master health facility list: innovative Indian experience. *BMJ Innovations* **7**, (2021).
14. Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX). https://data.humdata.org/.
15. healthsites.io. https://healthsites.io/.

16. World Health Organization (WHO). Geolocated Health Facilities Data initiative. https://www.who.int/data/GIS/GHFD.
17. Cellule de la Carte sanitaire et sociale, de la Santé digitale et de l'Observatoire de la Santé (CSSDOS). *Rapport Annuel de Suivi de la Carte Sanitaire 2019*. https://www.sante.gouv.sn/sites/default/files/Carte%20sanitaire%20Senegal%20Rapport%20annuel%20de%202019_0.pdf (2020).
18. Cellule de la Carte sanitaire et sociale, de la Santé digitale et de l'Observatoire de la Santé (CSSDOS). *Rapport Annuel de Suivi de la Carte Sanitaire 2021*. https://www.sante.gouv.sn/sites/default/files/RAPPORT%20ANNUEL%20DE%20SUIVI%20DE%20LA%20CARTE%20SANITAIRE%202021.pdf (2022).
19. Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD) & ICF. *Sénégal Enquête Continue sur la Prestation des Services de Soins de Santé (ECPSS) 2012-2013*. https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-SPA18-SPA-Final-Reports.cfm (2013).
20. Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD) & ICF. *Sénégal Enquête Continue sur la Prestation des Services de Soins de Santé (ECPSS) 2014*. https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-SPA21-SPA-Final-Reports.cfm (2015).
21. Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD) & ICF. *Senegal Enquête Continue sur la Prestation des Services de Soins de Santé (ECPSS) 2015*. https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-SPA25-SPA-Final-Reports.cfm (2016).
22. Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD), Ministère de la Santé et de l'Action Sociale (MSAS), & ICF. *Sénégal Enquête Continue sur la Prestation des Services de Soins de Santé (ECPSS) 2016*. https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-SPA26-SPA-Final-Reports.cfm (2017).

23. Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD), Ministère de la Santé et de l'Action Sociale (MSAS), & ICF. *Senegal: Enquête Continue sur la Prestation des Services de Soins de Santé (ECPSS) 2017*. https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-SPA27-SPA-Final-Reports.cfm (2018).
24. Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD) & ICF. *Senegal: Enquête Continue sur la Prestation des Services de Soins de Santé (ECPSS) 2019*. https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-SPA33-SPA-Final-Reports.cfm (2020).
25. Ministère de la Santé et de l''Action sociale (MSAS). *Plan National de Développement Sanitaire et Social (PNDSS) 2019-2028*. https://www.sante.gouv.sn/sites/default/files/1%20MSAS%20PNDSS%202019%202028%20Version%20Finale.pdf (2019).
26. ESRI Sénégal. Carte sanitaire Kaolack. https://esrisenegal-esrisenegal.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/carte-sanitaire-kaolack.
27. Jaro, M. A. Advances in Record-Linkage Methodology as Applied to Matching the 1985 Census of Tampa, Florida. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **84**, 414–420 (1989).
28. Robusto, C. C. The Cosine-Haversine Formula. *The American Mathematical Monthly* **64**, 38–40 (1957).
29. L'Institut de Recherche en Santé de Surveillance Épidémiologique et de Formation (IRESSEF), Centre des Opérations d'Urgence Sanitaire (COUS), Département de la Planification de la Recherche et des Statistiques (DPRS), Agence Nationale de Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD), & Exemplars in Global Health (EGH). A consolidated and geolocated list of health facilities in Senegal. (2023).
30. Diop, I. L., Touré, I. D., Koita, M., Diop, M. & El-Khoury, M. *Cartographie du secteur privé de la santé au Sénégal 2016-2017*.

https://shopsplusproject.org/sites/default/files/resources/Cartographie%20du%20secteur%20priv%C3%A9%20de%20la%20sant%C3%A9%20au%20S%C3%A9n%C3%A9gal%202016-2017_0.pdf (2018).

31. Clinton Health Access Initiaitve (CHAI). *Exemplars in geospatial data use for primary healthcare: cross-cutting lessons*. https://clintonhealth.app.box.com/s/5ei753zgwz08njk8es6ttecq1xuuorim (2023).
32. Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (ANSD) & ICF. *Senegal: Enquête Démographique et de Santé Continue (EDS- Continue) 2019*. https://dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-FR368-DHS-Final-Reports.cfm (2020).
33. Africa CDC Annual Report 2021. *Africa CDC* https://africacdc.org/download/africa-cdc-annual-report-2021/.
34. Nguyen, M. *et al.* Mapping malaria seasonality in Madagascar using health facility data. *BMC Medicine* **18**, 26 (2020).
35. Liu, P. Y. *et al.* Quantifying drivers of childhood vaccination in Senegal: a modeling analysis based on the Exemplars in Vaccine Delivery framework. *Working paper*.
36. Loquiha, O. *et al.* Mapping maternal mortality rate via spatial zero-inflated models for count data: A case study of facility-based maternal deaths from Mozambique. *PLoS One* **13**, e0202186 (2018).
37. Croke, K., Mengistu, A. T., O'Connell, S. D. & Tafere, K. The impact of a health facility construction campaign on health service utilisation and outcomes: analysis of spatially linked survey and facility location data in Ethiopia. *BMJ Global Health* **5**, e002430 (2020).
38. Gage, A. D., Fink, G., Ataguba, J. E. & Kruk, M. E. Hospital delivery and neonatal mortality in 37 countries in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia: An ecological study. *PLOS Medicine* **18**, e1003843 (2021).
39. Ministry of Health Malawi. Master Health Facility Registry of Malawi. https://zipatala.health.gov.mw/.

40. Federal Ministry of Health of Ethiopia. Master Facility Registry (MFR). https://mfrv2.moh.gov.et/#/dashboard.

41. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. (2021).

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the Ministry of Health departments and affiliated agencies, whose overall support and willingness to facilitate data access made this work possible. We especially thank the regional focal points who provided feedback at various points in this work, including attending the 2023 facility list workshop. We thank health facilities and their staff, who gave of their time to complete the health facility surveys used in this dataset. We appreciate the guidance and assistance provided by the DHS program around facility data applications. We acknowledge Audrey Ihler of the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) for work on geolocating private facilities, as well as IHME team members who gave feedback on this work as part of the Exemplars in Vaccine Delivery project in Senegal. We thank the following individuals from Gates Ventures, for their programmatic support and assistance: Niranjan Bose, David Phillips, Jordan-Tate Thomas, Rowan Hussein, and Ryan Fitzgerald.

Author contributions

DMG, ABL, PIN, NF, PYL, KM, and AD were involved in identifying, applying for, and/or sharing data. DMG, NF, PYL, and KM were involved in data collation, analysis, and review, with DMG leading regional focal point verification. DMG, NF, and PYL were involved in conceptualizing the database. DMG, NF, PYL, GI, and MS were involved in writing the initial draft of the manuscript. All authors were involved in the revision of the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Corresponding author

Correspondence to Nancy Fullman (nancy.fullman@gatesventures.com)

Competing interests

NF, PYL, and GI are paid employees of Gates Ventures. NF, PYL, and GI previously worked at the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME): September 2008-2011 and February 2013-June 2022 for NF; June 2014-September 2017 and January-June 2022 for PYL; and August 2014-July 2020 for GI. NF reports funding from WHO between June and September 2019 for consulting unrelated to this work.