Costs, catastrophic out-of-pocket payments and impoverishment related to accessing surgical care among households in rural Ethiopia

Short title: Economic impact of accessing surgical care in Ethiopia

Yohannes Hailemichael[1], Tigist Eshetu[2], Hanna Negussie[2], Andualem Deneke[3], Amezene Tadesse[3], Ahmed Abdella[4], Abebe Bekele[3], Andrew Leather[5], Girmay Medhin[6], Martin Prince[7], Charlotte Hanlon[8,2]*

Affiliations

[1]Armauer Hansen Research Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia;

[2]Department of Psychiatry, School of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia;

[3]Department of Surgery, School of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia;

[4]Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, School of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia;

[5]King's Centre for Global Health and Health Partnerships, School of Life Course and Population Sciences, King's College London, London, UK;

[6;]Aklilu-Lemma Institute of Pathobiology, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia;

[7]King's Global Health Institute, King's College London, London, UK;

[8]Centre for Global Mental Health, Health Service and Population Research Department, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

Authors' email addresses

Yohannes Hailemichael: yohannes.h.michael@gmail.com;

Tigist Eshetu: tigisteshetu.g@gmail.com;

Hanna Negussie: hanna.abnet@yahoo.com;

Andualem Deneke: andualemdb94@yahoo.com;

Amezene Tadesse: amezenet@yahoo.com;

Ahmed Abdella: ahmedamu@yahoo.com;

Abebe Bekele: abekele@ughe.org;

Andrew Leather: andy.leather@kcl.ac.uk;

Girmay Medhin: gtmedhin@yahoo.com;

Martin Prince: martin.prince@kcl.ac.uk;

Charlotte Hanlon: charlotte.hanlon@kcl.ac.uk.

* Correspondence: Charlotte Hanlon charlotte.hanlon@kcl.ac.uk, Department of Psychiatry, 7th Floor, College of Health Sciences Administration Building, Black Lion Hospital Compound, Addis Ababa, PO 9086, Ethiopia

Abstract

Background

The objective of this study was to assess the costs, catastrophic out-of-pocket (OOP) health expenditure, impoverishment and coping mechanisms used to pay for surgical care in a predominantly rural area of Ethiopia.

Methods

We conducted a community-based, cross-sectional household survey of 182 people who had undergone a surgical procedure. Participants were interviewed in their homes at six weeks post-operation. Using a contextually adapted version of the Study of global AGEing and adult health (SAGE) questionnaire, we estimated direct and indirect costs of surgical care from a household perspective. Catastrophic out-of-pocket (OOP) health expenditure was estimated using thresholds of 10% and 25% of annual household consumption expenditure. Impacts of surgical care payments on poverty levels was estimated by comparing pre- and post-operative OOP payments. Analysis of variance, t-test and a logit model were used to assess factors associated with catastrophic OOP health expenditure.

Results

Most surgical patients were women (87.9%), with 65% receiving obstetric surgical care. Direct costs dominated expenditure: direct medical costs Birr 1649.5 (44.6%), direct non-medical costs Birr 1226.5 (33.2%), indirect costs Birr 821.9 (22.2%). Catastrophic OOP surgical care expenditure was experienced by 69.2% households at the 10% threshold and 45.6% at the 25% threshold. The increase in average normalized poverty gap due to OOP surgical care expenditure was higher in non-obstetric (14.1%) compared to obstetric (5.8%) procedures, and for non-emergency (13.3%) compared to emergency care (6.3%). To pay for surgical care, 38% of households had sold assets and 5% had borrowed money.

Conclusions

Due to surgical care, households faced severe financial burdens leading to impoverishment. Households implemented hardship coping strategies to mitigate the financial constraints. Provision of free maternal care reduced but did not eliminate these burdens. There is a pressing need to tailor financial risk protection mechanisms to achieve universal coverage for surgical care.

Key words: catastrophic healthcare expenditure; impoverishment, universal health coverage, global surgery

Background

In low-income and lower-middle-income countries, over nine out of ten people cannot access safe, timely and affordable surgical and anaesthesia care [1]. Key barriers include the direct and indirect costs related to surgical services [2, 3]. Surgical conditions additionally can have a severe impact on the person's day-to-day activities and result in a loss of income to the household, either in the form of wage losses from the patient or caregivers, or due to losses in agricultural output or other earnings. Shrime et al. (2016) reported that half of the world population, or 3.7 billion people (posterior credible interval: 3.2-4.2 billion), are at risk of catastrophic expenditure if they were to need surgery because they do not have financial risk protection [4]. Each year, an estimated 81 million people worldwide are driven to financial catastrophe due to the cost of surgery and its associated indirect costs, with the biggest burden borne by people in low- and middle-income countries [5]. In patients who underwent surgery at a government hospital in Uganda, 31% faced catastrophic expenditure [6]. In Malawi, 94% of district and 87% of central hospital patients experienced catastrophic expenditure for surgical care [7] .

In Ethiopia pre-payment and other financial risk protection mechanisms are limited. In recognition of this, in recent years the country has introduced health care financing reforms to increase affordable access to health services and achieve universal health coverage (UHC) [8]. In Ethiopia, efforts to enhance financial risk protection for accessing essential health services include provision of high-impact interventions free of charge through an exemption program; subsidization of more than 80% of the cost of care in public health facilities; implementation of community-based health insurance (CBHI) schemes; and full subsidization of the very poor through fee waivers [9]. However, the coverage of CBHI is low (28%)[10], while the coverage of social health insurance for the formal sector is less than 3% [11] and fee waivers are based on a quota system, covering only 10% of the poorest population [12]. Therefore, for the majority, care provision is based on "fees for service". Thus, out-of-pocket health expenditure

97 (OOPHE) still dominates all sources of expenditures for health care and constituted 35% of total health
98 expenditure in 2018 [13]. As a result, OOPHE has impoverishing effects on households of those who
99 experience ill-health, especially among the poorest [14, 15]. In addition, due to the impact of OOP
100 payments, a large treatment gap is likely to exist. In a recent study from Ethiopia, Kiros et al. (2020)
101 estimated that, on average, 0.9 % (range 0.1-5.0%) of the population becomes impoverished every year
102 because of the cost of accessing health care services [16]. Thus, where healthcare payments are made
103 mostly through OOP payments, it becomes a trade-off for patients and families to get care and suffer
104 catastrophic expenditure or accept the consequences of not accessing care. As is the case in Ethiopia,
105 many households may risk not seeking care [17].

106 Several studies in Ethiopia have investigated and compared the burden of OOPHE and impoverishment
107 for specific health conditions [18-20] and between different regional states [15, 16]. However, we were
108 not able to find many studies on the magnitude of catastrophic health care expenditure due to surgical
109 care. It is important for policy makers to understand the financial impact of surgical care on the
110 economic welfare of households to guide the national health policy to achieve equitable, accessible and
111 affordable surgical services. In light of this, the objective of this study was to quantify direct and indirect
112 costs, investigate the magnitude of catastrophic out-of-pocket payments and impoverishment related to
113 accessing surgical care and to identify the coping strategies implemented by affected households.

114 **Materials and Methods**

115 We conducted a community-based, cross-sectional household survey of people who had undergone a
116 surgical procedure and were interviewed in their homes at six weeks after the operation. This study was
117 conducted as part of the pre-implementation phase of the ASSET programme (Health System
118 Strengthening in sub-Saharan Africa). The goal of ASSET was to identify system bottlenecks to accessing

quality surgical, maternal and primary healthcare in Ethiopia, Sierra Leone, South Africa and Zimbabwe [21]. In this paper, we present findings from Ethiopia.

Study setting

The study was conducted in Meskan, Misrak Meskan, Sodo and South Sodo districts and Butajira town of the Gurage zone located in the Southern Nations, Nationalities and People's Region of Ethiopia. Health services are provided through governmental and non-governmental health facilities. In the five districts there are 94 health posts and 16 primary health care units (health centers) for preventive and curative health services. There is one general and one primary hospital where surgical care is available. In the general hospital, there is one surgeon, one obstetrician/gynaecologist and two Integrated Emergency Surgical Officers (IESOs) who provide both emergency and elective surgical care. In the primary hospital, there are two IESOs providing only emergency surgical care. The common surgical procedures performed in the hospitals are Caesarean section, abdominal hysterectomy, management of pelvic organ prolapse, tubal ligation, repair of hernias, management of acute appendicitis, haemorrhoidectomy, fracture and dislocation management and tooth extractions. Most surgical care services are based on a "fee for service" model, but obstetric care is an exempted service.

Participants

Participants were all surgical patients who had undergone a surgical procedure between 3rd June and 27th September 2019 at the general or primary hospital and were available for a community-based survey 6-8 weeks following the operation. The aim was to investigate the costs incurred when accessing surgical care and to estimate the proportion of people facing catastrophic OOP payments and impoverishment (pushing the household below the poverty threshold) [22, 23].

Recruitment procedure

141 Participants were approached by research staff while in hospital once their condition had stabilized.
142 They were invited to participate in the study and provide informed consent for research staff to visit
143 their home for an interview on expenditures related to surgical care.

144 **Sample size**

145 We estimated that we would recruit 150-200 participants over the four month study period. This was a
146 pragmatic decision based on what was feasible and comparable with previous studies from Malawi [7]
147 and Ghana [24].

148 **Outcome variables**

149 The primary outcome was cost of surgical care, with secondary outcomes of catastrophic out-of-pocket
150 healthcare expenditure, the poverty impact of accessing surgical care and coping strategies
151 implemented to manage financial constraints.

152 **Measurements**

153 A contextually adapted and abbreviated version of the World Health Organization SAGE (Study of global
154 AGEing and adult health) survey instrument was used. SAGE was used previously in a study on health
155 and ageing in six LMICs [25] and in Ethiopia [14]. The SAGE instrument is used to collect information on a
156 variety of individual and household socio-economic attributes such as consumption expenditure,
157 income, assets and household demographics (detailed below). Cost of illness was derived from
158 consumption expenditure data and income loss of patients and caregivers associated with seeking
159 surgical care and providing care for the person who had undergone a surgical procedure.

160 Type of surgery was categorised as emergency versus elective with the assumption that this would be
161 relevant to the cost of care. Moreover, we classified the type of surgical care as obstetric vs. non-

162 obstetric procedures for the reason that obstetric care alone was exempted from full costs. These
163 classifications were based on information obtained from hospital records. Sociodemographic data were
164 measured in terms of age, sex, residential area (urban/rural), marital status, religion and education.
165 Information on the availability of financial risk protection mechanisms for the patient was obtained from
166 the hospital record and classified as having community-based health insurance (CBHI), a 'free
167 certificate' (fee waiver) or not covered by any financial risk protection mechanism.

168 **Consumption expenditures**

169 Consumption expenditure variables were collected at the household level. Food expenditure was
170 estimated by summing consumption of the household's own food products and expenditure on food
171 items over the seven days preceding the survey**.** Non-food expenditure was calculated by summing
172 expenditure on rent, electricity, transport, clothes and health care for the 30 days preceding the survey,
173 and expenditure on education, health aids, hospitalization and long-term health care for the 12 months
174 preceding the survey. To obtain comparable time periods, all consumption expenditures data were
175 annualised and then converted to a 30-day time period. Monthly household consumption expenditure
176 was calculated as the sum of food, non-food and health expenditure.

177 **Out-of-pocket health expenditure**

178 Out-of-pocket health expenditures were those made by households at the point of receiving health
179 services and payments directly related to seeking care (transportation, food, accommodation and
180 caregiving) as reported by respondents. We further classified OOP payments into 'catastrophic' and
181 'non-catastrophic' categories. Catastrophic OOPHE was defined in relation to a household's
182 consumption expenditures. OOP health care payment was taken to be financially catastrophic when it
183 exceeded 10% or 25% of total household consumption [26, 27].

184 For cost of surgical care, data were collected on expenditures incurred as:

185 (i) direct medical costs, including registration, consultation, medicines, diagnostics (investigations and
186 procedures), medical supplies and hospital charges; (ii) direct non-medical costs, like transportation to
187 seek care for the affected person and accompanying household members, food, accommodation, hiring
188 of someone as a care provider/attendant; and (iii) indirect costs, which was income that was foregone
189 due to the patient's inability to work or other income foregone by other household members because
190 they accompanied the patient to the facility or spent time caring for the patient at home [28]. In
191 estimating productivity losses, we followed recommended practice to use the actual income losses
192 rather than the potential losses. The rationale is that, in agricultural societies or for people engaged in
193 informal labour there are seasons in which work intensity is high and others in which work intensity is
194 low. In addition, household use coping strategies that may mitigate these potential losses. Thus, days of
195 ill-health do not necessarily translate neatly into days of lost work [29, 30]. All costs were expressed in
196 Ethiopian Birr and exchange rate to USD and PPP (the purchasing power parity conversion rate to
197 International dollar was provided at the foot note of the tables). [31, 32].

198 **Incidence and intensity of catastrophic out-of-pocket health expenditure**

199 The incidence of catastrophic OOPHE is measured by catastrophic head count which is the percentage of
200 households incurring OOPHE in excess of a specified threshold in one year [33]. In this study, two
201 thresholds were used: greater than or equal to 10% and 25% of total consumption expenditure. Both
202 thresholds are indicators linked to Sustainable Development Goals for monitoring Universal Health Care
203 [34].

204 The intensity of catastrophic OOPHE captures how much a household's OOPHE exceeds the catastrophic
205 threshold and is estimated through the catastrophic overshoot and the mean positive overshoot
206 (MPO)[33]. For calculation of catastrophic OOPHE**,** direct medical and non-medical costs were used.

Poverty impact of out-of-pocket health expenditure

The poverty impact of OOPHE was measured in terms of:

(i) poverty head count, which is the percentage of households living below the poverty line;

(ii) poverty gap, or the average amount by which resources fall short of the poverty line, measures poverty depth or intensity of poverty (the amount by which poor households fall short of the poverty line).

(iii) normalized poverty gap, obtained by dividing the poverty gap by the poverty line for pre- and post-OOPHE.

The poverty line was set based on median consumption expenditure, a relative poverty line of half and two-thirds of median consumption per capita [35, 36] .

Statistical analysis

OOP health care expenditure and poverty impact of surgical care expenditures were analyzed using one-way analysis of variance, Student's t-test and Kruskal Wallis test depending on the required statistical assumptions and number of categories to be compared. Categorical data were cross-tabulated and the statistical significance of observed differences in proportions was investigated using Pearson's Chi-square (χ^2) or alternatively Fisher's exact test, as appropriate. Further analysis was conducted to investigate the effect of OOPHE on household food and non-food consumption expenditure using a linear probability model.

Results

227 Out of 224 people who underwent surgical procedures during the study period, 182 (81.3%) participated
228 in the survey in the community after 6-8 weeks. See Figure 1 for a flow chart of participants.

229 Figure 1: Flow chart of participants

230 **Background characteristics**

231 See Table 1 for demographic characteristics of respondents. The mean (standard deviation; SD) age of
232 respondents was 33.1 (SD 13.5) years, with 84.1% within the 19–40 year age group. Most (about 88%) of
233 household heads were men, 56.0% (n=102) were Muslim, 81 (44.5%) had attended primary level
234 education and 55 (30.2%) had no formal education. The majority (87.9%) of respondents were married.
235 In terms of financial protection, 14 (8.4%) of the study participants were members of CBHI and 25
236 (13.8%) had a poverty certificate (fee waiver) to access health services without payment.

237 **Table1: Household characteristics**

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Age group (years)		
19-40	153	84.1
41-50	8	4.4
51-60	9	4.9
61 or above	12	6.6
Gender		
Male	22	12.1
Female	160	87.9
Residence		
Urban	96	54.2
Rural	81	45.8
Education attainment		
No formal education	55	30.2
Primary education	81	44.5
Secondary education	20	11.0
Above secondary	26	16.3
Marital		
Never married	11	6.0
Married	160	87.9
Separated/ Divorced/ Widowed	11	6.0
Religion		
Muslim	102	56.0

Orthodox	68	37.4
Protestant	12	6.6
Member of Community-Based Health Insurance		
Yes	14	8.4
No	153	91.6
Free health care certificate(fee waiver)		
Yes	25	13.8
No	156	86.2
Either CBHI and fee waiver		
Yes	39	21.4
No	153	78.6
Surgery by condition		
Emergency	122	67.1
Non-emergency	60	32.9
Surgery by type		
Obstetric	120	65.9
Non-obstetric	62	34.1
Length of Hospital stay(days)		
1-3	84	46.9
4-5	72	40.2
6 or more	23	12.9

Consumption expenditures

Supplementary table 1 shows the monthly household consumption expenditure by consumption categories. On average, household food consumption was Birr 5970.3 (SD 4400.3), representing 43.7% of total consumption expenditure, with Birr 2423.3 (SD 7981.7) spent on household utilities, Birr 1694.9 (SD 6830.9) on big purchases and Birr 2876.1 (SD 3848.9) on healthcare.

Table 2 provides the detailed household consumption expenditure by household characteristics and surgery type (emergency vs. elective; obstetric vs. non-obstetric). The share of OOP payments for health care as a percentage of total consumption expenditure was 16.4% for obstetric surgical procedures compared to 35.6% for non-obstetric procedures ($p<0.001$). Health care costs for rural residents were about 13% ($p< 0.001$) higher than health care costs for urban residents. The cost of treatment for women was about 19.7% ($p<0.001$) less in terms of OOP health care expenditure compared to cost of treatment for men.

251 **Table 2. Mean consumption expenditures (in Birr) by household characteristics, catastrophic**
252 **health expenditure and type of surgical care**

Household characteristics	Food Mean (%)	Housing utilities Mean (%)	Big expenditures Mean (%)	Healthcare Mean (%)	All expenditures
Urban	6804.5(46.7)	3590.3(24.5)	1700.5(11.6)	2540.1 (17.3)	14635.4
Rural	4905.8(46.2)	1016.1(9.6)	1439.4(13.6)	3241.4 (30.6)***	10602.7
Male	6699.4(44.5)	1210.5(8.0)	1229.2(8.1)	5904.9(39.2)	15044.0
Female	5795.4(46.8) **	2514.4(20.3)**	1589.4(12.8)	2459.7(19.9) ***	12358.9
Obstetric	5923.9(45.7)	2979.6(23.0)	1927.7(14.9)	2124.3(16.4)	12955.5
Non-obstetric	5867.5(48.2)	1151.4(9.5)	806.9(6.7)	4331.4(35.6) ***	12157.2
Emergency	6234.6(49.8)	2073.5(16.6)	1575.6(12.6)*	2615.3(17.3)	12499.0
Non-emergency	5234.0(40.0)**	2932.6(22.4)	1485.5(11.3)	3406.5(26.0)**	13058.6
Catastrophic	5263.8(45.7)***	1481.6(12.8)***	805.5(6.9)***	3958.3(34.3)***	11509.2
Non catastrophic	7275.0(47.1)	4458.3(28.9)	3128.8(20.2)	562.6(3.6)	15424.7

253 *1 USD = 29.07 Birr (2019, purchasing power parity, 1 international dollars=10.74 Birr)*
254 *ANOVA and t-test for means and Pearson's χ2 for categorical variables. P<0.05*,P<0.01**;P<0.001***.*
255

256 Households that faced catastrophic OOPHE had significantly lower expenditure on food (p=0.002),
257 housing utilities (p=0.008) and big item expenditures (p=0.012) compared to non-catastrophic
258 households.

259 **Direct and indirect costs of surgical care**

260 Table 3 shows the mean expenditure on surgical care. Direct medical costs contributed the largest
261 proportion (44.6%) of the economic cost of surgical care, comprising an average of Birr 1649.5 per
262 respondent. Of the direct medical costs, 36.2% was spent on medication and 29.3% on other medical
263 items.

264

265 **Table 3. Cost of surgical care by cost categories**

Cost categories	Mean(SD)	Percentage share
A. Direct medical	1649.5(2600.6)	44.6
Registration	7.3(8.8)	0.4
Medications	596.8(1137.3)	36.2
Medical supplies	264.0(1012.2)	16.0
Hospital bed	225.4(743.8)	13.7
Investigations	73.3(201.3)	4.4
Other medical items	482.6(1212.1)	29.2
B. Direct non-medical	1226.5(1956.1)	33.2
Transportation	227.3(611.7)	18.5
Food items	596.8(937.6)	48.7
Care giver/attendants	402.5(1097.4)	32.8
C. Indirect cost (Lost income)	821.9(1698.6)	22.2

266 *1 USD = 29.07 Birr (2019, purchasing power parity, 1 international dollars=10.74 Birr)*

267

268 Following direct medical costs, the cost of direct non-medical and indirect costs accounted for an
269 average of Birr 1226.5 and Birr 821.9 per respondent, respectively. The major contributor to direct non-
270 medical expenses was expenditure on food items (mean Birr 596.8). Income loss to the patient and
271 family member accounted for 22.2% of all total costs of surgical care.

272 Table 4 shows the distribution of health care cost categories across households.

273 **Table 4. Mean cost of surgical care by cost category, surgical type and household**
274 **characteristics**

Characteristics	Frequency	Direct medical cost Mean (%)	Direct non-medical cost Mean (%)	Indirect cost Mean (%)	Total cost
Male	22	3682.2(54.4)	2222.7(32.9)	856.8 (12.7)	6761.7
Female	160	1370.1(41.8)	1089.6 (33.2)	817.2(25.0)	3276.9
P value of t-test		<0.001	0.017	0.918	
Urban	96	1516.6(46.2)	1023.5 (31.2)	740.5(22.6)	3280.6
Rural	81	1754.1(41.8)	1487.3 (35.4)	956.9 (22.8)	4198.3
P value of t-test		0.269	0.060	0.202	
Obstetric	120	1129.7(38.8)	994.6(34.2)	786.6 (27.0)	2910.9

Non- obstetric	62	2655.8(50.9)	1675.5 (32.0)	890.3(17.1)	5221.6
P-value t-test		<0.001	0.025	0.697	
Emergency	122	1387.2(39.5)	1228.2(35.0)	891.9(25.4)	3507.2
Non-Emergency	60	2183.1(53.4)	1223.4(30.0)	679.8(16.6)	4086.3
P value of t-test		0.026	0.506	0.785	
Catastrophic	124	2351.1 (47.3)	1607.2 (32.4)	1008.9 (20.3)	4967.2
Non-catastrophic	58	149.8(15.2)	412.8(32.0)	422.2 (32.8)	984.8
P value of t-test		<0.001	<0.001	0.029	
1-3 days	84	905.4(32.8)	1093.5(39.6)	761.0(27.6)	2759.9
4-5 days	72	1819.2(48.1)	1144.1(30.3)	818.8(21.6)	3782.1
6 or more days	23	3908.3(55.8)	2022.8(28.9)	1075.4(15.3)	7006.5
P value of ANOVA		<0.001	0.557	0.389	

1 USD = 29.07 Birr (2019, purchasing power parity, 1 international dollars=10.74 Birr)

There was a similar pattern of distribution with the direct medical, direct non-medical and indirect costs, with males, rural residents, and those undergoing non-obstetric surgery spending more compared to their counterparts. Length of hospitalization had an effect on treatment cost. For every additional day of hospitalization on average patient incur Birr 376.0 for direct medical cost.

Catastrophic out-of-pocket health care expenditure

Table 5 shows the distribution of catastrophic OOPHE across consumption expenditure quintiles. The proportion of households whose healthcare expenditure was above the two set thresholds for catastrophic spending (i.e., 10% and 25%) was high. For the 10% threshold, catastrophic OOP healthcare expenditure was significantly higher for male patients compared with female patients (95.4% vs. 64.3%; p<0.001). Similarly, catastrophic OOP health expenditure was higher in those with non-emergency compared to emergency conditions (p=0.016) and in those undergoing non-obstetric surgical care compared to obstetric care (p<0.001). Significantly more rural households experienced catastrophic OOP

289 health expenditure compared to urban residents (83.9% vs. 54.1%; $p<0.001$). Catastrophic OOP health

290 expenditure was higher in participants who were hospitalized for 6 or more days (93.1%) compared to

291 those who hospitalized for 1-3 days (57.1%; $p=0.005$).

292 **Table 5. Household experiencing catastrophic OOPHE by socio-economic status and surgical type**

Characteristics	Catastrophic OOPHE measures					
	>=10% threshold(95% CI)			>=25% (95% CI)		
	Headcount	Overshoot	MPO	Headcount	Overshoot	MPO
Male	95.4***(72.6-99.4)	31.3***(21.0-41.6)	32.8(22.5-43.1)	68.1**(45.9-84.3)	19.4**(10.7-28.1)	28.5(18.9-38.0)
Female	64.3(56.5-71.4)	14.8(11.7-17.9)	23.0(18.9-27.0)	37.5(30.2-45.3)	7.5(5.1-9.8)	20.0(15.0-24.9)
Urban	54.1(44.0-63.9)	10.9(7.6-14.2)	20.1(15.4-24.9)	31.2(22.7-41.2)	5.0(2.8-7.2)	16.0(10.6-21.4)
Rural	83.9***(74.1-90.5)	22.6***(17.5-27.6)	26.9(21.4-32.3)	50.6**(39.7-61.4)	12.7**(8.5-16.8)	25.1(18.8-31.3)
Obstetric	56.6(47.5-65.3)	11.4(8.2-14.5)	20.1(15.5-24.8)	27.5 (20.1-36.2)	15.7(10.7-20.7)	19.8(13.5-26.2)
Non-obstetric	90.3***(79.8-95.6)	27.2***(21.3-33.0)	30.1(24.1-36.1)	67.7*** (55.0-70.2)	15.7(10.7-20.7)	23.2(17.0-29.4)
Emergency	62.2(53.2-70.5)	13.5(10.3-16.7)	21.6(17.5-25.8)	34.4(26.4-43.3)	6.6(4.3-8.8)	19.1(14.4-23.9)
Non-emergency	80.0*(67.7-88.3)	23.5**(17.0-29.9)	29.3(22.2-36.5)	55.0**(42.1-67.1)	13.7(8.3-19.1)	24.9(16.9-33.0)
CBHI(Yes)	67.9(60.0-74.9)	14.8(3.7-25.9)	20.8(6.5-35.0)	35.7(15.0-63.5)	7.3(0.9-15.6)	20.5(0.2-43.1)
CBHI(No)	71.4(42.6-89.3)	17.7(14.2-21.6)	26.0(21.8-30.2)	43.7(36.0-51.8)	9.6(6.9-12.3)	22.0(17.3-26.7)
Granted free certificate	68.0(47.2-83.4)	13.9(4.7-23.2)	20.5(7.9-33.2)	32.0(16.5-52.7)	7.1(0.3-14.7)	22.4(0.5-45.4)
No free certificate	67.9(60.1-74.8)	17.1(13.8-20.4)	25.2(21.2-29.2)	42.3(34.7-50.2)	9.2(6.6-11.7)	21.7(17.3-26.2)
Financial protection,(Yes)	66.2(58.0-73.5)	15.4(12.1-18.6)	23.2(19.1-27.4)	40.0(32.2- 48.2)	7.8(5.3-10.3)	19.5(14.5-24.4)
(No)	75.6(59.1-87.0)	22.2(14.2-30.2)	29.4(20.3-38.5)	45.9(30.5-62.1)	13.4(7.0-19.7)	29.2*(19.8-38.5)
Length of stays (1-3 days)	57.1(46.2-67.3)	11.6(7.7-15.5)	20.4(14.6-26.1)	30.9(21.9-41.7)	5.5(2.6-8.4)	17.8(10.0-25.7)
4-5 days	72.2(60.6-81.4)	17.6(12.7-22.5)	24.4(18.6-30.1)	44.4(33.3-56.1)	9.2(5.4-13.0)	20.8(14.1-27.5)
6 or more days	91.3*(70.2-97.9)	33.0***22.6-43.4)	36.2*(25.9-46.5)	69.5(47.8-85.0)	20.8***(11.8-29.8)	29.9*(20.0 - 39.8)

293 *P<0.05*,P<0.01**;P<0.001***.P is from Pearson's χ2 and Kruskal walls test*

294 Financial risk protection included, CBHI(community based health insurance) and those granted free certificate to access health care without
295 payment;

296 **Impoverishment effect of out-of-pocket payments**

297 As shown in Supplementary table 2, using half and two-thirds of household per capita median
298 consumption expenditures as the poverty line, out-of-pocket surgical care expenditures led to a 10.4%
299 and 19.2% rise in poverty head count ratios, respectively. The normalized poverty gap increased by 6.0%
300 (a 90.9% increment) for a poverty line of half median consumption expenditure, and by 8.6% (an 82.7%
301 increment) for the poverty line of two-thirds median consumption. Similarly, using half of median
302 consumption, the poverty gap increased by Birr 289.9, representing a 92.0% relative increment. A
303 similar pattern was observed when the two-thirds of median total consumption threshold was used as
304 the poverty line.

305

306 A stratified analysis of poverty impact of OOP health expenditure for surgical care is presented in Table
307 6. The analysis shows that using a poverty line of half of median consumption expenditure, 3.9% of
308 obstetric, 17.6% of non-obstetric, 6.6% of emergency and 18.3% of non-emergency patients were
309 pushed below the poverty line after paying for surgical care. The poverty gap also increased by Birr
310 2042.1 for obstetric surgical intervention, Birr 2119.9 for non-obstetric surgical intervention, Birr 2134
311 for emergency cases and Birr 2022.8 for non-emergency cases.

312 **Table 6. Poverty impact of OOPHE using 1/2 and2/3 of annual median consumption as a poverty line**
313 **by surgical type**

Poverty measures	Surgical type			
	Obstetric	Non- Obstetric	Emergency	Non-emergency
I. using 1/2 of median consumption				
Headcount				
Prepayment head count	17.5%	20.9%	14.7%	26.7%
Post payment head count	21.4%	38.7%	21.3%	45.0%
Absolute point change	3.9%	17.6%***	6.6%	18.3%*
Relative change	22.2%	84.2%	44.8%	68.5%
Poverty gaps				
Prepayment poverty gap (Birr)	315.6	313.9	268.2	410.2
Post payment poverty gap (Birr)	493.5	820.6	454.7	910.2

Absolute gap change(Birr)	177.9	506.6*	186.5	500.0*
Relative change	56.3%	161.3%	69.5%	121.8%
Normalized gaps				
Prepayment normalized gap^{X}	6.6%	6.5%	5.6%	8.6%
Mean positive pre-payment poverty gap(Birr)	1803.4	1497.2	1817.9	1538.4
Post-payment normalized gap ^{Y}	10.3%	17.2%	9.5%	19.0%
Mean positive post-payment poverty gap (Birr)	2042.1	2119.9	2134.0	2022.8
Absolute percentage point change (impact) $^{Z}_{(=Y-X)}$	3.7%	10.6%*	3.9%	10.4%*
Relative percentage change (=Z/X*100)	56.0%	163.0	69.6%	120.9%
II. Using 2/3 of median consumption				
Headcount				
Prepayment head count	30.0%	27.4%	24.6%	38.3%
Post payment head count	44.1%	56.4%	42.6%	60.0%
Absolute point change	14.1%	29.0%*	18.0%	21.7%
Relative change	47%	105.8%	73.1%	56.6%
Poverty gaps				
Prepayment poverty gap	655.3	1025.8	539.3	925.2
Post payment poverty gap(Birr)	688.2	1586.8	943.5	1772.9
Absolute gap change(Birr)	132.9	561.0	404.2	847.7
Relative change	20.2%	54.6%	74.9%	91.6%
Normalized gaps				
Prepayment normalized gap^{X}	10.3%	10.8%	8.4%	14.5%
Mean positive pre-payment poverty gap(Birr)	2184.4	2510.2	2193.3	2413.5
Post-payment normalized gap ^{Y}	16.1%	29.4%	14.8%	27.9%
Mean positive post-payment poverty gap(Birr)	2322.7	2810.9	2213.6	2954.8
Absolute percentage point change (impact) $^{Z}_{(=Y-X)}$	5.8%	14.1%*	6.3%	13.3%*
Relative percentage change (=Z/X*100)	56.3%	130.5%	75.0%	91.7%

1 USD = 29.07 Birr (2019, purchasing power parity, 1 international dollars=10.74 Birr)

Kruskal-Wallis comparing pre and post payment by surgical care sub groups

Out-of-pocket payments for surgical care raised the average poverty gap (normalized gap) for households of obstetric, non-obstetric, emergency and non-emergency cases by 5.8%, 14.1%, 6.3% and 13.3%, respectively.

At the poverty line of two-thirds of consumption expenditure, 14.1% of obstetric surgical procedures, 29.0% of non- obstetric surgical procedures, 18.0% of emergency and 21.7% of non-emergency patients fell into poverty due to out-of-pocket payments for healthcare. We also found significant differences in

323 the poverty gap after paying for health care. The poverty gap increased by Birr 2184.4 for obstetric
324 surgical procedures, Birr 2510.2 for non-obstetric surgical procedures, Birr 2193.3 for emergencies and
325 Birr 2413.5 for non-emergencies.

326 **Coping strategies implemented for financial constraints**

327 Supplementary table 3 shows the source of payments for surgical care. More than half (53.3%) of those
328 who received surgical care paid for the service from their income, with over one-third (37.9%) of
329 households needing to sell items, 15.3% having care paid for by relatives and 4.9% needing to borrow
330 money.

331 **Factors associated with catastrophic OOP health expenditure**

332 Table 7 presents factors associated with catastrophic OOP health expenditure in excess of either 10% or
333 25% of the household's consumption expenditure. Patients who received obstetric surgical care had
334 much lower odds of catastrophic OOP health expenditure (adjusted Odds Ratio (AOR) 0.1, 95% CI: 0.03,
335 0.7; p=0.047) compared to non-obstetric surgical patients. Rural residents had significantly higher odds
336 of catastrophic OOP health expenditure than urban residents at the 10% threshold (AOR 4.2, 95%CI: 1.8,
337 9.7; p=0.002) and at the 25% threshold (AOR 1.8, 95%CI: 1.2, 3.9; p=0.049. At the 10% and 25%
338 thresholds, the odds of facing catastrophic expenditure for those who had no financial risk protection
339 mechanism were (AOR 3.3, 95%CI: 0.7-15.4) and (AOR 2.6, 95%CI: 0.7-8.1) times higher, respectively,
340 compared to those who had financial risk protection. However, these differences are not statistically
341 significant.

342

343 Table 7. Factors associated with catastrophic OOPHE

Characteristics	Catastrophic thresholds			
	>=10%		>=25%	
	COR(95%,CI)	AOR(95%,CI)	COR(95%,CI)	AOR(95%,CI)
Gender				
Male	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Female	0.08* (0.01- 0.6)	0.5(0.04-6.0)	0.2(0.1-0.7)	0.6(0.3-5.0)
Residence				
Urban	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Rural	4.4*** (2.1-9.0)	4.2** (1.8-9.7)	2.2**(1.2-4.1)	1.8* (1.2-3.9)
Surgical condition				
Emergency	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Non- emergency	2.42* (1.16- 5.0)	1.0(0.3-3.2)	2.3**(1.2-4.3)	1.6(0.2-2.0)
Surgical type				
Obstetric	0.1* (0.05-0.3)	0.1* (0.03-0.7)	0.1***(0.09-0.3)	0.1** (0.04-0.5)
Non-obstetric	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Users by payment status				
CBHI				
Yes	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
No	0.8(0.2-2.8)	3.1(0.5-18.1)	1.4(0.4-4.3)	4.1(0.8-19.9)
Free certificate				
Yes	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
No	0.9(0.4-2.4)	2.8(0.4-24.1)	1.5(0.6-3.8)	2.1(0.3-12.4)
Length of stays				
1-3 days	0.1(0.02-0.5)	0.3(0.05-2.0)	0.1**(0.03-0.4)	0.1* (0.07-0.5)
4-5 days	0.2(0.05-1.1)	0.5(0.1-3.8)	0.5*(0.01-0.8)	0.3* (0.1-0.9)
6 or more days	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Financial risk protection				
Yes	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
No	0.6(0.2-1.4)	3.3(0.7-15.4)	0.7(0.3-1.6)	2.6(0.7-8.1)

344 Financial risk protection included, CBHI(community based health insurance) or granted free certificate to access
345 health care without payment; $p<0.05$*,$p<0.01$**,$p<0.001$***

346

347 **Discussion**

348 This study examined the extent of cost of surgical care among service users in primary and general
349 hospitals in rural Ethiopia. Even though our service-using sample was likely to include households who
350 were already of better socioeconomic status than those not accessing care at all, we found that the cost
351 of surgical care was catastrophic for households.

352 More than two-thirds of surgical patients faced catastrophic OOP health expenditure at the 10%
353 threshold of total consumption expenditure. Our finding is lower than reports from Malawi [7] and
354 Madagascar [37], while being greater than the 59% for Vietnam [38], 12% for Sierra Leone [39] and 31%
355 reported for Uganda [6]. All surgical care is considered free in Malawi and Uganda, and in Madagascar
356 there is a form of insurance for the poor [37]. In Ethiopia, surgical services are based on payments at the
357 point of care, with the exception of obstetric services which are meant to be provided free of charge
358 through the exemption programme [9, 40, 41]. Beyond these differences in healthcare financial
359 strategies across countries, it is likely that the proportion of those in need of surgical care who even
360 manage to access hospital care may vary, expected to be lower in this rural, low-income Ethiopian
361 setting. Thus, those accessing surgical care represent households of relatively higher socio-economic
362 status or women accessing obstetric care. A further reason for varying estimates of catastrophic OOP
363 health expenditure is due to methodological differences in estimating catastrophic expenditure. In some
364 of these studies, wage loss was included in the estimation of catastrophic health expenditure whereas
365 we considered that this cost is not an OOP payment.

366 Despite obstetric care being considered an essential and fee-exempted health service at government
367 health facilities in Ethiopia, 56.6% and 27.5% of women that received obstetric surgical care
368 encountered catastrophic OOP payments at the 10% and 25% thresholds, respectively. Earlier studies
369 from Ethiopia reported that maternal services are supposed to be provided free of charge in Ethiopia
370 but costs incurred by the households to assess care are substantial [40, 41]. Similarly, in our analysis,
371 despite having financial protection mechanisms either in the form of CBHI or a free certificate to access
372 health care, about 68% of surgical patients faced catastrophic OOP payments findings. The free health
373 initiative in Sierra Leone provided more protection than in Ethiopia [39]. Nonetheless, our finding is
374 similar to the findings from Ghana that reported 58–87% of insured patients face financial catastrophe
375 when accessing surgical care [24]. There have been similar reports from a previous study from Ethiopia

376 on general health care among the members of CBHI [42]. However, it remains unclear why households
377 that are members of health insurance programs are paying OOP expenses for services and facing
378 catastrophic health expenditure. Probably the frequent stock out of medicines and medical supplies in
379 government facilities may force patients to buy these items from private retail pharmacies. On the other
380 hand the fee waiver targeting poor individuals proved inadequate, benefiting only 10% of the poor
381 households [43].

382 Our findings demonstrated that OOP payment was a major cause of poverty in patients receiving
383 surgical care. Thus, using half and two-thirds of median consumption expenditure as poverty lines,
384 paying for surgical care pushed 10.4 and 19.2 percent households into poverty, respectively. These
385 findings are higher than the nine percent reported for Sierra Leone [44] and the three percent for
386 Uganda [6]. One reason could be in Sierra Leone patients were from high wealth quintiles and less likely
387 to be affected by OOP payments. The other reason for the difference could be due to the differences in
388 the poverty measures used. We used a relative poverty line while the Sierra Leone and the Uganda
389 studies used international poverty lines. Using a relative poverty threshold might better identify
390 individuals with limited resources that are at risk of having adverse socio-emotional outcomes [45]. Our
391 study might have overestimated the poverty impact of OOP payment for surgical care; the reference
392 household expenditure for calculating catastrophic healthcare expenditure was based on expenditure
393 after surgery which may already have reduced as a financial coping strategy.

394 In a stratified analysis of poverty impact, both poverty headcount and poverty gap were much higher for
395 non-obstetric and non-emergency patients compared to obstetric and emergency patients, resulting in a
396 major impoverishment burden. The findings for non-emergency vs. emergency surgical conditions
397 reflect that most emergency surgical conditions are obstetric and thus exempted from point-of-care
398 costs. The poverty head count impact of OOP payment using half of median-consumption expenditure

399 for those who had obstetric or non-obstetric surgical care were 3.9 and 17.6%, respectively, while for
400 emergency vs. non-emergency surgical care it was 6.6 and 18.3 percent, respectively. When a poverty
401 line of two-thirds of median- consumption expenditure was used, poverty impact of OOP payment
402 showed similar trends with higher numbers of households being pushed below the poverty line.

403 The poverty gap following OOP payments increased for all surgical types. However, it was three times
404 higher for non-obstetric than obstetric and twice as high for non-emergency compared to emergency
405 surgical care. This finding indicates that all types of surgical care should be considered in priority setting
406 and financial risk protection mechanisms.

407 Health care expenditure was the second largest consumption expenditure category for the household
408 both in absolute terms and as a proportion of total consumption expenditure. Thus, spending a large
409 share of household budget on health care might impact expenditure on other subsistence needs of the
410 household. This result is similar to findings from Vietnam [46] and China [47].

411 In our analysis all respondents incurred OOP spending, irrespective of their payment status (i.e member
412 of CBHI, free certificate and payer). Overall, patients spent a higher share of surgical care cost on direct
413 medical costs (44.6%), while the indirect cost (lost income) contributed the smallest share (22.2%). The
414 interviews took place quite early in the recovery phase which might under-estimate the share of indirect
415 cost. A study of surgical in-patient care costs in Sierra Leone reported that direct medical costs
416 accounted for 63% of surgical care costs whereas indirect costs were only 21% [44]. Medications costs
417 were the largest expenditure category of direct medical costs which accords with findings from Rwanda
418 [48], Ghana [24] and Malawi [49].

419 Income losses of patients and their caregivers due to surgical illness were substantial. However, the
420 observed loss of income was smaller than that reported in previous studies [7, 44]. This could be due to
421 the high proportion of our sample that was women (88%) and housewives, thus reporting less income in

422 our study or differences in wage rates. Transportation costs for the patient and accompanying family
423 members required to stay with the patient during their hospital stay also contributed to catastrophic
424 OOP payments. In a review of surgical care costs, Okoroh (2021) identified that transportation cost and
425 wage loss were major drivers of catastrophic expenditures for surgery [50].

426 Inequitable impacts of surgical care costs were evident in our study. The ratio of health expenditure to
427 total consumption expenditure was highest (30.6%) in rural compared to urban (17.3%) households. This
428 indicates that rural households are disproportionately burdened by cost of surgical care. This is
429 explained by the high transport cost to access care from rural areas and lower total household
430 consumption of rural residents. In a household survey of catastrophic health expenditure in India [51]
431 and Zambia [52], the highest proportion of catastrophic expenditure was reported among the poorest
432 and rural residents, although all economic status groups experienced high catastrophic costs. Therefore
433 financial risk protection mechanisms must do more to target rural households.
434

435 In our study, non-emergency or non-obstetric surgical patients incurred significantly more costs
436 compared to emergency or obstetric cases. However, the majority of our sample had undergone
437 obstetric procedures and were exempted from costs at the point of care and had in most cases had
438 presented as an emergency. For such women, transport costs were subsidized or free if they were able
439 to access an ambulance. Our finding of lower surgical care costs for obstetric care is similar with the
440 study from Uganda that reported patients who received Cesarean sections spent less [6], which is
441 explained by the shorter duration of obstetrics admission in the hospital. In our analysis, women paid
442 lower surgical care costs compared to their male counterparts. Longer hospital stays were associated
443 with increased direct medical costs. The longer the stay the higher the costs of medicines, hospital bed
444 and the medical supplies used by the patient. In similar studies prolonged hospitalization was associated
445 with increased costs [44, 53].

446 Direct medical, direct non-medical and indirect costs were significantly higher for households that faced
447 catastrophic OOP payment for surgical care compared to those households that did not face
448 catastrophic payments. Therefore, these costs are likely to compromise the consumption of food and
449 other subsistence needs and impact negatively on the quality of life of these households.

450 In practice, in Ethiopia, surgical care service charges are similar regardless of economic status. Hence,
451 the poor pay the same amount for surgical care despite having less income. Therefore, even relatively
452 low spending on surgical care by the poor is catastrophic and thus likely to compromise access to
453 services. Moreover, in Ethiopia where one-fifth of the population is living below the poverty line[9], OOP
454 payment is a major obstacle to the use of essential surgical care and exacerbates impoverishment.

455 In order to pay for surgical care households used different coping strategies. The majority used their
456 income, which may not be an option for poorer households who could thus not access surgical care at
457 all. In addition, use of income for meeting health expenses reduces current consumption of other goods
458 and services. Moreover, the other coping strategies used were borrowing and selling assets, which are
459 deeply regressive and could induce long-term household economic impact and impoverishment.
460 Previous studies on coping strategies for paying of surgical care reported similar findings [7, 44, 50].

461 Although we believe this is the first study in Ethiopia to investigate surgical care costs, catastrophic
462 expenditure, and poverty impact of OOP payments, our study has the following limitations. Only two
463 hospitals were chosen and these may not be representative of all hospitals in Ethiopia. The sample size
464 was relatively small and thus may have limited the statistical power to detect differences. The possibility
465 of underestimation of non-medical costs due to recall bias cannot be ruled out. In subsistence farming
466 estimating lost income and consumption expenditure is difficult and might lead to under-estimation of
467 these costs for the respondents. We did not adjust consumption expenditure for household composition
468 (i.e., age and size) as data were not collected on these variables. Thus, estimates were calculated per

469 household which may affect interpretation of the difference between urban and rural households.
470 Lastly, the survey was conducted a few weeks after the patient was discharged from hospital and
471 households may have already reduced expenditure on non-essential (and some essential) items to
472 manage the catastrophic costs. So this might have over-estimated the degree to which the surgical costs
473 were catastrophic.

474 **Conclusions**

475 Due to surgical care, households faced severe financial burdens of treatment costs and lost income
476 leading to impoverishment. This was particularly marked for non-obstetric procedures which were not
477 exempt from payment at the point of care. Households were forced to use hardship coping mechanisms
478 to pay treatment cost. Therefore, surgical care should be accessible to all without financial hardship to
479 achieve universal health coverage. In addition, strategies need to be explored by the Ethiopian health
480 insurance service to include direct non-medical expenses like transportation costs that are not covered
481 currently.

482 **Supplementary material**

483 Supplementary table 1: Household consumption expenditure cost categories
484 Supplementary table 2: Poverty impact of OOP payments for surgical care
485 Supplementary table 3: Sources of payment for surgical care
486

487 **Abbreviations**

488 ASSET: Health System Strengthening in sub-Saharan Africa Health System Strengthening in sub-Saharan
489 Africa; OOP: Out-of-pocket; SAGE: Study on global Ageing and adult health; SDGs: Sustainable
490 development goals; UHC: Universal health coverage; WHO: World health Organization

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all participants in the study for their participation. For the purposes of open access, the author has applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Accepted Author Manuscript version arising from this submission.

Ethics approval and consent to participation

This study was conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the College of Health Sciences, Addis Ababa University (026/18/psy; 16th May 2018), and the Research Ethics Committee of King's College London (RESCM-17/18-6144; 18th August 2018). All participants gave written, informed consent. For people who were non-literate, a witness confirmed that the information sheet had been read out correctly and the participant provided a fingerprint.

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization (CH, MP and AL). YH analyzed the data, drafted the manuscript and wrote subsequent versions. CH and MP provided guidance and inputs to all versions of the manuscript. All co-authors gave critical feedback on drafts of the manuscript, read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Availability of data and materials

Available from the corresponding author on request.

513

514 **Consent for publication**

515 Not applicable.

516

517 **Competing interests**

518 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

519

520 **References**

521 1. Meara JG, Leather AJ, Hagander L, Alkire BC, Alonso N, Ameh EA, et al. Global Surgery 2030: evidence and
522 solutions for achieving health, welfare, and economic development. Lancet (London, England).
523 2015;386(9993):569-624. Epub 2015/05/01. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(15)60160-x. PubMed PMID: 25924834.

524 2. Grimes CE, Bowman KG, Dodgion CM, Lavy CBD. Systematic Review of Barriers to Surgical Care in Low-
525 Income and Middle-Income Countries. World journal of surgery. 2011;35(5):941-50. doi: 10.1007/s00268-011-
526 1010-1.

527 3. Willott C, Boyd N, Wurie H, Smalle I, Kamara TB, Davies JI, et al. Staff recognition and its importance for
528 surgical service delivery: a qualitative study in Freetown, Sierra Leone. Health policy and planning. 2021;36(1):93-
529 100. Epub 2020/11/28. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czaa131. PubMed PMID: 33246332; PubMed Central PMCID:
530 PMCPMC7938499.

531 4. Shrime MG, Dare A, Alkire BC, Meara JG. A global country-level comparison of the financial burden of
532 surgery. Br J Surg. 2016;103(11):1453-61. Epub 2016/07/19. doi: 10.1002/bjs.10249. PubMed PMID: 27428044.

533 5. Shrime MG, Bickler SW, Alkire BC, Mock C. Global burden of surgical disease: an estimation from the
534 provider perspective. The Lancet Global health. 2015;3 Suppl 2:S8-9. Epub 2015/05/01. doi: 10.1016/s2214-
535 109x(14)70384-5. PubMed PMID: 25926322.

536 6. Anderson GA, Ilcisin L, Kayima P, Abesiga L, Portal Benitez N, Ngonzi J, et al. Out-of-pocket payment for
537 surgery in Uganda: The rate of impoverishing and catastrophic expenditure at a government hospital. PloS one.

538 2017;12(10):e0187293. Epub 2017/11/01. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0187293. PubMed PMID: 29088302; PubMed
539 Central PMCID: PMCPMC5663485 manuscript have the following competing interests: MGS has received speaking
540 fees from Ethicon Inc. however Ethicon was not involved in any portion of this study. This does not alter our
541 adherence to PLOS ONE policies on sharing data and materials.
542 7. Bijlmakers L, Wientjes M, Mwapasa G, Cornelissen D, Borgstein E, Broekhuizen H, et al. Out-of-pocket
543 payments and catastrophic household expenditure to access essential surgery in Malawi - A cross-sectional patient
544 survey. Ann Med Surg (Lond). 2019;43:85-90. Epub 2019/07/16. doi: 10.1016/j.amsu.2019.06.003. PubMed PMID:
545 31304010; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6580231.
546 8. Alebachew A, Hatt L, Kukla M. Monitoring and evaluating progress towards Universal Health Coverage in
547 Ethiopia. PLoS Med. 2014;11(9):e1001696. Epub 2014/09/23. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001696. PubMed PMID:
548 25244146; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4171462.
549 9. FMOH. Health Sector Transformational Plan II 2020/2021-2024/2025. Addis Ababa: Federal Ministry of
550 Health, 2021.
551 10. Ethiopian Public Health Institute - EPHI, Federal Ministry of Health - FMoH, ICF. Ethiopia Mini
552 Demographic and Health Survey 2019. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: EPHI/FMoH/ICF, 2021.
553 11. FMOH. 7th National Health Accounts 2016/17; Statistical Report. Addis Ababa,Ethiopia: Federal
554 Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Ministry of Health, 2019.
555 12. Agency EHI. CBHI Members' Registration and Contribution (2011-2020): . Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Ethiopian
556 Health Insurance Agency, 2020.
557 13. WHO. Global Health expenditure data base. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2019.
558 14. Hailemichael Y, Hanlon C, Tirfessa K, Docrat S, Alem A, Medhin G, et al. Catastrophic health expenditure
559 and impoverishment in households of persons with depression: a cross-sectional, comparative study in rural
560 Ethiopia. BMC public health. 2019;19(1):930. Epub 2019/07/13. doi: 10.1186/s12889-019-7239-6. PubMed PMID:
561 31296207; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6625021.
562 15. Obse AG, Ataguba JE. Assessing medical impoverishment and associated factors in health care in Ethiopia.
563 BMC Int Health Hum Rights. 2020;20(1):7. Epub 2020/04/02. doi: 10.1186/s12914-020-00227-x. PubMed PMID:
564 32228634; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7106681.

565 16. Kiros M, Dessie E, Jbaily A, Tolla MT, Johansson KA, Norheim OF, et al. The burden of household out-of-
566 pocket health expenditures in Ethiopia: estimates from a nationally representative survey (2015-16). Health policy
567 and planning. 2020;35(8):1003-10. Epub 2020/08/11. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czaa044. PubMed PMID: 32772112;
568 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7553759.
569 17. Hailemariam M, Fekadu A, Prince M, Hanlon C. Engaging and staying engaged: a phenomenological study
570 of barriers to equitable access to mental healthcare for people with severe mental disorders in a rural African
571 setting. International journal for equity in health. 2017;16(1):156. Epub 2017/08/31. doi: 10.1186/s12939-017-
572 0657-0. PubMed PMID: 28851421; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5576237.
573 18. Tolla MT, Norheim OF, Verguet S, Bekele A, Amenu K, Abdisa SG, et al. Out-of-pocket expenditures for
574 prevention and treatment of cardiovascular disease in general and specialised cardiac hospitals in Addis Ababa,
575 Ethiopia: a cross-sectional cohort study. BMJ Glob Health. 2017;2(2):e000280. Epub 2017/12/16. doi:
576 10.1136/bmjgh-2016-000280. PubMed PMID: 29242752; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5584490.
577 19. Memirie ST, Metaferia ZS, Norheim OF, Levin CE, Verguet S, Johansson KA. Household expenditures on
578 pneumonia and diarrhoea treatment in Ethiopia: a facility-based study. BMJ Glob Health. 2017;2(1):e000166. Epub
579 2017/06/08. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2016-000166. PubMed PMID: 28589003; PubMed Central PMCID:
580 PMCPMC5321393.
581 20. Kasahun GG, Gebretekle GB, Hailemichael Y, Woldemariam AA, Fenta TG. Catastrophic healthcare
582 expenditure and coping strategies among patients attending cancer treatment services in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
583 BMC public health. 2020;20(1):984. Epub 2020/06/24. doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-09137-y. PubMed PMID:
584 32571275; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7310089.
585 21. Seward N, Hanlon C, Abdulahi A, Abrams Z, Alem A , Araya R. HeAlth System StrEngThening in four sub-
586 Saharan African countries (ASSET) to achieve high-quality, evidence-informed surgical, maternal and new born, and
587 primary care: protocol for pre-implementation phase studies. Research Square Preprint 2021.
588 22. Seward N, Hanlon C, Abdella A, Abrahams Z, Alem A, Araya R, et al. HeAlth System StrEngThening in four
589 sub-Saharan African countries (ASSET) to achieve high-quality, evidence-informed surgical, maternal and newborn,
590 and primary care: protocol for pre-implementation phase studies. Global health action. 2022;15(1):1987044. Epub

591 2022/01/18. doi: 10.1080/16549716.2021.1987044. PubMed PMID: 35037844; PubMed Central PMCID:
592 PMCPMC8765245.
593 23. Seward N, Murdoch J, Hanlon C, Araya R, Gao W, Harding R, et al. Implementation science protocol for a
594 participatory, theory-informed implementation research programme in the context of health system strengthening
595 in sub-Saharan Africa (ASSET-ImplementER). BMJ open. 2021;11(7):e048742. Epub 2021/07/11. doi:
596 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-048742. PubMed PMID: 34244274; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8268893.
597 24. Okoroh J, Sarpong DO, Essoun S, Riviello R, Harris H, Weissman JS. Does insurance protect individuals from
598 catastrophic payments for surgical care? An analysis of Ghana's National Health Insurance Scheme at Korle-Bu
599 teaching Hospital. BMC Health Serv Res. 2020;20(1):45. Epub 2020/01/19. doi: 10.1186/s12913-020-4887-2.
600 PubMed PMID: 31952520; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6969414.
601 25. WHO. World Health Organization study on global Ageing and adult health (SAGE). Geneva: World Health
602 Organization, 2013.
603 26. Wagstaff A, Flores G, Hsu J, Smitz MF, Chepynoga K, Buisman LR, et al. Progress on catastrophic health
604 spending in 133 countries: a retrospective observational study. The Lancet Global health. 2018;6(2):e169-e79.
605 Epub 2017/12/19. doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(17)30429-1. PubMed PMID: 29248367.
606 27. Bank WatW. Tracking Universal Health Coverage: The 2017 Global Monitoring Report. Geneva: World
607 Health Organization and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, 2017.
608 28. Russell S. The economic burden of illness for households in developing countries: a review of studies
609 focusing on malaria, tuberculosis, and human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. Am J
610 Trop Med Hyg. 2004;71(2 Suppl):147-55. Epub 2004/08/28. PubMed PMID: 15331831.
611 29. WHO. WHO guide to identifying the economic consequences of disease and injury. Geneva: World Health
612 Organization, 2009.
613 30. Chisholm D, Stanciole AE, Tan Torres Edejer T, Evans DB. Economic impact of disease and injury: counting
614 what matters. BMJ (Clinical research ed). 2010;340:c924. Epub 2010/03/04. doi: 10.1136/bmj.c924. PubMed
615 PMID: 20197323.
616 31. Ethiopia NBo. Inter-bank daily foreign exchange rate in (USD). Addis Ababa: national bank of Ethiopia,
617 2020.

618 32. Bank W. World development indicators 2022 [1st June,2022]. Available from:
619 https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/PA.NUS.PPP?end=2019&start=1990.
620 33. Wagstaff A, van Doorslaer E. Catastrophe and impoverishment in paying for health care: with applications
621 to Vietnam 1993-1998. Health Econ. 2003;12(11):921-34. Epub 2003/11/06. doi: 10.1002/hec.776. PubMed PMID:
622 14601155.
623 34. UN. Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development'. New York: United Nations,
624 2015.
625 35. Wagstaff A, Flores G, Smitz MF, Hsu J, Chepynoga K, Eozenou P. Progress on impoverishing health
626 spending in 122 countries: a retrospective observational study. The Lancet Global health. 2018;6(2):e180-e92.
627 Epub 2017/12/19. doi: 10.1016/s2214-109x(17)30486-2. PubMed PMID: 29248366.
628 36. and JLA, Bennett NG, Conley DC, Li J. The Effects of Poverty on Child Health and Development. Annual
629 Review of Public Health. 1997;18(1):463-83. doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.18.1.463. PubMed PMID: 9143727.
630 37. Bruno E, White MC, Baxter LS, Ravelojaona VA, Rakotoarison HN, Andriamanjato HH, et al. An Evaluation
631 of Preparedness, Delivery and Impact of Surgical and Anesthesia Care in Madagascar: A Framework for a National
632 Surgical Plan. World journal of surgery. 2017;41(5):1218-24. doi: 10.1007/s00268-016-3847-9.
633 38. Nguyen H, Ivers R, Jan S, Pham C. Cost of surgery and catastrophic expenditure in people admitted to
634 hospital for injuries: estimates from a cohort study in Vietnam. Lancet (London, England). 2015;385 Suppl 2:S50.
635 Epub 2015/08/28. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(15)60845-5. PubMed PMID: 26313100.
636 39. van Duinen AJ, Westendorp J, Ashley T, Hagander L, Holmer H, Koroma AP, et al. Catastrophic expenditure
637 and impoverishment after caesarean section in Sierra Leone: An evaluation of the free health care initiative. PloS
638 one. 2021;16(10):e0258532. Epub 2021/10/16. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0258532. PubMed PMID: 34653191;
639 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC8519447.
640 40. Abadi T, Mebratie AD. Cost of Treating Maternal Complications and Associated Factors in Mekelle General
641 Hospital, Northern Ethiopia. Risk management and healthcare policy. 2021;14:87-95. Epub 2021/01/16. doi:
642 10.2147/rmhp.s285793. PubMed PMID: 33447112; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7802893.

643 41. Akalu T, Guda A, Tamiru M, Haile Mariam D. Examining out of pocket payments for maternal health in
644 rural Ethiopia: Paradox of free health care un-affordability. Ethiopian Journal of Health Development. 2012;26:251-
645 7.
646 42. Agency EHI. Evaluation of Community-Based Health Insurance Pilot Schemes in Ethiopia: Final Report. .
647 Addis Ababa,Ethiopia: Ethiopian health Insurance Agency(EHIA), 2015.
648 43. Demissie B, Gutema Negeri K. Effect of Community-Based Health Insurance on Utilization of Outpatient
649 Health Care Services in Southern Ethiopia: A Comparative Cross-Sectional Study. Risk management and healthcare
650 policy. 2020;13:141-53. Epub 2020/03/12. doi: 10.2147/rmhp.s215836. PubMed PMID: 32158291; PubMed Central
651 PMCID: PMCPMC7049267.
652 44. Phull M, Grimes CE, Kamara TB, Wurie H, Leather AJM, Davies J. What is the financial burden to patients
653 of accessing surgical care in Sierra Leone? A cross-sectional survey of catastrophic and impoverishing expenditure.
654 BMJ open. 2021;11(3):e039049. Epub 2021/05/20. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-039049. PubMed PMID: 34006018;
655 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7942261.
656 45. Lee K, Zhang L. Cumulative Effects of Poverty on Children's Social-Emotional Development: Absolute
657 Poverty and Relative Poverty. Community mental health journal. 2022;58(5):930-43. Epub 2021/11/10. doi:
658 10.1007/s10597-021-00901-x. PubMed PMID: 34750684.
659 46. Nguyen KT, Khuat OT, Ma S, Pham DC, Khuat GT, Ruger JP. Effect of health expenses on household
660 capabilities and resource allocation in a rural commune in Vietnam. PloS one. 2012;7(10):e47423. Epub
661 2012/10/19. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0047423. PubMed PMID: 23077612; PubMed Central PMCID:
662 PMCPMC3471826.
663 47. Fang K, Jiang Y, Shia B, Ma S. Impact of illness and medical expenditure on household consumptions: a
664 survey in western China. PloS one. 2012;7(12):e52928. Epub 2013/01/04. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0052928.
665 PubMed PMID: 23285229; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3532419.
666 48. Rickard JL, Ngarambe C, Ndayizeye L, Smart B, Majyambere JP, Riviello R. Risk of Catastrophic Health
667 Expenditure in Rwandan Surgical Patients with Peritonitis. World journal of surgery. 2018;42(6):1603-9. Epub
668 2017/11/17. doi: 10.1007/s00268-017-4368-x. PubMed PMID: 29143091.

669 49. Cornelissen D, Mwapasa G, Gajewski J, McCauley T, Borgstein E, Brugha R, et al. The Cost of Providing
670 District-Level Surgery in Malawi. World journal of surgery. 2018;42(1):46-53. Epub 2017/08/10. doi:
671 10.1007/s00268-017-4166-5. PubMed PMID: 28791448; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5740194.
672 50. Okoroh JS, Riviello R. Challenges in healthcare financing for surgery in sub-Saharan Africa. Pan Afr Med J.
673 2021;38:198. Epub 2021/05/18. doi: 10.11604/pamj.2021.38.198.27115. PubMed PMID: 33995804; PubMed
674 Central PMCID: PMCPMC8106793.
675 51. Chowdhury S, Gupta I, Trivedi M, Prinja S. Inequity & burden of out-of-pocket health spending: District
676 level evidences from India. The Indian journal of medical research. 2018;148(2):180-9. Epub 2018/11/02. doi:
677 10.4103/ijmr.IJMR_90_17. PubMed PMID: 30381541; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC6206772.
678 52. Masiye F, Kaonga O, Kirigia JM. Does User Fee Removal Policy Provide Financial Protection from
679 Catastrophic Health Care Payments? Evidence from Zambia. PloS one. 2016;11(1):e0146508. Epub 2016/01/23.
680 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0146508. PubMed PMID: 26795620; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4721670
681 interests.
682 53. Nwanna-Nzewunwa O, Oke R, Agwang E, Ajiko MM, Yoon C, Carvalho M, et al. The societal cost and
683 economic impact of surgical care on patients' households in rural Uganda; a mixed method study. BMC Health Serv
684 Res. 2021;21(1):568. Epub 2021/06/11. doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06579-x. PubMed PMID: 34107950; PubMed
685 Central PMCID: PMCPMC8190862.

686

687

688

689

690

691


N =224
Consecutive people having a surgical procedure
N=2 died in hospital
N= 222
Discharged from hospital
N=4 wrong address
N= 4 refused
N=1 prison
N=1 missed
N=30 living in inaccessible area
N=182
Home assessments at 6-8 weeks post-operation

Figure 1