Title: Geospatial Accessibility to Primary and Community Health Centres in India

Short title: PHC CHC access India

Authors: Shreyas Patil[1,2], Aamir Miyajiwala[1,3], Anoushka Arora[1,4], Ankit Raj[1], Harsh Thakkar[1,3], Mukta S. Takalikar[5], Siddhesh Zadey[1,6,7,8]

Affiliations:

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

2 Department of Community Medicine and Family Medicine, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Bibinagar, Telangana, India

3 Department of Computer Science, Viterbi School of Engineering, University of Southern California, LA, CA, USA

4 Smt. Nathiba Hargovandas Lakhmichand Municipal Medical College, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

5 Department of Computer Engineering, SCTR's Pune Institute of Computer Technology, Pune, Maharashtra, India

6 Department of Epidemiology, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, NYC, NY, USA

7 GEMINI Research Center, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA

8 Dr. D. Y. Patil Dental College, Hospital, and Research Centre, Dr. D. Y. Patil Vidyapeeth, Pune, Maharashtra, India

Corresponding Author: Siddhesh Zadey BSMS, MScGH;

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

Email: sidzadey@asarforindia.org

Article type: Original Article

Abstract

Background: Studies have found that accessibility to public healthcare in India is poor. However, data on geographic access to primary and secondary public health facilities in terms of travel time and geographical scope are limited. Our study estimates the travel times and the proportion of the population with timely geographic access to primary health centres (PHCs) and community health centres (CHCs) in India.

Methods: PHC and CHC locations were taken from the Geographic Information System (GIS) dataset of the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) 2021. Motorized and walking travel-time friction surface rasters were taken from the Malaria Atlas Project 2020. Using these, we examined the densities, travel times, and Access Population Coverage (APC) for PHCs and CHCs in India up to the district level.

Results: In 2021, India had 23.22 PHCs and 3.07 CHCs per million people. Median PHC travel time was 79.53 minutes (walking) and 16.77 minutes (motorised transport); rural: 79.9 and 17.16 minutes, urban: 60.77 and 6.99 minutes. CHC travel time was 227.53 minutes (walking) and 36.23 minutes (motorised transport); rural: 228.36 and 36.80 minutes, urban: 173.65 and 18.26 minutes. PHC APCs for walking were: 18.69% (overall), 20.51% (rural), 13.81% (urban); and for motorised transport were 97.97% (overall), 97.36% (rural), 99.73% (urban). CHC APCs for walking were 10.89% (overall): 11.58% (rural), 9.05% (urban); and for motorised transport were 98.88% (overall), 98.62% (rural), 99.06% (urban).

Conclusion: Our study found marked heterogeneity in geographic access across Indian states/UTs and districts. Geographic access by walking was better in rural India, and was better in urban India by motorised transport.

Keywords: Primary Healthcare, Secondary Healthcare, Geographic Access, Population Coverage, Motorized Transport, Travel Time

1 Background

India is currently the most populous country in the world, being home to over 1.4 billion individuals.(1) Safeguarding the health of this huge population has several challenges and requires immense resources with their commensurate distribution. Geographical factors like the size of the country, the 7th largest in the world, affect the distribution of these resources. Variations in terrain exacerbate these difficulties, particularly in hilly or mountainous regions.(2) The Alma-Ata declaration propounded the goal of “Health for All" recognising the importance of primary health care in attaining this objective.(3) In India, primary health care is rendered mainly by the primary health centres (PHCs), the first point of contact of the community with a trained medical officer. Above the PHCs in the continuum of care are the community health centres (CHCs), which are the first level of referral and provide specialist care. The Indian Public Health Standards (IPHS) 2022 recommend the availability of one PHC for every 50,000 people in urban areas, every 30,000 people in rural areas, and every 20,000 people in tribal/hilly areas. The recommendations for CHCs are that one facility must be available for every 80,000 people in tribal/hilly areas and for every 120,000 people in rural areas. For urban areas, the recommended population norms are one CHC for every 500,000 people in metro areas and every 250,000 people in non-metro regions.(4)

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 availability. On the other hand, accessibility is a spatial measure of ‘closeness’ or geographical proximity with an element of time.(5,6) A mere availability of health facilities will not fulfil the health needs of a population if geographic access is difficult due to reasons such as distance, terrain, or costs. Geographical distance and travel times are significant barriers to accessibility, universalization of health care, and thus utilisation of health services, particularly in rural settings.(6–13) Moreover,

timely geographic access to healthcare is essential to ensure optimal health outcomes.(14–16) Longer travel times have a harmful influence on child mortality rates.(17,18) They are also associated with an increased risk of stillbirths, maternal morbidity, and mortality.(19–22) Increased distances to healthcare facilities can also negatively impact neonatal and maternal outcomes by decreasing the probability of women undergoing institutional delivery.(23,24) Distances do not necessarily indicate geographic access better due to various factors such as terrain. Time taken to travel distances, therefore, serves as a more accurate measure. Furthermore, longer travelling times impose additional burdens like higher travel costs and longer loss of wages.(25–27) Additionally, access, geography, and timeliness have been identified as forms of moral capital when healthcare systems are viewed as moral economies. Taking these into consideration can improve healthcare systems by making them more equitable, effective, and efficient. (28)

It is estimated that 44.2% or 3.16 billion people around the globe would not be able to access healthcare facilities within one hour if they travel on foot. This figure drops to 8.9% or 646 million people with access to motorised transport.(29) Other studies in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) settings have also shown that a significant share of individuals are not able to access healthcare in a timely manner.(30,31) Travel times are particularly higher in rural areas, with motorised transport availability and ownership improving access.(32–35) Similarly, in India, it has been observed that public healthcare accessibility is low in rural areas, particularly for those with no access to motorised transport.(36) However, studies on geographic access to public healthcare facilities in terms of travel time in the Indian context are few and limited in geographical breadth. The current study aims to estimate the travel times and the proportion of the population with timely geographic access to PHCs and CHCs in India.

2 Methods

2.1 Data sources

To comprehensively map the densities of PHCs and CHCs and their travel times, the study necessitated collecting, extracting, and collating data from multiple sources. The geolocation data for the PHCs and CHCs were extracted from the Geographic Information System (GIS) dataset of the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY).(37) The PMGSY is a wholly centrally sponsored scheme by the Government of India (GoI) to provide all-weather connectivity to unconnected habitations as a poverty alleviation strategy. We utilized the 2021 PMGSY GIS dataset and extracted geo-coordinates and other related geographical information for the health facilities under study, i.e., the PHCs and CHCs. PMGSY GIS data on PHCs and CHCs were not available for 7 states/UTs, i.e., Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu (DNH and DD), Delhi, Lakshadweep, Puducherry, and Goa. At the district level, data on PHCs and CHCs were missing for 60 and 134 districts, respectively. The Malaria Atlas Project (MAP) data for the year 2019 were used to obtain the motorized and walking friction rasters for every square kilometre (1 km2).(38) GADM v3.6 data were used to delineate the administrative boundaries of India, while high-resolution (1 sq. km.) United Nations (UN) adjusted population counts from the WorldPop dataset for 2020 for India served as our source of population data.(39,40)

2.2 Outcomes

The study had three outcomes. The first outcome was to calculate the density of health facilities, i.e., the number of PHCs and CHCs for every million population in India. The second outcome was to determine the median travel time to the closest PHC and CHC, from each 1 km2 raster in India. The third outcome was to estimate the proportion of the

population with timely geographic access, also called Access Population Coverage (APC), to a PHC and a CHC. By walk, timely geographic access was defined as access within 30 minutes for PHCs and within 60 minutes for CHCs. For motorised transport, timely geographic access meant access within 60 minutes for PHCs, and 120 minutes for CHCs. These outcomes were calculated for India, 36
states and union territories (UTs), and 735 districts, and their urban and rural areas as well.

2.3. Data Analysis

For geocoding of the primary and secondary healthcare facilities (PHCs and CHCs), addresses were cleaned manually for improved machine readability. The Google Maps' application programming interface (API) and the 'Awesome Table' add-on for Google Sheets for machine or API-based geocoding were used. For locations that returned multiple sets of coordinates, the ones with the most relevant address string were chosen. Geo-coordinates were used to identify and remove duplicates and points extending beyond the latitude and longitude limits of India.

An implementation of the Dijkstra algorithm was utilised to compute the minimum time required to traverse the friction surface from every 1 km^2 pixel (grid cell) on the map to the geo-coordinates of every PHC and CHC. The algorithm was implemented for two modes of transport, i.e., walk and motorised transport. The proportion of the population with access to a PHC within 30 minutes by walking and 60 minutes by motorised transport, and the proportion with access to a CHC within 60 minutes by walking and within 120 minutes by motorised transport were the proxy variables for timely geographic access.

A binary accessibility raster was created with '1's for pixels that fulfilled the timeliness criterion of each proxy variable and '0's for cases otherwise. This raster was then overlaid on the population raster (extent matched). The population figures at each pixel were multiplied with the weights (i.e., 1s and 0s) to get the population number with timely geographic access. Proportions or percentages of the population with timely geographic access were obtained by dividing these numbers by the overall population.

The workflow has been described in Figure 1. The same workflow has been discussed for investigating geographic access to surgical facilities in India (41, 42).



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

3 Results

3.1 Density of healthcare facilities

3.1.1 Primary Health Centres (PHCs)

According to the PMGSY GIS 2021 dataset, there were 31,958 PHCs in India with a national average density of 23.22 centres per million population (cpm). Among states/UTs, Maharashtra (3445) had the highest number of PHCs (3445) while the UT of Ladakh (31) had the lowest number of PHCs. The density of PHCs exceeded the national average in 25/29 (86.21%) states/UTs. The density of PHCs among states/UTs ranged from 8.46 cpm in West Bengal to 124.88 cpm in the state of Arunachal Pradesh. At the district level, the number of PHCs varied from 1 in Khagaria, Bihar, to 386 in Pune, Maharashtra. PHC density at the district level surpassed the national average in 391/675 (57.92%), and ranged from 0.49 cpm in Khagaria, Bihar to 638.23 cpm in Anjaw, Arunachal Pradesh (**Figure 2**)..

3.1.2 Community Health Centres (CHCs)

The total number of CHCs at the national level was 4237 centres. Among states/UTs, the number varied from 2 centres in Sikkim to 760 centres in Uttar Pradesh. The national average density of CHCs was estimated to be 3.07 cpm. The density of CHCs was found to be better than the national average in 16/29 (55.17%) states/UTs. The density of CHCs ranged from 0.16 cpm in West Bengal to 36.25 cpm in Arunachal Pradesh. At the district level, the number of CHCs varied from 1 in 71/601 (11.81%) districts to 95 in Ahmednagar, Maharashtra. The density at the district level exceeded the national average in 353/601 (58.73%). The lowest and the highest density of PHCs were 0.08 cpm in South Twenty Four Parganas and 127.64 cpm in Anjaw, Arunachal Pradesh **(Figure 2)**.



Figure 2: Map depicting the variation in density of a) PHCs and b) CHCs across districts in India.

3.2 Travel time to the nearest PHC

3.2.1 By walking

At the national level, the median time taken to access a PHC by walking was found to be 79.53 (IQR: 45.88-134.00) minutes. The travel time was shorter than the national median in 17/34 (50.0%) states/UTs. The travel times ranged from 47.95 (IQR: 28.86- 73.05) minutes in Punjab to 852.32 (IQR: 477.10-1338.35) minutes in the UT of Ladakh. At the district level, 427/731 (58.10%) districts had a shorter travel time by walking compared to the national value. The walking time to a PHC was the shortest in Nalanda, Bihar [25.06 (IQR: 14.97-41.02) minutes] and the longest in the Upper Dibang Valley, Arunachal Pradesh [1157.79 (IQR: 718.68-1787.32) minutes]. The travel times for rural and urban regions are summarized in **Table 1.**

3.2.2 By motorised transport

At the national level, the median time taken to access a PHC by motorized transport was found to be 16.77 (IQR: 7.79-35.10) minutes. Among states/UTs, 16/34 (47.06%) had a shorter travel time compared to the national median. The UT of Puducherry had the shortest median travel time, 5.95 (IQR: 4.12-7.95) minutes, and the UT of Ladakh had the longest time, 311.73 (IQR: 126.63- 601.20) minutes. At the district level, the travel time was shorter than the national median in 439/731 (60.05%) districts. The travel time ranged from 2.32 (IQR: 1.89- 2.61) minutes in Mahe, Puducherry to 688.49 (IQR: 334.74- 1223.47) minutes in Upper Dibang Valley, Arunachal Pradesh. The travel times for rural and urban regions are summarized in **Table 1.**

3.3 Median travel time to the nearest CHC

3.3.1 By walking

At the national level, the median time to reach the nearest CHC by walk was found to be 227.53 (IQR: 130.80-384.07) minutes. At the State/UT level, 17/34 (50.0%) had a shorter travel time compared to the national median. The median travel time varied from 107.40 (IQR: 64.04-183.95) minutes in Kerala to 1774 (IQR: 1028.23-2513.59) minutes in the UT of Ladakh. The median travel time was shorter than the national value in 428/731 (58.55%) districts. The median time on foot was found to be the shortest in the Bongaigaon district of Assam at 61.63 (IQR: 37.22-92.41) minutes and the longest in the Leh district [2059.95 (IQR: 1488.33-2707.40) minutes] of Ladakh. The travel times for rural and urban regions are summarized in **Table 1.**

3.3.2 By motorised transport

At the national level, the median time to access a CHC by motorised transport was estimated to be 36.23 (IQR: 20.22-63.92) minutes. The travel time was shorter than the national median in 17/34 states/UTs (50.0%). The median time ranged from 12.66 (IQR: 7.44-25.28) minutes in Kerala to 396.83 (IQR: 218.94- 682.48) minutes in Ladakh. The median travel time was shorter than the national value in 435/731 (59.51%) districts. The median time in districts varied from 7.58 (IQR: 5.03-10.49) minutes in Kottayam, Kerala, to 1008.83 (IQR: 437.32-1560.25) minutes in Kurung Kumey of Arunachal Pradesh. The travel times for rural and urban regions are summarized in **Table 1.**

Table 1. Summary of travel times for rural and urban regions.

National level				
Median (IQR) travel time (in minutes)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking	79.9 (46.12-134.28)	60.77 (34.66-94.58)	228.36 (131.55-384.50)	173.65 (96.94-275.93)
Motorised transport	17.16 (8.04-27.57)	6.99 (3.82-11.22)	36.80 (20.68-64.36)	18.26 (10.55-29.29)
State/UT level				
States/UTs with travel time shorter than national median, n (%)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking	16/34 (47.06%)	20/34 (58.82%)	18/34 (52.94%)	17/34 (50.0%)
Motorised transport	16/34 (47.06%)	17/34 (50.0%)	17/34 (50.0%)	17/34 (50.0%)

Shortest median (IQR) travel time (in minutes)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking Motorised transport	Puducherry: 46.65 (33.18 - 59.77) Puducherry: 5.95 (4.12 -7.95)	Manipur: 25.11 (11.08 - 35.24) Manipur: 2.50 (1.58 - 4.14)	Kerala: 112.31 (64.29-199.52) Kerala: 13.69 (7.77-30.88)	Kerala: 88.92 (57.80-128.72) Kerala: 9.39 (6.15-13.48)
Longest median (IQR) travel time (in minutes)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking Motorised transport	Ladakh: 852.06 (477.00 -1337.78) Ladakh: 311.74 (126.63-601.20)	Goa: 451.13 (399.61-540.95) Goa: 41.33 (35.11-48.98)	Ladakh: 1773.88 (1027.79-2513.11) Ladakh: 396.73 (218.88-681.95)	Mizoram: 863.19 (450.79-897.74) Goa: 73.08 (65.99-79.98)
District level				

Districts with travel time shorter than the national median, n (%)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking	427/722 (59.14%)	306/689 (44.41%)	429/722 (59.41%)	338/689 (49.05%)
Motorised transport	427/722 (59.14%)	334/689 (48.48%)	428/731 (58.55%)	358/689 (51.96%)
Shortest median (IQR) travel time (in minutes)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking	Mahe, Puducherry: 24.11 (22.96-25.27)	NGH[1], Meghalaya: 8.64 (4.32-12.25)	Alappuzha, Kerala: 57.74 (37.36-84.46)	Changlang, Arunachal Pradesh: 13.60 (9.88-21.03)
Motorised transport	Pulwama, J&K[3]: 685.55 (333.12-1214.67)	Kakching, Manipur: 1.57 (0.79-2.40)	Alappuzha, Kerala: 6.7 (4.11-10.01)	West District, Sikkim: 1.34 (1.08-1.60)
Longest median (IQR) travel time (in minutes)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)

Walking	UDV[2], Arunachal Pradesh: 1151.97 (717.39-1780.34)	South Goa, Goa: 525.79 (445.30-573.21)	Leh, Ladakh: 2059.70 (1487.61-2706.89)	Murshidabad, West Bengal: 953.89 (495.94-1120.93)
Motorised transport	UDV[2], Arunachal Pradesh: 685.55 (333.12-1214.67)	Mirpur, J&K[3]: 120.42 (120.42-120.42)	KK[4], Arunachal Pradesh: 1007.826 (437.17-1558.69)	Dakshin Dinajpur, West Bengal: 94.53 (83.39-125.52)

[1]NGH: North Garo Hills, [2]UDV: Upper Dibang Valley, [3]J&K: Jammu & Kashmir, [4]KK: Kurung Kumey

3.4 Access Population Coverage (APC) for PHCs

3.4.1 By walking

By walking, timely geographical access to a PHC meant being able to access one within 30 minutes. At the national level, the APC was estimated to be 18.69%. At the state/UT level, 16/34 (47.06%) had an APC greater than the national median. APC ranged from 0.84% in Chandigarh to 43.71% in Manipur. Among districts, 305/731 (41.72%) had an APC greater than the national average, and greater than 50% in 21/731 (2.86%) districts. APC varied from 0.02% in Upper Dibang Valley, Arunachal Pradesh, to 75.69% in Mahe, Puducherry **(Figure 3)**. APC was estimated to be 0 in 3/36 (8.33%) state/UTs (Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Goa, Lakshadweep) and 16/731 (2.19%) districts. APC was less than 50% in all states/UTs; it was 0% in Goa, and <1% in Chandigarh. The APCs for urban and rural regions, and the urban-rural differences in APC, have been summarized in **Table 2** and **Table 3**. APC was less than 50% in all rural and urban areas except urban Manipur (69.3%). APC was 0% in rural Goa, urban Mizoram, urban Goa, and <1% in urban Chandigarh.

3.4.2 By motorised transport

By motorised transport, timely geographical access to a PHC meant being able to access one within 60 minutes. At the national level, the APC was estimated to be 97.97%. At the state/UT level, 17/34 (50.0%) had an APC greater than the national average. APC was greater than 50% in 33/34 (97.06%) states/UTs, and ranged from 44.70% in Ladakh to 100% in the UTs of Delhi and Chandigarh. APC was greater than the national average in 412/731 (56.05%) districts and greater than 50% in 714/731 (97.67%) districts. APC ranged from 13.39% in Muzaffarabad, Jammu & Kashmir, to 100% in 82/735 (11.16%) districts **(Figure 3)**. APC was estimated to be 0 in 2/34 (5.88%) states/UTs (Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Lakshadweep). The APCs for urban and rural regions, and the urban-rural differences in

APC, have been summarized in **Table 2** and **Table 3.** APC was greater than 50% in urban areas of all states/UTs. In rural areas, the APC was less than 50% in Ladakh (44.6%).

3.5. Access Population Coverage (APC) for CHCs

3.5.1 By walking

By walking, timely geographic access to a CHC meant being able to access one within 60 minutes. At the national level, the APC was estimated to be 10.89%. At the state/UT level, 14/34 (41.18%) had an APC greater than the national average. APC ranged from 0.08% in Puducherry to 29.39% for the state of Kerala. Among districts, 286/735 (38.91%) had an APC greater than the national average, while APC was found to be greater than 50% in 2/731 (0.27%) districts. APC varied from 0.02% in Mahabubnagar, Telangana, to 52.20% in Dhanbad, Jharkhand **(Figure 3)**. APC was estimated to be 0 in 1/34 (2.94%) states (Goa) and 57/731 (7.8%) districts. The APCs for urban and rural regions, and the urban-rural differences in APC, have been summarized in **Table 2** and **Table 3**. APC was less than 1% in rural Puducherry, urban Puducherry, urban DNH, DD, and urban Mizoram.

3.5.2 By motorised transport

By motorised transport, timely geographic access to a CHC meant being able to access one within 120 minutes. At the national level, the APC was estimated to be 98.88%. Among states/UTs, APC was greater than the national average in 16/34 (47.06%) states/UTs and greater than 50% in 33/34 (97.06%) states/UTs, respectively, and ranged from 49.65% in Ladakh to 100% in the UTs of Delhi and Chandigarh. Among districts, 487/735 (66.26%) had an APC greater than the national average, while APC was found to be greater than 50% in 719/735 (97.82%) districts and was 0% in 4/735 (0.54%) districts. The APCs for urban and rural regions, and the urban-rural differences in APC, have been summarized in **Table 2** and

Table 3. Urban areas performed better, with APC greater than 50% in urban areas of all states/UTs, while in rural areas, it was less than 50% in Ladakh (49.54%).



Figure 3: Maps depicting the APC in the districts of India for a) PHCs by walking, b) PHCs by motorised transport, c) CHCs by walking, and d) CHCs by motorised transport.

Table 2: Summary of access population coverage (APC) for rural and urban regions.

National level				
Access Population Coverage (APC), %				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking	20.51%	13.81%	11.58%	9.05%
Motorised transport	97.36%	99.73%	98.62%	99.66%
State/UT level				
States/UTs with APC greater than the national average, n (%)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking	15/34 (44.12%)	15/34 (44.12%)	14/34 (41.18%)	14/34 (41.18%)
Motorised transport	18/34 (52.94%)	24/34 (70.59%)	18/34 (52.94%)	25/34 (73.53%)
States/UTs with APC = 0, n (%)				

	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking Motorised transport	1/34 (8.82%) 0/34 (0.0%)	2/34 (5.88%) 0/34 (0.0%)	2/34 (5.88%) 0/34 (0.0%)	2/34 (5.88%) 0/34 (0.0%)
States/UTs with APC ≥ 50% n (%)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking Motorised transport	0/34 (0.0%) 33/34 (97.06%)	1/34 (2.94%) 34/34 (100%)	0/34 (0.0%) 33/34 (97.06%)	0/34 (0.0%) 34/34 (100%)
States/UTs with APC = 100% n (%)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking Motorised transport	0/34 (0.0%) 2/34 (5.88%)	0/34 (0.0%) 8/34 (23.53%)	0/34 (0.0%) 2/34 (5.88%)	0/34 (0.0%) 13/34 (38.23%)
State with the lowest access population coverage (APC), %				

	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking Motorised transport	Delhi: 1.4% Ladakh: 44.58%	Chandigarh: 0.79% Goa: 94.83%	Puducherry: 0.15% Ladakh: 49.54	Puducherry: 0.06% Goa: 95.39%
State with the highest access population coverage (APC), %				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking Motorised transport	Himachal Pradesh: 37.34% Chandigarh & Delhi: 100%	Manipur: 69.33% 8 states/UTs: 100%	Kerala: 34.31% Chandigarh & Delhi: 100%	Jharkhand: 35.35% 13 states/UTs: 100%
District level				
Districts with APC greater than the national average, n (%)				

	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking	282/722 (39.06%)	338/689 (49.06%)	279/722 (38.64%)	290/689 (42.09%)
Motorised transport	426/724 (58.84%)	620/689 (89.98%)	493/724 (68.09%)	635/689 (92.16%)
Districts with APC = 0, n (%)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking	7/722 (0.97%)	63/689 (9.14%)	47/722 (6.51%)	158/689 (22.93%)
Motorised transport	0/724 (0.0%)	0/689 (0.0%)	0/724 (0.0%)	0/689 (0.0%)
Districts with APC ≥ 50% n (%)				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking	20/722 (2.77%)	47/689 (6.82%)	3/722 (0.42%)	46/689 (6.68%)
Motorised transport	707/724 (97.65%)	689/689 (100.0%)	712/724 (98.34%)	688/689 (99.85%)
Districts with APC = 100% n (%)				

	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking Motorised transport	0/722 (0%) 78/724 (10.77%)	1/689 (0.14%) 555/689 (80.55%)	0/722 (0.0%) 188/724 (25.97%)	2/689 (0.29%) 593/689 (86.07%)
District with the lowest access population coverage (APC), %				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking Motorised transport	UDV[1], Arunachal Pradesh: 0.02% Muzaffarabad, J&K[2]: 13.39%	Fazilka, Punjab: 0.03% Diu, DNH and DD[3]: 64.54%	Mahabubnagar, Telangana: 0.02% Anjaw, Arunachal Pradesh: 17.36%	Bastar, Chhattisgarh: 0.01% Dakshin Dinajpur, West Bengal: 42.89%
District with the highest access population coverage (APC), %				
	PHC (Rural)	PHC (Urban)	CHC (Rural)	CHC (Urban)
Walking	Mahe, Puducherry: 99.54%	Tengnoupal, Manipur: 100%	Dhanbad, Jharkhand: 52.20%	2 districts: 100%

Motorised transport	78 districts: 100%	555 districts: 100%	188 districts: 100%	593 districts: 100%

[1]UDV: Upper Dibang Valley, [2]J&K: Jammu & Kashmir, [3]DNH and DD: Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu

Table 3: Urban-rural differences in access population coverage (APC) by mode of transport.

National level			
		PHC	*CHC*
Walking		-6.70%	-2.53%
Motorised transport		2.37%	1.04%
State level			
Urban-rural difference in APC (%)			
		PHC	*CHC*
Walking	Negative[1]	24/34 (70.59%)	23/34 (67.65%)
	Positive[2]	9/34 (26.47%)	10/34 (29.41%)
	Zero[3]	1/34 (2.94%)*	1/34 (2.94%)*
	Negative[1]	3/34 (8.82%)	3/34 (8.82%)

Motorised transport	Positive[2]	29/34 (95.3%)	29/34 (85.29%)
	Zero[3]	2/34 (5.88%)[#]	2/34 (5.88%)[#]
Lowest urban-rural difference in APC (%)			
		PHC	*CHC*
Walking *Motorised transport*		*Sikkim:* -19% *Goa:* -3.87%	*Nagaland:* -10.83% *Goa:* -3.72%
Highest urban-rural difference in APC (%)			
		PHC	*CHC*
Walking *Motorised transport*		*Manipur:* 34.96% *Ladakh:* 55.42%	*Jharkhand:* 19.44% *Ladakh:* 50.45%
District level			
Urban-rural difference in APC (%)			

		PHC	*CHC*
Walking	Negative[1]	443/680 (65.15%)	393/680 (57.79%)
	Positive[2]	231/680 (33.97%)	251/680 (36.91%)
	Zero[3]	6/680 (0.88%)*	36/680 (5.29%)*
Motorised transport	Negative[1]	24/692 (3.47%)	29/682 (4.25%)
	Positive[2]	581/692 (83.96%)	441/682 (64.66%)
	Zero[3]	77/692 (11.12%)[#]	212/682 (31.08%)[#]
Lowest urban-rural difference in APC (%)			
		PHC	*CHC*
Walking		*Sivaganga, Tamil Nadu:* -39.4%	*Lower Subansiri. Arunachal Pradesh:* -34.60%
Motorised transport		*Diu, DNH and DD[4]:* - 31.85%	*Diu, DNH and DD[4]:* - 31.85%

Highest urban-rural difference in APC (%)		
	PHC	*CHC*
Walking *Motorised transport*	*Tengnoupal, Manipur:* 82.76% *Kishtwar, Jammu & Kashmir:* 69.41%	*West district, Sikkim:* 92.56% *Kishtwar, Jammu & Kashmir:* 69.41%

[1]*Negative urban-rural difference means that timely geographical access was lower in urban regions compared to rural regions*

[2]*Positive urban-rural difference means that timely geographical access was higher in urban regions compared to rural regions*

[3]*Zero urban-rural difference means that timely geographical access was equal in both urban and rural regions*

**The APC difference was zero because the urban and rural APCs were zero*

#APC difference was zero because the urban and rural APCs were 100

[4]*DNH and DD: Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu*

4 Discussion

4.1 Summary and interpretation of findings

The main aim of this study was to map timely geographic access to primary and secondary public healthcare facilities across geographic scales from the national to the district levels in India. Arunachal Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Nagaland, and Ladakh were observed to have the highest densities of PHCs and CHCs. The lowest densities for PHCs were seen in West Bengal, Bihar, and Uttar Pradesh, and the lowest densities for CHCs were observed in West Bengal, Tamil Nadu, and Maharashtra. Travel times by walking were the longest in states/UTs with difficult terrain, including Arunachal Pradesh, Ladakh, Mizoram, and Sikkim. Urban areas fared better than rural areas, possibly due to a dearth of pedestrian-friendly infrastructure in the latter. The average road density for India in 2018-19 was 5296.3 per 1000 km^2 for urban areas in comparison to 1458.1 for rural areas (43). This could explain the relatively shorter travel times observed for urban areas by motorised transport. However, even in the case of motorised transport, travel times were the longest in the states/UTs of Arunachal Pradesh, Ladakh, Mizoram, and Sikkim. Therefore, it can be seen that the nature of the terrain in these regions tends to slow down movement in general, whether on foot or by motorised transport.

Travel time, a summary statistic, cannot showcase a holistic picture of geographic access. Hence, we looked at access population coverage (APC) as a measure of geographic access. Geographic access by walking was found to be poor. Overall, approximately 1118 million or 81.31% Indians, 798 million or 79.49% rural Indians, and 320 million or 86.19% urban Indians were beyond the 30-minute threshold. Similarly, approximately 1225 million or 89.11% Indians, 888 million or 88.42% rural Indians, and 337 million or 90.95% urban Indians were beyond the 60-minute threshold for CHCs. Geographic access by walking was

low in Arunachal Pradesh, Ladakh, Mizoram, Goa, Chandigarh, Delhi, Puducherry, and DNH and DD. This could have resulted from the long travel times in Arunachal Pradesh, Ladakh, and Mizoram. The PMGSY dataset lacked information on primary and secondary healthcare facilities for Goa, Chandigarh, Delhi, Puducherry, and DNH & DD. This resulted in artificially long travel times and low geographic access for these states/UTs. Geographic access by walking was heterogeneous across states/UTs and districts but was generally better in rural areas compared to urban areas, despite the longer travel times. This could be credited to improvements in the rural health infrastructure brought about by sustained investments over the last two decades through the National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) (44). On the whole, these figures depict an alarming situation, as they indicate that hundreds of millions of Indians lack geographic access to primary and secondary healthcare, resulting in significant repercussions for their health.

Approximately 28 million Indians, 27 million rural Indians, and 1 million urban Indians were still beyond the 60-minute threshold by motorised transport for PHCs. For CHCs, approximately 15 million, 14 million rural Indians, and 1 million urban Indians were beyond the 120-minute threshold. Although these percentages appear small, they translate into a sizable number of Indians lacking geographic access and merit a deeper look for action. Geographic access was on the lower end for Ladakh, Arunachal Pradesh, and Mizoram, possibly due to the long travel times in these regions. On the other hand, it was 100% for Chandigarh and Delhi despite the lack of primary and secondary healthcare facilities for these UTs in the PMGSY dataset. The small administrative areas of these UTs and well-developed road networks, due to their urban nature, could have facilitated quick access to primary and secondary healthcare facilities beyond their borders. There was marked heterogeneity in

geographic access by motorised transport across states/UTs and districts, but it was generally better in urban areas.

4.2 Strengths and limitations

Our study has the following strengths. First, using the PMGSY GIS dataset allowed us to analyse precisely geocoded locations of primary and secondary healthcare facilities. This enabled us to comprehensively map travel times and geographic access using APC. Second, travel times and APCs were estimated for two modes of travel: walking and motorised transport, and two regions: rural and urban. Third, estimates were calculated up to the district level, lending further strength to our study.

There were certain limitations as well. First, data related to primary and secondary health facilities were not available for several states/UTs and districts. However, the algorithm estimated travel times and APCs except for Lakshadweep and Andaman & Nicobar. This resulted in artificially longer travel times and artificially low APCs for these states/UTs and districts. Second, our study is also limited by the lack of information on the functional status of the health facilities. Third, the estimates for walking do not account for groups like the elderly or disabled, who would lack access despite geographical and temporal proximity. Fourth, the APCs for motorised transport assume that everybody has access to it, the unavailability of which would preclude an individual from accessing a health facility on time.

4.3 Implications and Takeaways

Increased travel times and low geographic access can result in reduced utilization of health services and worsen health outcomes. Issues with healthcare access also impede the pursuit of Universal Health Coverage (UHC), and deepen inequities (9,13–15,18–22,24,30). We

identified three states/UTs that must be the focus of future policy and efforts like APC-guided facility placement and improvements in pedestrian and road infrastructure, as they were consistently found to have long travel times and low geographic access: Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram, and Ladakh. Our findings indicate that the current spatial distribution of primary and secondary healthcare facilities in India does not favour geographic access for a major portion of the Indian population by walking. A spatial coverage modelling study done in one district of Jammu & Kashmir, India, reported that access to ambulatory and immunization care within one hour of walking was 17% (36). A similar study from Western Province, Rwanda, found that 26.6% of the population could access the primary health care network by walking within one hour (34). This divergence in findings across studies can be explained by the differences in study settings and the methodologies used to determine geographic access. Investments in pedestrian infrastructure to improve walkability in the short term and utilising APC as a guidance tool for locating health facilities in the long term can help ameliorate this situation.

Geographic access by motorised transport to primary and secondary healthcare facilities in the current study was high. This phenomenon of high geographic access by motorised transport has been noted in other studies as well (29,33,36). However, geographic access was lower in rural areas compared to urban areas. This can be addressed by improving public road transport and strengthening ambulance networks in these areas. These measures are faster to implement and are a pragmatic stopgap until a more equitable APC-guided establishment of future healthcare facilities can be achieved over a long-term horizon. Furthermore, our study also lends support to the use of APC as a measure of geographic access over travel times. We noticed that the travel times for walking in urban areas were shorter compared to rural areas, but APC values were lower for urban areas. This is because APC takes into account

population size, density, and spatial distribution of health facilities, providing a more holistic view of geographic access. Finally, it is necessary to highlight that future research must incorporate the functional status of the health facilities as well as population attributes that facilitate or impede geographic access. This will result in more precise estimates of geographic access to health facilities and better inform policy making and programmes.

5 Conclusion

This study finds several gaps in geographic access to primary and secondary healthcare facilities in India, particularly for walking. Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram, and Ladakh, with long travel times and low geographic access, should be the priority areas for future interventions. Focusing on APC-based facility establishment and pedestrian infrastructure can help improve geographic access by walking. Additionally, rural areas must be prioritized for improvements in road transport and ambulance networks. Addressing these disparities in geographic access is essential for improving health outcomes and achieving UHC.

6 List of Abbreviations

1. PHC: Primary Health Centre
2. CHC: Community Health Centre
3. IPHS: Indian Public Health Standards
4. LMIC: Low-and Middle Income Countries
5. GIS: Geographic Information System
6. PMGSY: Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana
7. GoI: Government of India
8. MAP: Malaria Atlas Project
9. UN: United Nations

10. APC: Access Population Coverage
11. UT: Union Territory
12. API: Application Programming Interface
13. RHS: Rural Health Statistics

7 Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable

Consent for publication: Not applicable

Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study is available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests: Siddhesh Zadey is the co-founding director of the Association for Socially Applicable Research (ASAR). He also represents ASAR at the G4 Alliance Permanent Council, and serves as the Chair of the SOTA Care in Asia Working Group, The G4 Alliance, a Fellow of the Lancet Citizens' Commission on Reimagining India's Health System, and a Drafting Committee Member for Maharashtra State Mental Health Policy. Other authors declare no competing interests.

Funding: None

Authors' contributions:

Study concept and design: Siddhesh Zadey

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: Shreyas Patil, Harsh Thakkar, Aamir Miyajiwala, Anoushka Arora, Harsh Thakkar, Ankit Raj, Siddhesh Zadey

Drafting of the manuscript: Shreyas Patil, Anoushka Arora

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

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

Administrative, technical, or material support: Siddhesh Zadey

Study supervision: Siddhesh Zadey

Acknowledgements: None

8 Bibliography

1. UN DESA Policy Brief No. 153: India overtakes China as the world's most populous country | Department of Economic and Social Affairs [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 18]. Available from: https://www.un.org/development/desa/dpad/publication/un-desa-policy-brief-no-153-india-overtakes-china-as-the-worlds-most-populous-country/
2. The hilly terrain: Discussing health in Manipur [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 29]. Available from: https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/health-manipur-hilly-terrain
3. International Conference on Primary Health Care. Declaration of Alma-Ata. WHO Chron. 1978 Nov;32(11):428–30.
4. IPHS 2022 Guidelines | National Health Systems Resource Centre [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 29]. Available from: https://nhsrcindia.org/IPHS2022/iphs-2022-guidelines
5. McLaughlin CG, Wyszewianski L. Access to care: remembering old lessons. Health Serv Res. 2002 Dec;37(6):1441–3.
6. Forsyth A. Geographic Healthcare Access and Place. Health and Places Initiative; 2014 Sep.
7. Garchitorena A, Ihantamalala FA, Révillion C, Cordier LF, Randriamihaja M, Razafinjato B, et al. Geographic barriers to achieving universal health coverage: evidence from rural Madagascar. Health Policy Plan. 2021 Nov 11;36(10):1659–70.

8. Varela C, Young S, Mkandawire N, Groen RS, Banza L, Viste A. TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS TO ACCESS HEALTH CARE FOR SURGICAL CONDITIONS IN MALAWI a cross sectional nationwide household survey. BMC Public Health. 2019 Mar 5;19(1):264.

9. Ipa M, Laksono AD, Wulandari RD. The Role of Travel Time on Hospital Utilization in the Islands Area: A Cross-Sectional Study in the Maluku Region, Indonesia, in 2018. Indian J Community Med. 2023 Apr 7;48(2):269–73.

10. Al-Taiar A, Clark A, Longenecker JC, Whitty CJM. Physical accessibility and utilization of health services in Yemen. Int J Health Geogr. 2010 Jul 21;9:38.

11. Müller I, Smith T, Mellor S, Rare L, Genton B. The effect of distance from home on attendance at a small rural health centre in Papua New Guinea. Int J Epidemiol. 1998 Oct;27(5):878–84.

12. Stock R. Distance and the utilization of health facilities in rural Nigeria. Soc Sci Med. 1983;17(9):563–70.

13. Panciera R, Khan A, Rizvi SJR, Ahmed S, Ahmed T, Islam R, et al. The influence of travel time on emergency obstetric care seeking behavior in the urban poor of Bangladesh: a GIS study. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2016 Aug 22;16(1):240.

14. Barry R, Rehm J, de Oliveira C, Gozdyra P, Chen S, Kurdyak P. The relationship between rurality, travel time to care and death by suicide. BMC Psychiatry. 2023 May 17;23(1):345.

15. Konerding U, Bowen T, Elkhuizen SG, Faubel R, Forte P, Karampli E, et al. The impact of travel distance, travel time and waiting time on health-related quality of life of diabetes patients: An investigation in six European countries. Diabetes Res Clin Pract. 2017 Apr;126:16–24.

16. Kelly C, Hulme C, Farragher T, Clarke G. Are differences in travel time or distance to healthcare for adults in global north countries associated with an impact on health outcomes? A systematic review. BMJ Open. 2016 Nov 24;6(11):e013059.

17. Okwaraji YB, Cousens S, Berhane Y, Mulholland K, Edmond K. Effect of geographical access to health facilities on child mortality in rural Ethiopia: a community based cross sectional study. PLoS ONE. 2012 Mar 12;7(3):e33564.

18. Manongi R, Mtei F, Mtove G, Nadjm B, Muro F, Alegana V, et al. Inpatient child mortality by travel time to hospital in a rural area of Tanzania. Trop Med Int Health. 2014 May;19(5):555–62.

19. Örtqvist AK, Haas J, Ahlberg M, Norman M, Stephansson O. Association between travel time to delivery unit and unplanned out-of-hospital birth, infant morbidity and mortality: A population-based cohort study. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2021 Aug;100(8):1478–89.

20. Luke S, Hobbs A, Mak S, Der K, Pederson A, Schummers L. Travel Time to Delivery, Antenatal Care, and Birth Outcomes: A Population-Based Cohort of Uncomplicated Pregnancies in British Columbia, 2012-2019. J Obstet Gynaecol Can. 2022 Aug;44(8):886–94.

21. Ravelli ACJ, Jager KJ, de Groot MH, Erwich JJHM, Rijninks-van Driel GC, Tromp M, et al. Travel time from home to hospital and adverse perinatal outcomes in women at term in the Netherlands. BJOG. 2011 Mar;118(4):457–65.

22. Hanson C, Cox J, Mbaruku G, Manzi F, Gabrysch S, Schellenberg D, et al. Maternal mortality and distance to facility-based obstetric care in rural southern Tanzania: a secondary analysis of cross-sectional census data in 226 000 households. Lancet Glob Health. 2015 Jul;3(7):e387-95.

23. Kumar S, Dansereau EA, Murray CJL. Does distance matter for institutional delivery in rural India? Appl Econ. 2014 Nov 22;46(33):4091–103.

24. McGuire F, Kreif N, Smith PC. The effect of distance on maternal institutional delivery choice: Evidence from Malawi. Health Econ. 2021 Sep;30(9):2144–67.

25. 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 Jun;8(6).

26. 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 Aug 1;37(22):1935–45.

27. 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 Aug 21;21(1):854.

28. Bartosch P, Jaye C, Crampton P. Moral economy and moral capital: A new approach to understanding health systems. Soc Sci Med. 2024 Jul;352:117016.

29. Weiss DJ, Nelson A, Vargas-Ruiz CA, Gligorić K, Bavadekar S, Gabrilovich E, et al. Global maps of travel time to healthcare facilities. Nat Med. 2020 Dec;26(12):1835–8.

30. Amoah-Nuamah J, Agyemang-Duah W, Prosper Ninorb G, Gladstone Ekeme B. Analysis of spatial distribution of health care facilities and its effects on access to primary healthcare in rural communities in kpandai district, ghana. Cogent Public Health. 2023 Dec 31;10(1).

31. Palk L, Okano JT, Dullie L, Blower S. Travel time to health-care facilities, mode of transportation, and HIV elimination in Malawi: a geospatial modelling analysis. Lancet Glob Health. 2020 Dec;8(12):e1555–64.

32. Carrasco-Escobar G, Manrique E, Tello-Lizarraga K, Miranda JJ. Travel time to health facilities as a marker of geographical accessibility across heterogeneous land coverage in peru. Front Public Health. 2020 Sep 16;8:498.

33. Ouko JJO, Gachari MK, Sichangi AW, Alegana V. Geographic information system‐based evaluation of spatial accessibility to maternal health facilities in Siaya County, Kenya. Geographical Research. 2019 Aug;57(3):286–98.

34. Huerta Munoz U, Källestål C. Geographical accessibility and spatial coverage modeling of the primary health care network in the Western Province of Rwanda. Int J Health Geogr. 2012 Sep 17;11:40.

35. Comber AJ, Brunsdon C, Radburn R. A spatial analysis of variations in health access: linking geography, socio-economic status and access perceptions. Int J Health Geogr. 2011 Jul 25;10:44.

36. Verma VR, Dash U. Geographical accessibility and spatial coverage modelling of public health care network in rural and remote India. PLoS ONE. 2020 Oct 21;15(10):e0239326.

37. Home | National Rural Infrastructure Development Agency (NRIDA), Government of India [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 30]. Available from: https://pmgsy.nic.in/

38. MAP [Internet]. Maria Atlas. [cited 2024 Jun 30]. Available from: https://malariaatlas.org/our-work/

39. GADM. GADM maps and data [Internet]. GADM. [cited 2021 Mar 16]. Available from: https://gadm.org/index.html

40. Global 1km Population total adjusted to match the corresponding UNPD estimate. University of Southampton. 2020;

41. Jadhav T, Vissoci JRN, Zadey S. Measuring timely geographical access to surgical care in India: a geospatial modelling study. Lancet Glob Health. 2022 Mar;10 Suppl 1:S29.

42. Zadey S. Measuring Access to Surgical Care in Rural India: Synthesis of Data and Novel Index. 2021;

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

44. National Rural Health Mission :: National Health Mission [Internet]. [cited 2025 Feb 16]. Available from: https://nhm.gov.in/index1.php?lang=1&level=1&lid=49&sublinkid=969