Assessing Population-level Accessibility to Medical College Hospitals in India: A Geospatial Modeling Study

Short title: Medical College Hospitals Accessibility India

Harsh Thakkar[1], Chaitanya Reddy[1,2] +, Varun Raj Passi[1] +, Aamir Miyajiwala[1], Sahil Kale[1], Ankit Raj[1], Siddhesh Zadey[1,3,4,5]

1 Association for Socially Applicable Research (ASAR), Pune, Maharashtra, India

2 Smt. Bhikhiben Kanjibhai Shah Medical Institute and Research Center, Vadodara, Gujarat, India

3 Global Emergency Medicine Innovation and Implementation (GEMINI) Research Center, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham North Carolina USA

4 Dr. D. Y. Patil Dental College and Hospital, Dr. D. Y. Patil Vidyapeeth, Pune, Maharashtra, India

5 Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, NYC New York USA

+ Contributed equally

Corresponding author:

Siddhesh Zadey BSMS, MScGH;

ASAR Office Address: D2 Sai Heritage, New DP Road, Aundh, Pune, Maharashtra, India 411007

Email: sidzadey@asarforindia.org; Ph. No.: +1-919-699-9557

Article Type: Original Article

Word count: 8239

No. of figures: 24

ABSTRACT

Background: While studies have investigated the availability of Medical College Hospitals (MCHs) in India, data on geographical accessibility is limited. Our study looks at the current geographical accessibility to these MCHs across 36 states and union territories (UTs) and 735 districts.

Methods and Findings: We provided and validated the MCH data acquired from the National Health Profile Report 2022. We took motorized and walking travel-time friction surface rasters from the Malaria Atlas Project 2019 and high-resolution population estimates from WorldPop 2020. Using these, we examined the density of MCHs per million population and the median travel time to the nearest MCH. We assessed the Access Population Coverage (APC), defined as the proportion of the population within 30, 60, 90, and 120 minutes by motorized transport and within 30 and 60 minutes from the nearest MCH by walking.

In 2022, India had an average density of 0.47 MCHs per million. The median travel time to the nearest MCH was 67.94 minutes by motorized transport and 589.82 minutes by walking. 71.76% of the population could access the nearest MCH by motorized transport within 60 minutes (range across districts: 0-100%). 4.22% of the population could access the nearest MCH by walking within 30 minutes (range across districts: 0-71.86%). The APC was 62.20% within 60 minutes by motorized transport in rural vs. 92.34% in urban areas. The APC within 60 minutes by motorized transport for public MCHs was 63.62%, while that for private was 45.95%. These estimates do not account for resource availability at the hospitals or vehicular ownership in the population.

Conclusions: Median travel time and APC are useful for assessing geographical accessibility. Our study found a wide disparity in MCH access across Indian states and rural vs. urban areas. These analyses can guide the optimal placement of new MCHs.

1. Introduction

Medical college hospitals (MCH) play an important role in healthcare systems worldwide. They provide hands-on clinical training to medical students, act as centers of research setting standards of care, [1] and offer specialized clinical care to patients. In lower-middle-income countries (LMICs) MCHs often act as the last points of referral, providing the highest level of specialized care available. Patients in LMICs also tend to utilize MCHs more for non-emergency services, bypassing primary healthcare services. [2]

India was estimated to have a total of 648 MCHs in 2022. [3] MCHs are essential in providing subsidized or free tertiary care services as a large proportion of them (estimated to be 53.39% in 2022) are publicly owned. Additionally, privately owned MCHs are also often legally required to provide subsidized care to a proportion of their patients, instead of the concessions they receive from the government. In emergency conditions related to trauma, maternal and newborn care, and non-communicable diseases, MCHs are crucial in offering life-saving care as the capacity to provide such services is limited in existing tertiary care centers (i.e. public sector district hospitals and nursing homes). [4] MCHs also improve local primary health care in their surrounding region by providing outreach services. [4] Therefore, MCHs act as important stakeholders in the healthcare system of their geographical area. Provinces with higher MCH density in India perform better in major health indicators such as maternal mortality ratio (MMR), infant mortality rate (IMR), and percentage of institutional delivery. [5]

Given the importance of MCHs in India's public health system, it is important to study their growth and distribution in the country. There has been a rapid growth in the total number of MCHs in India in the last few decades. An important feature of this growth is the increasing

involvement of the private sector in the medical education sector. [4] However, the distribution and growth of MCHs is not even. MCHs are heavily clustered in provincial capitals and major cities that already have established and well-functioning MCHs. Out of 207 newly established MCHs between 2009 and 2019, 139 (67.15%) were located within 50km of an old MCH. This unequal distribution in MCHs is starker in the case of private MCHs, with 60.6% of all private MCHs in the country being located in a handful of provinces in the southern part of India, i.e., Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh, Telangana, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu, and Puducherry. [5]

Availability refers to the extent to which resources are available to meet the needs of patients. The number of health facilities in terms of a defined population size is referred to as the density of health facilities and is a measure of the availability of care. Geographical accessibility refers to geographical proximity to care with an element of time, delineating how easily patients can reach the provider's location. [6] While studies have mapped the distribution and density of MCHs in India, [4,5] geographical accessibility in terms of time and the population covered remains to be studied. Timely access to tertiary healthcare services is necessary for optimal outcomes, particularly in time-sensitive emergencies such as stroke, [7] acute coronary syndromes, [8] surgical, and maternal and child health emergencies. Poor accessibility to specialized care also increases additional costs due to travel and longer loss of wages. [9–11] Consequently, geographical accessibility to MCHs constitutes an important component of moral capital in the country. [12]

We aimed to assess the multiple measures of geographic accessibility to MCHs including density per million people, travel time to the nearest MCH, and the access population coverage (APC). We provide accessibility estimates by different modes of transport for 735

districts in 36 Indian states and union territories (UTs). Further, we also assessed the access disparities for people living in rural and urban areas and those seeking care in public vs. private hospitals.

2. Methods

2.1 Data Sources

To comprehensively map the densities of MCHs and their travel times, the study necessitated the collection, extraction, and collation of data from the National Health Profile Report 2022 published by the Central Bureau of Health Intelligence. [3] The report provides addresses of active MCHs along with their health sector ownership, beds, and training intake. This study classified the government-owned MCHs and those jointly run by non-profit societies/trusts with the government as public. While others were classified as private. We obtained high-resolution (1 km^2) United Nations (UN) projection-adjusted population counts for India from the 2020 WorldPop. [13] The motorized and walking friction rasters for each square kilometer (1 km2) were obtained using Malaria Atlas Project data for 2019. Mapping the worldwide response to malaria is the primary goal of the Malaria Atlas Project (MAP), an international scientific effort. [14] Friction rasters are informational maps that show how much it costs to go through them, usually expressed in time units. [15] These friction rasters account for several physical and environmental variables that may impede or prolong travel. The administrative borders of India were drawn from the publicly available shapefile. [4,16] A global raster with ordinal catchment area (CA) categories based on population densities and proximity to high-density urban areas provided standardized rural-urban regions. [17] We classified CA categories >7 as rural.

2.2 Outcomes

We had three primary outcomes. We first determined the MCH density as the number of MCHs per million people to understand the geographic distribution of MCHs relative to the underlying population. The second outcome was travel time to the nearest MCH. Using the granular estimates of travel time for each 1 km^2 pixel or grid cell, we report the median and interquartile range (IQR) values at aggregate group levels. Lastly, Access Population Coverage (APC) was defined as the percentage of the population with timely access to the nearest MCH. We categorized timely access thresholds by modes of transportation. For motorized transport, we considered timely access as within 30, 60, 90, and 120 minutes. For walking, timely access was defined as within 30 and 60 minutes. APC combined the population and timeliness aspects of access.

2.3 Analysis

Before the geocoding of MCH locations, addresses were manually cleaned to increase machine readability. This process included standardizing the format and correcting discrepancies. For geocoding, we used the Google Maps Application Programming Interface (API). When multiple sets of coordinates were produced for a single address, the coordinates that best matched the address string were selected. Lastly, as a sanity check, geo-coordinates were used to detect and eliminate duplicates and implausible locations beyond the geographical boundaries of India.

We analyzed the Worldpop 2020 and the rural-urban CA rasters to derive area-specific populations at different geographic levels. First, the global multi-category CA raster (1 km^2 resolution at the equator, pixel = agglomeration category label value) was reduced to the Indian national boundary (admin level-0) to estimate the area-specific populations. Next, the raster was divided into two layers: rural (CA agglomeration labels >7) and urban (CA

agglomeration labels <= 7). The WorldPop 2020 Indian population counts raster (1 km2 resolution at the equator, pixel = population count) was superimposed with the binarized rural-urban CA rasters for India. To match the extent and resolution of the population raster and to align the origin, the CA raster was resampled. Population counts per pixel were multiplied by the category value (1 for rural regions in the rural raster) to determine the rural population at each pixel. Put differently, the rural raster weighted the urban CAs by 'NA' (not applicable). Similarly, the urban raster had rural CAs weighted by 'NA'. The total population was obtained as the sum of rural and urban populations. For denominators of density and APC values, we aggregated total, rural, and urban populations at the national, state (admin level-1), and district (admin level-2) levels based on the administrative boundaries in the shapefiles.

For travel times, we used the Dijkstra algorithm to determine the shortest time needed to move across the MAP friction surface between each 1 km^2 pixel (grid cell) and the location of the MCH. We generated two accessibility rasters based on the friction surfaces from MAP for walking only and motorized transport that gave travel times in minutes assuming optimal speeds. Median and interquartile range (IQR) values of the travel time distributions were estimated at different geographic levels.

For APCs, we used 30, 60, 90, and 120 minutes as the timely access thresholds for motorized accessibility raster and 30 and 60 minutes as the thresholds for walking-only raster. These thresholds were used to dichotomize the accessibility rasters with 1s for pixels below the threshold and 'NA' for those beyond the time threshold. Next, this raster was extent-matched and superimposed on the population raster to extract the population count with timely access

at each pixel. Finally, population proportions with timely access were calculated by dividing these numbers by the total population.

Figure 1 describes the analysis pipeline. We have previously discussed the details elsewhere and used it for investigating access to surgical facilities in India. [18, 19]

3. Results

3.1 MCH density in India

As per NHP 2022, India had 648 MCHs. Tamil Nadu had the highest number of MCHs (71), followed by Karnataka (67) and Uttar Pradesh (67) while Nagaland, Ladakh, and Lakshadweep had no MCHs. The national density was 0.47 MCHs per million people. MCH in 23 states/union territories (UTs) exceeded the national value. Among states/UTs with a functional MCH, the UT of Puducherry had the highest density (6.47) while the state of Bihar had the lowest density (0.16) **(Figure 2A)**. Of the 735 districts, 359 did not have an MCH. Among districts, Puducherry had the highest density of 7.35 MCHs per million people. About 14.14% of the districts (104 out of 735) had a density greater than one. A total of 264 (35.91%) districts exceeded the national density value **(Figure 2B)**.

Two hundred and ten or 32.41% of MCHs were situated in rural areas. Seven (19.44%) states had zero MCHs per million population in rural areas. Whereas eight (22.22%) states exceeded the national density value. Puducherry had the highest MCH density in rural areas at 9.91. Urban areas in three (8.33%) states had a density of zero MCH per million population. Urban areas in twenty-nine (80.55%) states exceeded the national density value. Sikkim had the highest density of MCHs in urban areas at 20.71.

Of the 648 MCHs, 346 (53.40%) were public while 302 (46.60%) were private. The state of Sikkim did not have even a single public MCH per million population whereas eleven (30.55%) states exceeded the national density value. Andaman and Nicobar Islands had the highest public MCH density at 2.76. Seven (19.44%) states had zero private MCHs per million population whereas five (13.88%) states exceeded the national density value. Puducherry had the highest private MCH density at 5.03.

3.2 Median travel time to the nearest MCH

3.2.1 Motorized transport

The national median (interquartile range) time to reach the nearest MCH by motorized transport was 67.94 (41.32, 110.42) minutes. In comparison, 17 states/UTs had a shorter travel time to access the nearest MCH **(Figure 3A)**. The median travel time in the UT of Lakshadweep could not be computed since it is a group of islands with no MCHs. The median travel times were under 30 minutes in five states. The median travel time was under 60 minutes in 17 states. The UT of Ladakh had the longest median travel time of over 1800 minutes to the nearest MCH by motorized transport.

Four hundred and forty seven (60.81%) districts had a shorter travel time by motorized transport to an MCH, and 285 (38.77%) districts had a longer travel time compared to the national average **(Figure 3B)**. The median travel time to MCHs by motorized transport for three island districts, Lakshadweep, North and Middle Andaman, and Nicobars could not be computed. The median time to reach an MCH by motorized transport was found to be shorter than 30 minutes in 100 (13.60%) districts. The shortest median (IQR) travel time by motorized transport to an MCH was in Mumbai in Maharashtra at 1.89 (1.16, 2.67) minutes

and the longest travel time was in Anjaw in Arunachal Pradesh at 1576.80 (1136.23, 2054.06) minutes.

In rural areas, the national median (IQR) time to reach the nearest MCH was 69.04 (42.54, 111.38) minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 3C)**. In urban areas, the median (IQR) time to reach the nearest MCH by motorized transport was determined to be 25.92 (8.79, 49.47) minutes **(Figure 3D)**.

By motorized transport, the median (IQR) time to reach the nearest MCH in rural areas ranged from 7.81 (6.49, 10.57) minutes in Chandigarh to 1866.22 (1866.22, 1866.22) minutes in Ladakh. The shortest time to travel in urban areas was noted in Sikkim at 3.51 (1.84, 18.35) minutes and the longest in Ladakh at 137.06 (136.80, 144.34) minutes **(Figure 4A)**. When compared with the national median time, rural areas in 17 (47.22%) states/UTs and urban areas in 33 (91.66%) states/UTs had a lesser median travel time to reach the nearest MCH by motorized transport.

The district-level analysis demonstrated that in rural areas, the shortest median (IQR) time required to access the nearest MCH by motorized transport was reported in Puducherry at 6.93 (4.21, 10.97) minutes and longest in Anjaw in Arunachal Pradesh at 1574.58 (1132.43, 2050.78) minutes **(Figure 4B)**. For urban areas, Mumbai in Maharashtra had the shortest travel time by motorized transport at 1.59 (1.12, 2.20) minutes. South West Garo Hills in Meghalaya had the longest travel time at 286.50 (285.88, 286.98) minutes **(Figure 4C)**. In comparison with the national median time, 446 (60.68%) districts had shorter median travel times, and 287 (39.04%) districts had longer median times by motorized transport to access

the nearest MCH. Rural areas in 610 (84.25%) districts and urban areas in 672 (97.25%) districts were within 120 minutes (2 hours) of an MCH by motorized transport.

At the national level, the median (IQR) time to reach the nearest public MCH by motorized transport was 77.46 (47.86, 120.38) minutes. Similarly, the median (IQR) time to access a private MCH by motorized transport was 106.69 (61.67, 181.94) minutes.

A state-level analysis of public-private MCHs revealed that the public MCHs in Chandigarh had the shortest median travel time to reach by motorized transport at 6.33 (4.16, 7.93) minutes. Ladakh had the longest median travel by motorized transport at 1866.22 (1866.22, 1866.22) minutes. Among private MCHs, Puducherry had the shortest median travel time by motorized transport at 8.25 (4.70, 12.23) minutes. Private MCHs in Arunachal Pradesh had the longest median travel time at 5853.52 (4964.69, 6905.61) minutes. Public MCHs in 18 states/UTs had a shorter median travel time compared to the national value. On the other hand, Private MCHs in 12 states/UTs had shorter travel times by motorized transport.

Among districts, the median travel times to the nearest public MCH ranged from 1.89 (1.18, 2.62) minutes in Mumbai, Maharashtra to 1576.80 (1136.23, 2054.06) minutes in Anjaw, Arunachal Pradesh. Four hundred and forty-three (60.27%) districts had a shorter median travel time compared to the national value. Similarly, the median travel times to the nearest private MCHs by motorized transport ranged from 5.69 (3.80, 7.89) minutes in Hyderabad in Telangana to 1895.79 (1455.28, 2371.46) minutes in Anjaw in Arunachal Pradesh. Four hundred (54.42%) districts had a shorter travel time compared to the national value.

3.2.2 Walking

The national median (interquartile range) time to reach the nearest MCH by walking was 589.82 (359.49, 913.74) minutes. A state-level analysis of travel times revealed that compared to the national median time for walking, 18 states/UTs had a shorter travel time to reach the nearest MCH by walking **(Figure 5A)**. Whereas the travel time was longer in 17 states/UTs by walking to access the nearest MCH. The median travel time to an MCH by walking in the UT of Lakshadweep could not be computed. The median travel time to an MCH by walking was less than 30 minutes in none and less than 60 minutes in just one state/UT i.e. Chandigarh which had a median (IQR) travel time of 58.60 (39.14, 75.13) minutes. The UT of Ladakh had the longest median travel time by walking of 4120.86 (3353.96, 4910.96) minutes.

At the district level, 448 (60.95%) districts had a shorter travel time by walking to an MCH, and 284 (38.63%) districts had a longer travel time compared to the national average **(Figure 5B)**. The median travel time to MCHs by walking for three island districts, Lakshadweep, North and Middle Andaman and Nicobars could not be computed. The median walking time to an MCH was found to be shorter than 30 minutes in two districts. The shortest median (IQR) travel time by walking to an MCH was in Mumbai in Maharashtra at 22.13 (11.06, 30.55) minutes while the longest median (IQR) travel time was in Leh in Ladakh at 4466.33 (3786.09, 5176.35) minutes.

For people in rural areas, the national median (IQR) time to reach the nearest MCH was 597.18 (368.41, 919.30) minutes by walking **(Figure 5C)**. Similarly for urban areas the median (IQR) time to reach the nearest MCH by walking was 269.57 (93.13, 509.30) minutes **(Figure 5D)**.

Among states, this proportion for median (IQR) time to reach the nearest MCH by walking varied from rural areas of Chandigarh at 59.65 (48.84, 92.89) minutes to Ladakh at 4120.77 (3353.69, 4910.45) minutes. In urban areas the median (IQR) time to reach the nearest MCH by walking varied from 48.34 (25.78, 215.33) minutes in Sikkim to 2030.60 (2025.88, 2037.49) minutes in Ladakh. When compared with the national median time, rural areas in 18 (50%) states/UTs and urban areas in 33 (91.66%) states/UTs had a lesser median travel time by walking to reach the nearest MCH **(Figure 6A)**.

At district level, the median (IQR) time to reach the nearest MCH by walking in rural areas of Puducherry was the shortest at 59.65 (48.84, 92.84) minutes and longest in Leh in Ladakh at 4466.25 (3786.27, 5175.86) minutes **(Figure 6B)**. Similarly, urban areas of Mumbai in Maharashtra had the shortest travel time by walking at 17.82 (11.06, 26.36) minutes **(Figure 6C)**. Whereas, the longest travel time by walking was in urban areas of Kargil in Ladakh at 2030.60 (2025.88, 2037.49) minutes. In comparison to the national average, 443 (60.27%) districts had shorter median travel time by walking and 290 (39.45%) districts had longer median travel time by walking to the nearest MCH.

At the national level, the median (IQR) time to reach the nearest public MCH by walking was found to be 687.91 (426.49, 1044.83) minutes. Similarly, the median (IQR) time to access a private MCH by walking was found to be 992.37 (567.88, 1672.34) minutes.

Within states/UTs, Chandigarh had the shortest median travel time by walking at 58.60 (39.14, 75.13) minutes to the nearest Public MCH. Ladakh had the longest median travel time by walking at 4120.86 (3353.96, 4910.96) minutes. Puducherry had the shortest median travel time by walking at 90.82 (53.40, 132.16) minutes to Private MCHs. Ladakh had the

longest median travel time by walking at 2000.72 (2000.72, 2000.72) minutes to private MCHs. When compared to the national median travel time, 18 states/UTs and nine states/UTs had a shorter median travel time by walking to public and private MCHs, respectively.

Among districts, the median travel times to the nearest public MCH by walking ranged from 22.13 (15.27, 30.55) minutes in Mumbai in Maharashtra to 4466.33 (3786.09, 5176.95) minutes in Leh in Ladakh. Four hundred and forty seven (60.81%) districts had a shorter travel time than the national value. Similarly, the median travel times to the nearest private MCH by walking ranged from 62.11 (37.64, 93.16) minutes in Puducherry to 7322.25 (6815.12, 7973.86) minutes in Upper Dibhang Valley in Arunachal Pradesh. Four hundred (54.42%) districts had a shorter travel time than the national value.

3.3 Access population coverage (APC)

3.3.1 Motorized transport

3.3.1.1 Within 30 minutes

By motorized transport, timely access to an MCH meant being able to access a hospital within 30 minutes. Access population coverage (APC) is the proportion of the population with timely access. The national APC value was 39.85%. The population of Lakshadweep and Ladakh had no access to even a single MCH within 30 minutes by motorized transport. At the state/UT level, less than 1% of the population in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands were able to reach the nearest MCH within 30 minutes by motorized transport. The total population of Chandigarh and Delhi (100%) was able to reach the nearest MCH by motorized mode within 30 minutes **(Figure 7A)**. The APC values were found to be greater than 50% in eleven states/UTs.

At the district level, 175 (23.80%) districts had an APC of zero. Among other districts, less than 1% of the population in Giridih in Jharkhand and everyone in 11 states/UTs districts were able to reach the nearest MCH within 30 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 7B)**. Overall, only 194 (26.39%) districts had an APC value greater than 50%.

Nationally, 26.54% of the population residing in rural areas and 75.92% in urban areas had timely access to the nearest MCH within 30 minutes of motorized transport (percentage point difference = 49.38). The population in rural areas of four states/UTs and the population in urban areas of Ladakh had an APC of zero. Rural areas in Chandigarh had the highest APC of 100% while those in Nagaland had the lowest value (2.19%). Urban areas in Delhi had the highest APC (99.94%) while those in Andaman and Nicobar Island had the lowest value (3.05%). Mizoram had the highest urban-rural difference of 67% points. Except for Chandigarh, all states/UTs had lower APCs for rural areas than the corresponding urban areas. Chandigarh had an urban-rural difference of -0.1% points **(Figure 7C)**. At district level, the population in rural areas of 156 (21.22%) districts **(Figure 8A)** and the population in urban areas of 190 (25.85%) districts **(Figure 8B)** had no access to the nearest MCH within 30 minutes of motorized transport. Rural areas of three (0.40%) districts and urban areas of 36 (4.87%) districts had an APC value of 100%.

Nationwide, 32.95% of the population and 25.32% of the population had timely access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 30 minutes by motorized transport. The population of three states/UTs had no access to public MCHs within 30 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 9A)**. Similarly, the population of eight states/UTs had no access to private MCHs within 30 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 9B)**. Whereas Chandigarh had the

highest access percentage to public MCHs (100%) and Delhi had the highest access percentage to private MCHs (97.97%) within 30 minutes by motorized transport.

At the district level, the population of 197 (26.80%) **(Figure 9C)** and 398 (54.14%) **(Figure 9D)** districts had no access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 30 minutes by motorized transport. Ten (1.36%) districts had an APC of 100% to public MCHs. Seven (0.95%) districts had an APC of 100% to private MCHs. When compared to the national average, the population in 249 (33.87%) districts and 183 (24.89%) districts had timely access within 30 minutes by motorized transport to public and private MCHs respectively.

3.3.1.2 Within 60 minutes

By motorized transport, timely access to an MCH meant being able to access a hospital within 60 minutes. The national APC value was found to be 71.76%. The population of Lakshadweep and Ladakh had no access to even a single MCH within 60 minutes by motorized transport. Among states/UTs, it was found that less than 1% of the population in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands were able to reach the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by motorized transport. The total population of two UTs, Chandigarh and Delhi (100%) were within 60 minutes of their nearest MCH by motorized transport **(Figure 10A)**. The APC values were found to be greater than 75% in 16 states/UTs.

Fifty-four (7.34%) districts had no access to the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by motorized transport. Among other districts, it was observed that less than 1% of the population in 24 (3.26%) districts and everyone in 21 districts were able to reach the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 10B)**. Everyone in 11 districts of

Delhi had an MCH within 60 minutes by motorized transport. Overall, 337 (45.85%) districts had APC values above 75%.

Nationally, 62.20% of the population residing in rural areas and 92.34% of the population in urban areas had timely access to the nearest MCH within 60 minutes of motorized transport (percentage point difference = 30.14). The population in rural areas in three UTs and the population in urban areas of Ladakh had an APC value of zero. Rural areas in Chandigarh had the highest APC of 100% while those in Arunachal Pradesh had the lowest value (11.77%). Urban areas in Delhi and Sikkim had the highest APC (100%) while those in Andaman and Nicobar Island had the lowest value (3.05%). Mizoram had the highest urban-rural difference of 54.4% points. Except for Chandigarh and Goa, all states/UTs had lower APCs for rural areas than the corresponding urban areas. The lowest urban-rural difference was in Chandigarh (-0.1%) **(Figure 10C)**. At district level, the population in rural areas of 57 (7.75%) districts **(Figure 11A)** and the population in urban areas of 61 (8.29%) districts **(Figure 11B)** had no timely access to the nearest MCH within 60 minutes of motorized transport. Rural areas of six (0.81%) districts and urban areas of 234 (31.83%) districts had an APC of 100%.

Nationwide, 63.62% of the population and 45.95% of the population had timely access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 60 minutes by motorized transport. The population of two UTs, Ladakh and Lakshadweep had no access to public MCHs within 60 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 12A)**. Similarly, the population of seven states/UTs had no access to private MCHs within 60 minutes by motorized transport. The total population (100%) of Chandigarh and Delhi had the highest access to public MCHs and private MCHs within 60 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 12B)**.

At the district level, the population of 64 (8.70%) and 259 (35.23%) districts had zero access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 60 minutes by motorized transport. Everyone in 16 (2.17%) districts with public MCHs **(Figure 12C)** and everyone in 19 (2.58%) districts with private MCHs **(Figure 12D)** had timely access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively. In comparison to the national APC, 346 (47.07%) and 272 (37%) districts had a greater APC than public and private MCHs respectively.

3.3.1.3 Within 90 minutes

By motorized transport, timely access to an MCH meant being able to access a hospital within 90 minutes. Nationally, 89.40% of people were within 90 minutes of their nearest MCH by motorized transport. The population of Lakshadweep had no access to even a single MCH within 90 minutes by motorized transport. At the state/UT level, it was found that less than 1% of the population in Ladakh was able to reach the nearest MCH within 90 minutes by motorized transport. Everyone in Chandigarh was within 90 minutes of their nearest MCH **(Figure 13A)**. The APC values were found to be greater than 90% in fifteen states/UTs.

At the district level, the data revealed APC values of zero for 26 (3.53%) districts. Among other districts, it was observed that less than 1% of the population in nine (1.22%) districts and 100% in 53 (7.21%) districts were able to reach the nearest MCH within 90 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 13B)**. Overall, 425 (57.82%) districts had an APC value greater than 90%.

Nationally, 86.10% of the population residing in rural areas and 98.51% of the population in urban areas had timely access to the nearest MCH within 90 minutes of motorized transport

(percentage point difference = 12.41%). The population in rural areas of Lakshadweep and Andaman and Nicobar Islands and the population in urban areas of Ladakh had an APC value of zero. Rural areas in Chandigarh had the highest APC of 100% while those in Ladakh had the lowest value (0.35%). Urban areas in 12 states/UTs had the highest value (100%) while those in Andaman and Nicobar Island had the lowest value (3.05%). Arunachal Pradesh had the highest urban-rural difference of 64% points. Except Chandigarh, Goa and Ladakh, all states/UTs had lower APCs for rural areas than the corresponding urban areas. The lowest urban-rural difference was in Chandigarh (-0.1%) **(Figure 13C)**. At district level, the population in rural areas of 29 (3.94%) districts and the population in urban areas of 24 (3.26%) districts had no timely access to the nearest MCH within 90 minutes of motorized transport. Everyone in the rural areas of 11 (1.49%) districts **(Figure 14A)** and everyone in urban areas of 439 (59.72%) districts had access to the nearest MCH **(Figure 14B)**.

Nationwide, 84.43% of the population and 64.16% of the population had timely access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 90 minutes by motorized transport. The population of Lakshadweep had no access to public MCHs within 90 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 15A)**. Similarly, the population of six states/UTs had no access to private MCHs within 90 minutes by motorized transport. Everyone (100%) in Chandigarh and Delhi had access to public MCHs and private MCHs within 90 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 15B)**.

At the district level, the population of 28 (3.80%) and 188 (25.57%) districts had zero access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 90 minutes by motorized transport. The population in 45 (6.12%) districts **(Figure 15C)** and 38 (5.17%) districts **(Figure 15D)** had timely access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively. In

comparison to the national APC, 419 (57%) and 243 (46.66%) districts had a greater APC to public and private MCHs respectively.

3.3.1.4 Within 120 minutes

By motorized transport, timely access to an MCH meant being able to access a hospital within 120 minutes. The national APC value was found to be 95.94%. The population of Lakshadweep had no access to even a single MCH within 120 minutes by motorized transport. Among states/UTs, it was found that less than 1% of the population in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands were able to reach the nearest MCH within 120 minutes by motorized transport. Everyone in Chandigarh and Delhi was within 120 minutes of their nearest MCH by motorized transport **(Figure 16A)**. The APC values were found to be greater than 99% in seven states/UTs.

At the district level, it was found that 11 (1.49%) districts had no access to the nearest MCH within 120 minutes of motorized transport. Among other remaining districts, it was observed that less than 1% of the population in three districts and 100% in 112 (15.23%) districts were able to reach the nearest MCH within 120 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 16B)**. Overall, 307 (41.76%) districts had APC values above 99%.

Nationally, 94.55% of the population residing in rural areas and 99.86% of the population in urban areas had timely access to the nearest MCH within 120 minutes of motorized transport (percentage point difference = 5.31). Rural areas of Lakshadweep and Andaman and Nicobar Islands and the population in urban areas of Ladakh had an APC value of zero. Rural areas in Chandigarh had the highest APC of 100% while those in Ladakh had the lowest value (3.60%). Urban areas in 17 states/UTs had the highest value (100%) while those in Andaman

and Nicobar Island had the lowest value (3.05%). Arunachal Pradesh had the highest urban-rural difference of 55.4% points. Except Chandigarh, Goa, Kerala and Ladakh, all states/UTs had lower APCs for rural areas than the corresponding urban areas. The lowest urban-rural difference was in Chandigarh (-0.1%) **(Figure 16C)**. At the district level, the population in rural areas of 17 (2.31%) districts **(Figure 17A)** and the population in urban areas of eight (1.08%) districts **(Figure 17B)** had no timely access to the nearest MCH within 120 minutes of motorized transport. Rural areas of 14 (1.90%) districts and urban areas of 532 (72.38%) districts had an APC of 100%.

Nationwide, 94.46% of the population and 77.29% of the population had timely access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 120 minutes by motorized transport. The population of Lakshadweep had zero access to public MCHs within 120 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 18A)**. Similarly, the population of four states/UTs had no access to private MCHs within 120 minutes by motorized transport. Chandigarh and Delhi had an APC of 100% to public MCHs and private MCHs within 120 minutes by motorized transport **(Figure 18B)**.

At the district level, the population of 15 (2.04%) and 134 (18.23%) districts had zero access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 120 minutes by motorized transport. Everyone in 97 (13.19%) districts with public MCHs **(Figure 18C)** and everyone in 81 (11.02%) districts with private MCHs **(Figure 18D)** had access to the nearest MCH within 120 minutes by motorized transport. In comparison to the national APC, 455 (61.90%) and 412 (56.05%) districts had a greater APC to public and private MCHs respectively.

3.3.2 Walking

3.3.2.1 Within 30 minutes

By walking, timely access to an MCH meant being able to access a hospital within 30 minutes. The national APC value was found to be 4.22%. The population of Lakshadweep, Ladakh, and Nagaland had no access to even a single MCH within 30 minutes by walking. At the state/UT level, it was found that less than 1% of the population in Mizoram were able to reach the nearest MCH within 30 minutes by walking. Puducherry had the highest APC (29.24%) followed by Delhi (16.80%) **(Figure 19A)**. In three states/UTs, the APC values were found to be greater than 10%.

At the district level, the data revealed APC values of zero for 350 (47.61%) districts. Among other remaining districts, it was observed that less than 1% of the population in Kullu in Himachal Pradesh and 71.86% of the population in Mumbai in Maharashtra, the highest among all districts, were able to reach the nearest MCH within 30 minutes by walking **(Figure 19B)**. Overall, only four (0.54%) districts had APC values greater than 10%.

Nationally, less than 1% of the population residing in rural areas and 14.44% of the population in urban areas had timely access to the nearest MCH within 30 minutes of walking (percentage point difference = 14). Rural areas in seven states/UTs and urban areas in three states/UTs had an APC value of zero. Rural areas in Puducherry had the highest APC value (13.43%) while those in Mizoram had the lowest value (0.18%). Urban areas in Sikkim had the highest value (40.69%) while those in Meghalaya had the lowest value (1.82%). Sikkim had the highest urban-rural difference of 38.5% points. Except Mizoram, all states/UTs had lower APCs for rural areas than the corresponding urban areas. Mizoram had an urban-rural difference of -0.1% points **(Figure 19C)**. At the district level, the population in rural areas of 400 (654.42%) districts **(Figure 20A)** and the population in urban areas of 364 (49.52%)

districts **(Figure 20B)** had no timely access to the nearest MCH within 30 minutes of walking. Rural areas of Puducherry and urban areas of Shimla in Himachal Pradesh had the highest APC values of 21.30% and 83.42% respectively.

Nationwide, 2.96% and 1.53% of the population had timely access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 30 minutes by walking. The population of four states/UTs had zero access to public MCHs within 30 minutes by walking **(Figure 21A)**. Similarly, the population of ten states/UTs had zero access to private MCHs within 30 minutes by walking **(Figure 21B)**. Whereas the population of Puducherry had the highest access percentage to public MCHs (19.68%) and private MCHs (9.56%) within 30 minutes by walking.

At the district level, the population of 425 (57.82%) districts and 550 (74.82%) districts had no access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 30 minutes by walking. 71.83% of the population in Mumbai in Maharashtra **(Figure 21C)** and 20.96% of the population in Chengalpattu in Tamil Nadu **(Figure 21D)** had the highest percentage of timely access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively. In comparison to the national APC, 139 (18.91%) and 93 (12.65%) districts had a greater APC to public and private MCHs respectively.

3.3.2.2 Within 60 minutes

By walking, timely access to an MCH meant being able to access a hospital within 60 minutes. Access population coverage (APC) is the proportion of the population with timely access. Nationally, 10.96% of people were within 60 minutes of their nearest MCH by walking. The population of Lakshadweep, Ladakh, and Nagaland had no access to even a single MCH within 60 minutes by walking. At the state/UT level, it was found that less than

1% of the population in Mizoram were able to reach the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by walking. In Chandigarh, 68.46% of people were within 60 minutes of their nearest MCH by walking followed by Puducherry (65.75%) **(Figure 22A)**. In three states/UTs, the APC values were found to be greater than 25%.

At the district level, the data revealed APC values of zero for 338 (45.98%) districts. Among other remaining districts, it was observed that less than 1% of the population in Kullu in Himachal Pradesh) and 99.80% population in Shahdara in Delhi, the highest among all districts, were able to reach the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by walking **(Figure 22B)**. Overall, fourteen (1.90%) districts had an APC value greater than 50%.

Nationally, 1.98% of the population residing in rural areas and 35.27% of the population in urban areas had timely access to the nearest MCH within 60 minutes of walking (percentage point difference = 33.3). Rural areas in five states/UTs and urban areas in three states/UTs had an APC value of zero. Rural areas in Chandigarh had the highest APC value (51.40%) while those in Mizoram had the lowest value (0.48%). Urban areas in Puducherry had the highest value (78.84%) while those in Andaman and Nicobar Islands had the lowest value (3.05%). Sikkim had the highest urban-rural difference of 68.5% points. Except Mizoram, all states/UTs had lower APCs for rural areas than the corresponding urban areas. Mizoram had an urban-rural difference of -0.5% points **(Figure 22C)**. At the district level, the population in rural areas of 349 (47.48%) districts **(Figure 23A)** and the population in urban areas of 334 (45.44%) districts **(Figure 23B)** had no timely access to the nearest MCH within 60 minutes of walking. Rural areas of Puducherry and urban areas of Chamba in Himachal Pradesh had the highest APC values of 55.60% and 99.89% respectively.

Nationwide, 7.95% of the population and 4.86% of the population had timely access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 60 minutes by walking. The population of four states/UTs had no access to public MCHs within 60 minutes by walking **(Figure 24A)**. Similarly, the population of 10 states/UTs had no access to private MCHs within 60 minutes by walking **(Figure 24B)**. The population of Chandigarh had the highest access percentage to public MCHs (53.69%) and the population of Puducherry had the highest access percentage to private MCHs (26.36%) within 60 minutes by walking.

At the district level, the population of 413 (56.19%) districts **(Figure 24C)** and 538 (73.19%) districts **(Figure 24D)** had no access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively within 60 minutes by walking. 99.80% of the population in Shahdara in Delhi and 51.81% of the population in Bangalore in Karnataka had the highest percentage of timely access to the nearest public and private MCHs respectively. In comparison to the national APC, 143 (19.45%) and 105 (14.28%) districts had a greater APC to public and private MCHs respectively.

4. Discussion

In our study, using the National Health Profile (NHP) 2022 report, we were able to assess the densities of MCHs per million, the median travel time to the nearest MCHs by motorized transport and walking, and the Access Population Coverage (APC) of MCHs up to the district level in India. Nationally, India had an average density of 0.47 MCHs per million of the population. The median travel time to the nearest MCH was 67.94 minutes by motorized transport and 589.82 minutes by walking. By motorized transport, the APC was 39.85%, 71.76%, 89.40%, and 95.94% within 30, 60, 90, and 120 minutes, respectively. The APC by walking was 4.22% within 30 minutes and 10.96% within 60 minutes.

We noted an increase in MCH density from 0.408 to 0.47 per million, compared to a 2019 study that used the Medical Council of India's online database to map the geographical distribution of MCHs. No major changes in the distribution of MCHs were noted. Puducherry had the highest MCH density amongst states/UTs and Nagaland, Ladakh, and Lakshadweep had zero MCHs, unchanged from 2019 [5]. The results of our study correspond to findings from other countries. The average density of teaching hospitals is estimated to be 0.44 per million in Bangladesh [20], comparable to 0.47 for India. A wide disparity between districts is also seen in Bangladesh. The average travel time using public transport to the nearest tertiary hospital at the district level in Bangladesh ranged from 30 minutes to 276 minutes. [21] The significant disparities in availability and accessibility between rural and urban areas are also consistent. [21] For example, 16 (45.71%) out of 35 tertiary health centers in Bangladesh are located in Dhaka, its capital. The APCs estimated by us are also comparable to other LMICs. For instance, 92.5% of the population in Sub-Saharan Africa is estimated to reside within two hours of a hospital capable of performing essential surgical services. This value is close to the APC by motorized transport within two hours of 95.94% calculated for India. [22] Therefore, the patterns and values observed are similar to South Asian countries and other LMICs.

Density can inform us about the geographical distribution of facilities by population. However, it does not give any insight into whether those services are accessible promptly. Our study is the first to calculate median travel times and APC for MCHs in India. We chose to assess travel times instead of distances because the time taken to reach a facility is dependent on many factors other than distance such as the quality of roads, terrain, and traffic. Geographical features such as rivers, valleys, and mountains can also slow down

movement and increase travel times. However, travel times do not take the population of a region into account. APC which combines population with time tells us about the percentage of the population that can access care in a given period. Therefore, APC gives us a more complete picture of the geographical accessibility to care in a region. We recommend that APC be used to guide policy regarding the establishment of future MCHs in the country.

Our study noted quite a few states/UTs in need of policy attention. Three states/UTs: Ladakh, Nagaland, and Lakshadweep had zero MCHs. Ladakh had the longest median travel times by motorized transport and walking at 1866.2 minutes and 4120.86 minutes respectively. Andaman and Nicobar Islands also showed limited accessibility with less than 1% of the population being able to access MCHs within 120 minutes by motorized transport. The Northeastern states of Arunachal, Nagaland, Mizoram, and Meghalaya performed poorly as well, having APCs within 60 minutes by motorized transport of 14.58%, 27.57%, 35.20%, and 35.62% compared to the national average of 71.6%. In addition to the low density of MCHs, the nature of the terrain in these regions makes movement difficult, limiting accessibility.

We also noted severe disparities between rural and urban areas. The median travel time to the nearest MCH by motorized transport in rural areas was 69.04 minutes compared to 25.92 minutes in urban areas. Similarly, 62.20% of people living in rural areas could reach the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by motorized transport in contrast to 92.34% in urban areas. Given that 68.8% of India's population lives in rural areas [23], this disparity is alarming. The absence of quick accessibility to specialized care can lead to suboptimal outcomes, particularly in emergencies. Further, inaccessibility to qualified human resources for health

(HRH) and the consequent expenditure needed for transport are the key drivers of the popularity of unqualified healthcare workers in rural India. [24]

The access disparity between rural and urban areas could be because of poorer road infrastructure in rural areas, which increases travel times. In 2018-19, the average road density was 5296.3 per thousand kilometer square in urban areas in comparison to 1458.1 in rural areas. [25] Another possible reason for access disparity is the rapid growth of the private sector in medical education in the last few decades. The growth of private MCHs has been seen in more prosperous districts with better developmental indicators. This could be because private MCHs need to raise their own funds for sustained investment. These funds predominantly come from student fees and patients attending the attached hospitals. [4] The per-capita income in terms of net value added was estimated to be INR 40925 and 98435 in rural and urban areas respectively in 2011. [26] The higher paying capacity of urban populations can drive the establishment of private MCHS in close vicinity to them. The presence of better infrastructure in urban areas also allows them to attract more private investment. [4] Additionally, health professionals in India prefer to practice in urban areas, owing to the availability of better amenities and more opportunities for career growth. This makes it easy for MCHs established in cities to fulfill faculty requirement guidelines as set by the NMC. [5]

Our study also showed that public MCHs were more accessible than private MCHs. For instance, the APC within 60 minutes by motorized transport was 63.62 and 45.95 to public and private MCHs respectively. A reason for this is the higher number of public MCHs in the country (346 public MCHs vs 302 private MCHs). However, as stated above, private MCHs tend to be established in better-off districts. [4] The unregulated placement of private MCHs

in such areas could be misaligned to the healthcare needs of the population. This could also contribute to the difference in accessibility.

Disparities in geographical accessibility to MCHs can be addressed by strategic placement of new MCHs. The usage of location-allocation models (LAMs) can allow policymakers to set MCHs up at optimized locations improving accessibility [27]. Plans such as the central government's proposal to convert district hospitals to MCHs [28], particularly in underserved districts, can reduce disparities as well. The improvement of roads in rural areas through schemes such as the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) [29] can also improve accessibility in rural areas. It has also been noted that alumni of MCHs located in rural areas are more inclined towards rural practice. [5] Following WHO's recommendation of establishing MCHs away from major cities can increase the retention of doctors in rural areas, improving accessibility. [30]

Limitations and Strengths

The study has multiple limitations. First, our analysis inherited the assumptions and limitations of the source data including the NHP report, URCA, Worldpop, and MAP rasters. Second, the APC estimates did not account for access to or ownership of motor vehicles. As per the census 2011, only 21% of Indian households owned two-wheelers, and 4.7% owned cars, jeeps, or vans. [31] Although India meets WHO's norm of 1 ambulance per 100,000 people, there are large disparities in the availability of ambulance services among states/UTs. [32] Third, we did not account for the availability of facilities, services, or resources at an individual MCH that can impact care provision and quality. Fourth, our study estimated travel times and APCs by walking and motorized transport on land, not taking other means of transport into account. Consequently, we could not compute the median travel times for the

island districts of Lakshadweep, North and Middle Andaman and Nicobars. However, other means of transport, such as waterways, are not used as frequently in India as they are more likely to be affected by weather adversities such as heavy rainfall. Fifth, we did not investigate access measures specific to demographic groups based on age, gender, and socioeconomic status. Future studies should take these factors into account to provide a more comprehensive picture of geographical accessibility to MCHs in the country.

Despite these limitations, our study has many strengths. We developed a novel method using multiple outcome measures to assess the geographical accessibility to MCHs in India. Our study comprehensively analyzed the densities of MCHs per million, the median travel time to the nearest MCHs by walking and motorized transport, and the APC of MCHs in 36 states/UTs and 735 districts in India. We estimated APCs for both walking and motorized transport within multiple time frames. We also assessed geographical accessibility to MCHs in rural and urban areas. In addition, we analyzed geographical accessibility to public and private MCHs as well. Our study also validated the geolocation of all the MCHs in the country, lending further strength to our findings.

5. Conclusion

Median travel time to the nearest MCH and Access Population Coverage (APC) are comprehensive tools to assess geographical accessibility and should be used to guide future policy. Our study found that the northernmost UT of Ladakh, the island UTs of Andaman and Nicobar islands, and Lakshadweep, and the northeastern states of Arunachal, Nagaland, Mizoram and Meghalaya had poor geographical accessibility to MCHs. We also found a wide disparity in accessibility to MCHs in rural areas compared to urban areas. Future research

should assess geographical accessibility for different demographic groups taking the availability of facilities in each MCH into account.

6. References

1. Cardinal L, Kaell A. The role of medical education in the development of the scientific practice of medicine. J Community Hosp Intern Med Perspect. 2017;7: 58–60. doi:10.1080/20009666.2017.1286815

2. Clarke-Deelder E, Afriyie DO, Nseluke M, Masiye F, Fink G. Health care seeking in modern urban LMIC settings: evidence from Lusaka, Zambia. BMC Public Health. 2022;22: 1205. doi:10.1186/s12889-022-13549-3

3. Central Bureau of Health Intelligence (CBHI), Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. National Health Profile 2022 17th Issue. Central Bureau of Health Intelligence (CBHI), Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India; 2022.

4. Sabde Y, Diwan V, De Costa A, Mahadik VK. Mapping the rapid expansion of India's medical education sector: planning for the future. BMC Med Educ. 2014;14: 266. doi:10.1186/s12909-014-0266-1

5. Sabde Y, Diwan V, Mahadik VK, Parashar V, Negandhi H, Trushna T, et al. Medical schools in India: pattern of establishment and impact on public health - a Geographic Information System (GIS) based exploratory study. BMC Public Health. 2020;20: 755. doi:10.1186/s12889-020-08797-0

6. McLaughlin CG, Wyszewianski L. Access to care: remembering old lessons. Health Serv Res. 2002;37: 1441–1443. doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12171

7. Powers WJ, Rabinstein AA, Ackerson T, Adeoye OM, Bambakidis NC, Becker K, et al. Guidelines for the early management of patients with acute ischemic stroke: 2019 update to the 2018 guidelines for the early management of acute ischemic stroke: A guideline for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American

Stroke Association. Stroke. 2019;50: e344–e418. doi:10.1161/STR.0000000000000211

8. European Society of Cardiology. 2023 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute coronary syndromes. In: 2023 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute coronary syndromes [Internet]. 25 Aug 2023 [cited 14 Jul 2024]. Available: https://www.escardio.org/Guidelines/Clinical-Practice-Guidelines/Acute-Coronary-Syndromes-ACS-Guidelines

9. Mahajan A, Tirakotai W, Masayaanon P. The hidden costs of universal health coverage: solutions from the fight against catastrophic healthcare expenditure in Thailand. BMJ Glob Health. 2023;8. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2023-011932

10. Rocque GB, Williams CP, Miller HD, Azuero A, Wheeler SB, Pisu M, et al. Impact of travel time on health care costs and resource use by phase of care for older patients with cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2019;37: 1935–1945. doi:10.1200/JCO.19.00175

11. Kornelsen J, Khowaja AR, Av-Gay G, Sullivan E, Parajulee A, Dunnebacke M, et al. The rural tax: comprehensive out-of-pocket costs associated with patient travel in British Columbia. BMC Health Serv Res. 2021;21: 854. doi:10.1186/s12913-021-06833-2

12. Bartosch P, Jaye C, Crampton P. Moral economy and moral capital: A new approach to understanding health systems. Soc Sci Med. 2024;352: 117016. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117016

13. School of Geography and Environmental Science, University of Southampton; Department of Geography and Geosciences, University of Louisville; Departement de Geographie, Universite de Namur, Center for International Earth Science Information Network (CIESIN), Columbia University (2018). WorldPop. 22 Jun 2020 [cited 5 Jul

2024]. Available: https://dx.doi.org/10.5258/SOTON/WP00671

14. The Malaria Atlas Project. Explorer - Malaria Atlas Project. [cited 11 Apr 2021]. Available: https://malariaatlas.org/explorer/#/

15. European Commission. Global Accessibility Map. In: Global Accessibility Map [Internet]. [cited 14 Jul 2024]. Available: https://forobs.jrc.ec.europa.eu/gam/description

16. Meyers J. India Official Boundaries 2019. 2020 [cited 12 Jul 2024]. Available: https://github.com/justinelliotmeyers/India_Official_Boundaries_2019

17. Cattaneo A, Nelson A, McMenomy T. Global mapping of urban-rural catchment areas reveals unequal access to services. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2021;118. doi:10.1073/pnas.2011990118

18. Zadey S. Measuring Access to Surgical Care in Rural India: Synthesis of Data and Novel Index. Master thesis, Duke Global Health Institute (DGHI). 2021. Available: https://hdl.handle.net/10161/23143

19. Jadhav T, Vissoci JRN, Zadey S. Measuring timely geographical access to surgical care in India: a geospatial modeling study. Lancet Glob Health. 2022;10 Suppl 1: S29. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(22)00158-9

20. Loveday J, Sachdev SP, Cherian MN, Katayama F, Akhtaruzzaman AKM, Thomas J, et al. Survey of emergency and essential surgical, obstetric and anaesthetic services available in bangladeshi government health facilities. World J Surg. 2017;41: 1743–1751. doi:10.1007/s00268-017-3918-6

21. Rahman M, Islam Z, Alamgir HM. How Geographically Accessible is Tertiary Care in Low- and Middle-income Countries: The Bangladesh Case. J Health Manag. 2024. doi:10.1177/09720634241244426

22. Juran S, Broer PN, Klug SJ, Snow RC, Okiro EA, Ouma PO, et al. Geospatial mapping of access to timely essential surgery in sub-Saharan Africa. BMJ Glob Health. 2018;3: e000875. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2018-000875

23. Chandramouli C. Rural Urban Distribution of Population, Census of India 2011. REGISTRAR GENERAL & CENSUS COMMISSIONER, INDIA - MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, NEW DELHI : 15th July 2011; 2011. Available: https://censusindia.gov.in/2011-prov-results/paper2/data_files/india/Rural_urban_2011.pdf

24. Anand G, Chhajed D, Shah S, Atkins S, Diwan V. Do qualifications matter? A qualitative study of how villagers decide their health care providers in a developing economy. PLoS ONE. 2019;14: e0220316. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0220316

25. Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Government of India. Basic Road Statistics of India 2018-19. Ministry of Road Transport & Highways, Government of India; 2019.

26. Ministry of Statistics & Programme Implementation. Per Capita Income in Rural and Urban Areas. 2023. Available: https://pib.gov.in/PressReleaseIframePage.aspx?PRID=1913325

27. Rahman S, Smith DK. Use of location-allocation models in health service development planning in developing nations. European Journal of Operational Research. 2000;123: 437–452. doi:10.1016/S0377-2217(99)00289-1

28. India Today. 75 district hospitals to be converted into medical colleges. 75 district hospitals to be converted into medical colleges . 9 Jun 2019.

29. National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency GOI. Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana. In: Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana [Internet]. [cited 14 Jul 2024].

Available: https://omms.nic.in/

30. WHO. Increasing access to health workers in remote and rural areas through improved retention : Global Policy Recommendations. In: Increasing access to health workers in remote and rural areas through improved retention [Internet]. 2 Feb 2010 [cited 12 Jul 2024].

31. Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation G of I. Motor Vehicles. Statistical Year Book India 2015. 2015. Available: https://mospi.gov.in/statistical-year-book-india/2015/189

32. Pawalia K, Diksha M, Kothari A, Bhushan H. National Ambulance Services in India: A Narrative Review. International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research. 2023;5. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374615975_National_Ambulance_Services_in_India_A_Narrative_Review

7. Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable

Consent for publication: Not applicable

Funding: None

Authors' contributions:

Study concept and design: Siddhesh Zadey

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Chaitanya Reddy, Harsh Thakkar, Aamir Miyajiwala, Sahil Kale, Ankit Raj, Siddhesh Zadey

Drafting of the manuscript: Chaitanya Reddy, Varun Raj Passi

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors

Statistical analysis: Harsh Thakkar, Aamir Miyajiwala, Sahil Kale, Ankit Raj, Siddhesh Zadey

Administrative, technical, or material support: Siddhesh Zadey

Study supervision: Siddhesh Zadey

Competing interests: Siddhesh Zadey represents the Association for Socially Applicable Research (ASAR) on the drafting committee of the Maharashtra State Mental Health Policy and the Global Alliance for Surgical, Obstetric, Trauma, and Anesthesia Care (G4 Alliance). He serves as the chair of the South Asia Working Group of the G4 Alliance. He is on the board of ASAR and the advisory board of Nivarana. He has previously received honoraria from Think Global Health and The Hindu. Other authors declare no competing interests.

8. Figure Captions

Figure 1: Raster-based estimation pipeline used for creating criteria-specific regional population counts.

Figure 2: MCH density per million for A. States and union territories and B. Districts. The states/UTs of Ladakh, Lakshadweep, and Nagaland are not mentioned as they have no MCHs. Districts having zero MCHs are marked as N/A.

Figure 3: Median travel time to the nearest MCH by motorized transport for A. States and union territories. B. Districts. C. Rural areas in states and union territories and D. Urban areas in states and union territories. The black dotted lines in Figures A and B represent the national median travel time. Median travel times for the UTs of Andaman and Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep were not computable.

Figure 4: Box plots of median travel times by A. Motorized transport in rural vs urban areas. Median travel time to the nearest MCH by motorized transport for B. Rural areas in districts. C. Urban areas in districts.

Figure 5: Median travel time to the nearest MCH by walking for A. States and union territories. The black dotted line represents the national median travel time. B. Districts. C. Rural areas in states and union territories and D. Urban areas in states and union territories.

Figure 6:. Box plots of median travel times by A. Walking in rural vs. urban areas. These graphs show the wide disparity in travel times to the nearest MCH between rural and urban areas. Median travel time to the nearest MCH by walking for B. Rural areas in districts and C. Urban areas in districts.

Figure 7: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 30 minutes by motorized transport for A. States and union territories with the national value of 39.85% (black dotted line). B. Districts. C. Rural and urban areas. The difference is rural-urban percentage points.

Figure 8: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 30 minutes by motorized transport for A. Rural areas in districts and B. Urban areas in districts.

Figure 9: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 30 minutes by motorized transport for A. States and union territories with public MCHs with a national value of 32.95% (black dotted line). B. States and union territories with private MCHs with a national value of 25.32% (black dotted line). C. Districts with public MCHs and D. Districts with private MCHs.

Figure 10: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by motorized transport for A. States and union territories with the national value of 71.76% (black dotted line). B. Districts and C. Rural and urban areas. The difference is rural-urban percentage points.

Figure 11: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by motorized transport for A. Rural areas in districts and B. Urban areas in districts.

Figure 12: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by motorized transport for A. States and union territories with public MCHs with a national value of 63.62% (black dotted line). B. States and union territories with private MCHs national value of 45.95% (black dotted line). C. Districts with public MCHs and D. Districts with private MCHs.

Figure 13: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 90 minutes by motorized transport for A. States and union territories with a national value of 89.40% (black dotted line). B. Districts and C. Rural and urban areas. The difference is rural-urban percentage points.

Figure 14: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 90 minutes by motorized transport for A. Rural areas in districts and B. Urban areas in districts.

Figure 15: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 90 minutes by motorized transport for A. States and union territories with public MCHs with a national value of 84.43% (black dotted line). B. States and union territories with private MCHs with a national value of 64.16% (black dotted line). C. Districts with public MCHs and D. Districts with private MCHs.

Figure 16: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 120 minutes by motorized transport for A. States and union territories with the national value of 95.94% (black

dotted line). B. Districts and C. Rural and urban areas. The difference is rural-urban percentage points.

Figure 17: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 120 minutes by motorized transport for A. Rural areas in districts and B. Urban areas in districts.

Figure 18: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 120 minutes by motorized transport for A. States and union territories with public MCHs with the national value of 94.46% (black dotted line). B. States and union territories with private MCHs with a national value of 77.29% (black dotted line). C. Districts with public MCHs and D. Districts with private MCHs.

Figure 19: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 30 minutes by walking for A. States and union territories with the national value of 4.22% (black dotted line). B. Districts and C. Rural and urban areas. The difference is rural-urban percentage points.

Figure 20: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 30 minutes by walking for A. Rural areas in districts and B. Urban areas in districts.

Figure 21: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 30 minutes by walking for A. States and union territories with public MCHs with a national value of 2.96% (black dotted line). B. States and union territories with private MCHs with a national value of 1.53% (black dotted line). C. Districts with public MCHs and D. Districts with private MCHs.

Figure 22: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by walking for A. States and union territories with a national value of 10.96% (black dotted line). B. Districts and C. Rural and urban areas. The difference is rural-urban percentage points.

Figure 23: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by walking for A. Rural areas in districts and. B. Urban areas in districts.

Figure 24: APC values to access the nearest MCH within 60 minutes by walking for A. States and union territories with public MCHs with a national value of 7.95% (black dotted line). B. States and union territories with private MCHs with a national value of 4.86% (black dotted line). C. Districts with public MCHs and D. Districts with private MCHs.


For population estimation:
Global URCA ordinal raster
1km² resolution
1 pixel = CA category label
Crop to Indian boundary
National URCA ordinal raster
For timely access analysis:
Global motorized travel friction surface
(MAP Accessibility 2019)
1km² resolution
1 pixel = value of inaccessibility weight
Crop to Indian boundary
National motorized travel friction surface
(MAP Accessibility 2019)
+
Geocoded medical college hospitals list
Dijkstra-based travel costs
Travel-time to nearest hospital
1km² resolution
1 pixel = time in minutes
Continuous/ordinal raster
e.g. For population estimation, URCA categories
For timely access analysis, travel-time values
Binarized raster
e.g. For population estimation, for rural CA raster, 1 = CA category > 7
For timely access analysis, for 2 hours threshold, 1 = travel-time ≤ 120 minutes
X
Population raster
1km² resolution
1 pixel =No. of persons
e.g. For rural population estimation, WorldPop 2020 raster
For timely access analysis, rural population raster
Align origin resample to match resolution and extents
Rasters for population for given category
1km² resolution
1 pixel =No. of persons
e.g. For population estimation, rural people per pixel
For timely access analysis, rural people within 2 hours of medical college hospital
Overlay polygon boundaries extract aggregates within boundaries
Population counts for a given category within a region
e.g. For population estimation, for district boundaries, district-level sums of rural population counts
For timely access analysis, for district boundaries, district-level sums of rural people within 2 hours of medical college hospital

A


Andaman & Nicobar Islands
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttarakhand
Utttar Pradesh
West Bengal
0
3
6
9
12
MCH centers per million population

B


MCH per million people
0.0 to 0.2
0.2 to 0.5
0.5 to 1.0
1.0 to 100.0
NA


A
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
121
242
363
484
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by motorized transport


B
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by motorized transport
0.0 to 38.4
38.4 to 57.4
57.4 to 88.5
88.5 to 100.0
Missing Data


C
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
121
242
363
484
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by motorized transport


D
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
827
1654
2481
3308
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by walking


A
***
1500
1000
500
0
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by Motorized transport
Median = 58.55
Median = 33.79
n = 722
Rural
n = 690
Urban


B
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by motorized transpor
6.9 to 40.5
40.5 to 58.6
58.6 to 90.5
90.5 to 100.0
Missing Data


C
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by motorized vehicle
0.0 to 15.3
15.3 to 33.8
33.8 to 57.1
57.1 to 100.0
Missing Data


A
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
827
1654
2481
3308
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by walking


B
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by walking
0.0 to 100.0
100.0 to 343.1
343.1 to 496.2
496.2 to 737.7
Missing Data


C
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
30
60
90
120
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by motorized transport


D
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
409
818
1227
1636
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by walking

A

***
Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by Walking
4000
3000
2000
1000
0
Median = 502.41
Median = 359.69
n = 722
n = 690
Rural
Urban

B


Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by walking
0.0 to 100.0
100.0 to 167.0
167.0 to 359.7
359.7 to 615.8
Missing Data

C


Median travel time (mins) to nearest MCH by walking
59.7 to 100.0
100.0 to 354.4
354.4 to 502.4
502.4 to 744.8
Missing Data


A
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
B
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 1
1 to 25
25 to 50
50 to 100
C
Rural
Urban
Difference
Andaman & Nicobar 0 3.1 -3.1
Andhra Pradesh 26.9 70 -43.1
Arunachal Pradesh 7 71.2 -64.3
Assam 15.5 42 -26.4
Bihar 19.8 39.9 -20.1
Chandigarh 100 99.9 0.1
Chhattisgarh 15.5 73.7 -58.2
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu 78.6 96.9 -18.3
Delhi 95.7 99.9 -4.2
Goa 64.2 88.3 -24.1
Gujarat 32.2 87.3 -55
Haryana 36.6 77.5 -41
Himachal Pradesh 34.7 58.3 -23.6
Jammu & Kashmir 38.8 82.2 -43.4
Jharkhand 14.4 60.8 -46.4
Karnataka 39 88 -48.9
Kerala 76.8 88.2 -11.5
Ladakh 0 0
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh 11 62 -51
Maharashtra 25.6 85.9 -60.3
Manipur 35.1 89.6 -54.5
Meghalaya 16.7 69.4 -52.7
Mizoram 15.9 82.9 -67
Nagaland 1.2 4 -1.8
Odisha 12 63.1 -51.1
Puducherry 94.3 98.7 -4.5
Punjab 31.8 77 -45.2
Rajasthan 14.4 62 -47.6
Sikkim 54.8 96.8 -42
Tamil Nadu 53.9 89.1 -35.3
Telangana 35.2 90.8 -55.6
Tripura 18.5 62.2 -43.7
Uttar Pradesh 27.2 71.8 -44.6
Uttarakhand 22.2 56.3 -34.1
West Bengal 27.3 71.5 -44.2
India 26.5 75.9 -49.4
0
40
80
120
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport

A


% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 1
1 to 20
20 to 50
50 to 100
Missing Data

B


% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 25
25 to 55
55 to 90
90 to 100
Missing Data


A
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
B
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
C
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 10
10 to 25
25 to 50
50 to 100
D
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 1
1 to 25
25 to 50
50 to 100


A
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 30
30 to 70
70 to 90
90 to 100
B
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
C
Rural
Urban
Difference
Andaman & Nicobar 0 3.1 -3.1
Andhra Pradesh 66.7 93 -26.3
Arunachal Pradesh 11.8 81.7 -70
Assam 48.2 71.2 -23
Bihar 63.3 74.8 -11.6
Chandigarh 100 99.9 0.1
Chhattisgarh 39.9 90.8 -50.8
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu 87.8 96.9 -9.1
Delhi 96.2 100 -3.8
Goa 98.1 94 4.1
Gujarat 70.9 95.5 -24.6
Haryana 77.6 96.2 -18.6
Himachal Pradesh 72.1 95.8 -23.7
Jammu & Kashmir 63.8 92.6 -28.8
Jharkhand 45.9 88.5 -42.6
Karnataka 79.6 97.6 -17.9
Kerala 96.3 98.2 -1.9
Ladakh 0 0
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh 32.3 75.4 -43
Maharashtra 63.4 95.8 -32.4
Manipur 58.4 99 -40.5
Meghalaya 31.2 76.1 -44.9
Mizoram 28.5 82.9 -54.4
Nagaland 15.5 66.7 -51.2
Odisha 37.6 78.8 -41.2
Puducherry 96.1 99 -2.9
Punjab 81.5 97.7 -16.3
Rajasthan 42.5 79.3 -36.8
Sikkim 89.5 100 -10.5
Tamil Nadu 93 99.6 -6.6
Telangana 78.7 99.6 -20.9
Tripura 41.9 80 -38.1
Uttar Pradesh 73.1 92.6 -19.5
Uttarakhand 64.3 90.9 -26.6
West Bengal 77.1 96.3 -19.3
India 64.2 92.3 -28.1
0
40
80
120
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport

A


% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 25
25 to 65
65 to 90
90 to 100
Missing Data

B


% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transpor
0 to 65
65 to 90
90 to 99
99 to 100
Missing Data


A
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
B
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
C
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 20
20 to 60
60 to 90
90 to 100
D
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 10
10 to 35
35 to 75
75 to 100

A


Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 90 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport

B


% people within 90 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 70
70 to 90
90 to 99
99 to 100

C


Rural
Urban
Difference
Andaman & Nicobar 0 3.1 -3.1
Andhra Pradesh 90 100 -10
Arunachal Pradesh 17.7 81.7 -64
Assam 80.6 90.2 -9.7
Bihar 91.9 97.3 -5.5
Chandigarh 100 99.9 0.1
Chhattisgarh 66.8 96.8 -30
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu 88.3 96.9 -8.6
Delhi 96.2 100 -3.8
Goa 95 90 5
Gujarat 91 98.8 -7.8
Haryana 96.9 100 -3.1
Himachal Pradesh 88.6 100 -11.4
Jammu & Kashmir 77.9 98.6 -20.7
Jharkhand 78.3 100 -21.7
Karnataka 96.4 100 -3.6
Kerala 98 98.2 -0.3
Ladakh 0 0.4
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh 59.7 88.7 -29
Maharashtra 89.3 99.2 -10
Manipur 73.6 100 -26.4
Meghalaya 46.7 79 -32.3
Mizoram 43.5 90.2 -46.8
Nagaland 35.4 85.4 -50.1
Odisha 63.7 93.9 -30.1
Puducherry 96.1 99 -2.9
Punjab 98.7 100 -1.3
Rajasthan 72.5 95.7 -23.1
Sikkim 94.3 100 -5.7
Tamil Nadu 98.3 100 -1.7
Telangana 95.6 100 -4.4
Tripura 60.1 84.1 -23.9
Uttar Pradesh 92.3 98.8 -6.5
Uttarakhand 87.2 100 -12.8
West Bengal 94.9 99.6 -4.6
India 86.1 98.5 -12.4
0
40
80
120
% people within 90 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport

A


% people within 90 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 65
65 to 90
90 to 99
99 to 100
Missing Data

B


% people within 90 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 90
90 to 95
95 to 99
99 to 100
Missing Data


A
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 90 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
B
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 90 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
C
% people within 90 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 60
60 to 75
75 to 90
90 to 100
D
% people within 90 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 25
25 to 55
55 to 95
95 to 100


A
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 120 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
B
% people within 120 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 88
88 to 95
95 to 99
99 to 100
C
Rural
Urban
Difference
Andaman & Nicobar 0 3.1 -3.1
Andhra Pradesh 96.9 100 -3.1
Arunachal Pradesh 32.4 87.7 -55.4
Assam 93.7 95.3 -1.5
Bihar 98.4 100 -1.6
Chandigarh 100 99.9 0.1
Chhattisgarh 84 100 -16
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu 88.4 98.9 -10.6
Delhi 96.2 100 -3.8
Goa 99.1 5.1
Gujarat 96.9 99.3 -2.4
Haryana 99.6 100 -0.4
Himachal Pradesh 92.4 100 -7.6
Jammu & Kashmir 83.7 99.9 -16.2
Jharkhand 92.2 100 -7.8
Karnataka 99.3 100 -0.7
Kerala 98.5 98.2 0.3
Ladakh 3.6 3.6
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh 83.2 98 -14.8
Maharashtra 97.6 99.6 -1.9
Manipur 83.7 100 -16.3
Meghalaya 57.7 81.8 -24
Mizoram 54.8 98 -43.2
Nagaland 63 100 -37
Odisha 82.7 99.9 -17.2
Puducherry 96.1 99 -2.9
Punjab 99.2 100 -0.8
Rajasthan 90.4 99.7 -9.4
Sikkim 95.5 100 -4.5
Tamil Nadu 98.9 100 -1.1
Telangana 98.6 100 -1.4
Tripura 82.6 94.9 -12.4
Uttar Pradesh 97.5 100 -2.5
Uttarakhand 92.7 100 -7.3
West Bengal 98 100 -2
India 94.6 99.9 -5.3
0
40
80
120
% people within 120 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport

A


% people within 120 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 85
85 to 95
95 to 99
99 to 100
Missing Data

B


% people within 120 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 50
50 to 75
75 to 99
99 to 100
Missing Data

A
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 120 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
B
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 120 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
C
% people within 120 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 85
85 to 95
95 to 99
99 to 100
D
% people within 120 mins of their nearest MCH by motorized transport
0 to 10
10 to 50
50 to 90
90 to 100

A


Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by walking

B


% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
0.0 to 0.5
0.5 to 1.0
1.0 to 5.0
5.0 to 100.0

C


Rural
Urban
Difference
Andaman & Nicobar 0 3.1 -3.1
Andhra Pradesh .6 16.4 -15.9
Arunachal Pradesh .5 24.6 -24.1
Assam 2 4.3 -4.1
Bihar 3 5.2 -5
Chandigarh 0 15.3 -15.3
Chhattisgarh 2 14.2 -14
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu 3.1 10.2 -7.1
Delhi 0 17.2 -17.2
Goa 4 5 -4.6
Gujarat 3 17.9 -17.6
Haryana .6 7.5 -6.8
Himachal Pradesh 1.6 23.1 -21.6
Jammu & Kashmir .6 16 -15.4
Jharkhand 2 4.5 -4.3
Karnataka .7 28.7 -28
Kerala 1.5 6.1 -4.6
Ladakh 0 0
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh 2 12.3 -12.1
Maharashtra 3 20.7 -20.4
Manipur 1.2 25.4 -24.1
Meghalaya 1.8 -0.5
Mizoram 0 0.1
Nagaland 0 0
Odisha 2 10.8 -10.6
Puducherry 13.4 35.9 -22.5
Punjab 3 13.8 -13.5
Rajasthan 3 13.3 -13
Sikkim 2.2 40.7 -38.5
Tamil Nadu 1.9 20.7 -19.8
Telangana 1.8 21.6 -20.7
Tripura 2 14.1 -13.9
Uttar Pradesh 4 9.9 -9.5
Uttarakhand 1.8 12.7 -11.9
West Bengal 3 10.9 -10.7
India 4 14.4 -14
0
10
20
30
40
50
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by walking

A


% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
0.0 to 0.5
0.5 to 1.0
1.0 to 5.0
5.0 to 100.0
Missing Data

B


% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
0 to 1
1 to 5
5 to 15
15 to 100
Missing Data


A
B
C
D
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Havelli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
0.00 to 0.01
0.01 to 0.50
0.50 to 1.50
1.50 to 100.00
% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
0.00 to 0.01
0.01 to 0.05
0.05 to 1.00
1.00 to 100.00

A


Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by walking

B


% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
0 to 1
1 to 5
5 to 10
10 to 100

C


Rural
Urban
Difference
Andaman & Nicobar 0 3.1 -3.1
Andhra Pradesh 2.5 35.3 -32.8
Arunachal Pradesh 4 27.4 -26
Assam 9 11.2 -10.2
Bihar 2 12.7 -11.5
Chandigarh 51.4 53.7 -2.3
Chhattisgarh 1 36.6 -35.5
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu 10.9 39.1 -28.3
Delhi 9 49.3 -48.3
Goa 2 13.9 -12
Gujarat 1.9 42.1 -40.1
Haryana 2.4 17.8 -15.4
Himachal Pradesh 4.6 27.7 -23.1
Jammu & Kashmir 2 32.1 -30.2
Jharkhand 6 19.8 -19
Karnataka 3.5 57.8 -54.3
Kerala 7 19.3 -12.3
Ladakh 0 0
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh 1 33.2 -32.2
Maharashtra 1.6 47.1 -45.5
Manipur 3.7 45.3 -41.6
Meghalaya 3 20.5 -17.5
Mizoram 0 0 0.5
Nagaland 0 0 0
Odisha 1 31.7 -30.7
Puducherry 34.8 78.8 -44
Punjab 3 34.5 -33.2
Rajasthan 3 30.1 -28.8
Sikkim 8.4 76.8 -68.5
Tamil Nadu 4 47.7 -43.6
Telangana 3.2 56.8 -53.6
Tripura 5 46.3 -44.8
Uttar Pradesh 2 26.9 -24.9
Uttarakhand 2.8 31.4 -28.7
West Bengal 5 28.8 -27.3
India 2 35.3 -33.3
0
25
50
75
100
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by walking

A


% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
0.0 to 0.5
0.5 to 1.0
1.0 to 5.0
5.0 to 100.0
Missing Data

B


% people within 30 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
0 to 1
1 to 5
5 to 15
15 to 100
Missing Data


A
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
B
Andaman & Nicobar
Andhra Pradesh
Arunachal Pradesh
Assam
Bihar
Chandigarh
Chhattisgarh
Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu
Delhi
Goa
Gujarat
Haryana
Himachal Pradesh
Jammu & Kashmir
Jharkhand
Karnataka
Kerala
Ladakh
Lakshadweep
Madhya Pradesh
Maharashtra
Manipur
Meghalaya
Mizoram
Nagaland
Odisha
Puducherry
Punjab
Rajasthan
Sikkim
Tamil Nadu
Telangana
Tripura
Uttar Pradesh
Uttarakhand
West Bengal
0
20
40
60
80
100
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
C
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
0 to 1
1 to 5
5 to 10
10 to 100
D
% people within 60 mins of their nearest MCH by walking
0.0 to 0.5
0.5 to 1.0
1.0 to 5.0
5.0 to 100.0