Impact of the Liberian National Community Health Assistant Program on Childhood Illness Treatment in Grand Bassa County, Liberia: A Difference-in-Differences Analysis of Population-Based Data

Short Title: Impact of the Liberian National Community Health Assistant Program

Authors

Emily White^{1¶}, Savior Mendin^{2¶}, Featha R. Kolubah³, Robert Karlay², Ben Grant², George P. Jacobs⁴, Marion Subah², Mark J. Siedner^{5,6}, John D. Kraemer^{7&}, and Lisa R. Hirschhorn^{1,8&}

¹ Last Mile Health, Boston, MA, USA

² Last Mile Health, Monrovia, Liberia

³ Grand Bassa County Health Team, Buchanan, Liberia

⁴ Ministry of Health, Monrovia, Liberia

⁵ Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

⁶ Center for Global Health, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

⁷ Department of Health Systems Administration, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA

⁸ Department of Medical Social Sciences, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

¶Emily White and Savior Mendin contributed equally as first authors.

&Lisa R. Hirschhorn and John D. Kraemer contributed equally as senior authors.

Funding:

This study was supported by the United States Agency for International Development's Development Innovation Ventures, Johnson & Johnson, and the Margaret A. Cargill Foundation. JDK receives salary support from Last Mile Health. The program being evaluated was supported by the Children's Investment Fund Foundation; Co-Impact; CRI Foundation; Crown Family Philanthropies; David Weekley Family Foundation; Deerfield Foundation; The ELMA Foundation; Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance; IZUMI Foundation; Jasmine Social Investments; Johnson & Johnson; King Philanthropies; Lucille Foundation; Mulago Foundation; Peery Foundation; Swedish Postcode Foundation; Pfizer Inc.; Planet Wheeler Foundation; Ripple Foundation; Skoll Foundation; Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Limited; UBS

37 Optimus Foundation; USAID Development Innovation Ventures; Valhalla Foundation; and Virgin Unite.

38 Funders played no role in the design, conduct, or reporting of the study.

39

40 **Author contributions**

41 EW, MJS, LRH, and JDK designed the study. RK and TG conducted the data collection and review.

42 SM, MS, FK, GJ participated in the design and implementation of the intervention. EW and JDK

43 analyzed the data. JDK, SM, EW, and LRH drafted the manuscript. All authors reviewed and revised the

44 manuscript and approved its final version.

45

Abstract

Liberia launched its National Community Health Assistant Program in 2016, which seeks to ensure that all people living 5 kilometers or farther from a health facility have access to trained, supplied, supervised, and paid community health workers (CHWs). This study aims to evaluate the impact of the national program following implementation in Grand Bassa County in 2018 using data from population-based surveys.

We measured before-to-after changes in childhood treatment from qualified providers in a portion of the county that implemented in a first phase compared to those which had not yet implemented. We also assessed changes in whether children received oral rehydration therapy for diarrhea and malaria rapid diagnostic tests if they had a fever by a qualified provider (facility based or CHW). For these analyses, we used a difference-in-differences approach and adjusted for potential confounding using inverse probability of treatment weighting. We also assessed changes in the source from which care was received and examined changes by key dimensions of equity (distance from health facilities, maternal education, and household wealth).

We found that treatment of childhood illness by a qualified provider increased by 60.3 percentage points (95%CI 44.7-76.0) more in intervention than comparison areas. Difference-in-differences for oral rehydration therapy and malaria rapid diagnostic tests were 37.6 (95%CI 19.5-55.8) and 38.5 (95%CI 19.9-57.0) percentage points, respectively.

In intervention areas, treatment by a CHW increased from 0 to 81.6% and care from unqualified providers dropped. Increases in treatment by a qualified provider did not vary significantly by household wealth, remoteness, or maternal education.

72 This evaluation found evidence that the Liberian National Community Health Assistant Program has
73 increased access to effective treatment in rural Grand Bassa County. Improvements were approximately
74 equal across three measured dimensions of marginalization.

75

Introduction

Liberia has made significant gains in child health since the end of its prolonged civil war. Under-five mortality has reduced by approximately 15% since 2007.(1) Nationwide, these improvements were driven by substantial investments in public sector delivery of health care, strengthening of facility-based services and improved public health services.(2–4) Despite these gains, Liberia continues to suffer one of the highest rates of child death in the world, and Liberian children who live in rural areas are about 20% more likely to die before their fifth birthday than their urban counterparts.(1) This disparity results in part from higher barriers to care for easily treatable childhood illnesses, including higher rates of poverty, insufficient access to transportation, delays from greater travel time, lower health literacy, and, in some instances, lower quality of health services in rural areas.(5–7) Because they provide services directly in rural communities, community health worker (CHW) programs can be well suited to overcoming these barriers.(8–10)

In collaboration with the Liberian Ministry of Health, Last Mile Health, a non-governmental organization, implemented a pilot program of community health workers in Grand Gedeh County in 2012. The aim of the pilot program was to offer proof of principle data on whether trained, well-supplied, and supervised CHWs could increase access to preventive and curative treatment for malaria, pneumonia and diarrhea among children and expand maternal and reproductive health in rural communities. Early evaluation of this pilot project demonstrated before-to-after improvements in management of these childhood illnesses and uptake in facility-based delivery.(11) In a follow-up difference-in-differences analysis, a similar demonstration project in Rivercess County, Liberia, also showed substantial increases in childhood treatment from qualified providers in intervention areas and that care shifted from informal and traditional providers toward CHWs.(12)

Based in part on the early success of these initial pilot programs and lessons from the 2014-2015 Ebola epidemic response, Liberia adopted a National Community Health Assistant Program (NCHAP) in 2016 as part of a comprehensive strategy to extend the reach of the country's primary health care system into areas more than 5km from a health facility. The program uses an integrated and standardized approach in which CHWs, called community health assistants (CHAs), are trained and deliver a package of interventions in their communities.(13,14) However, the impact of implementation under the full national program on access and uptake of health services has not been assessed. Further, more data are needed to assess whether the program has been implemented in a way that equitably includes the most vulnerable populations.

Our study seeks to evaluate the national CHA program implementation in rural Grand Bassa County, Liberia. The implementation was led by the Liberian Ministry of Health with technical and financial support from Last Mile Health. Because program implementation was phased for operational reasons, we can assess program impact by measuring changes in child health treatment in areas that have already implemented compared to areas that have not implemented yet. We aim to answer three questions. First, did the program achieve greater gains to child health treatment in intervention areas than seen in comparison areas where implementation has not yet begun? Second, if treatment gains are observed, did the source of care shift to CHAs and facility-based providers from less effective informal sector providers? Third, how did changes in child health treatment outcomes in implementation areas vary across three measures of inequity: relative poverty, geographic remoteness, and maternal education?

Methods

Setting, population, and services

Grand Bassa is a predominately rural county in south-central Liberia, with a population of approximately 220,000 people spread over approximately 8000 square kilometers who are served by 31 health facilities.(15) It is divided into eight health districts. The CHA intervention began in Grand Bassa County in June 2018 and provides services to households in communities more than 5 km from the nearest health facility. Because of resource constraints, the program rollout was planned in four phases, with two health districts per phase. In this paper, we report results from the first phase of implementation.

Through the national program, CHAs provide a comprehensive package of health promotion and treatment services, including modules focused on maternal, newborn, and young child health; community registration; surveillance for diseases of epidemic potential; and family planning. These community-based providers are trained on integrated community case management protocols and provided commodities to treat uncomplicated suspected malaria, acute respiratory illness, and diarrhea and to support referral of complicated cases to health facilities. CHAs receive a monthly stipend of \$70 USD and are supervised by Community Health Services Supervisors who are mostly nurses, physician assistants, or midwives. The CHSS conducts supervision visits to each community health assistant twice monthly. There were 100 CHAs and 10 Community Health Services Supervisors at the time of the evaluation. All services were delivered following the standard of care under Liberian policy. Further details about CHA recruitment, training, supervision, incentives, and provision have been previously reported.(13,14,16)

Data Collection and Sampling

We conducted two population-based, stratified cluster-sample surveys in February-June 2018 (pre-intervention) and February-April 2019 (5 months after phase 1 implementation). The baseline survey included all eight districts in Grand Bassa but our analytical sample is limited to the four districts sampled at follow-up; the follow-up survey included the two implementation districts and the two non-implementation districts that were most comparable on baseline child health outcomes. At baseline, we

mapped the county immediately before data collocation and then we took a simple random sample of communities, stratified by district, and a census of households within each selected community. At follow-up, we sampled communities with probability of selection proportional to size, stratified by implementation phase, and then selected 24 households per selected community by a modified random walk procedure. All women aged 18-49 in selected households were invited to complete the maternal and child health modules of the survey. We provide more details on the sampling approach in the methods supplement (supplement 1). Sample size was determined to estimate trends in programmatic indicators with adequate precision over the planned series of surveys.

Surveys were adapted from the Liberian Demographic and Health Survey and are provided in supplement 2 and administered face-to-face in Liberian Vernacular English and Bassa, the local language in the county. Instruments were translated to Liberian Vernacular English and back-translated to American English to check translation accuracy. Bassa does not have a commonly used written form, but all enumerators were bilingual and trained to administer the survey in both languages. We recruited enumerators who had prior experience administering surveys in this setting, and provided a five-day supplemental training on the questionnaire, its administration, and research ethics with human subjects. Enumerators recorded responses on Android mobile phones and uploaded data regularly to facilitate data quality assurance and enumerator supervision. We discarded data collected by one enumerator because those surveys failed a quality assurance check designed to ensure that enumerators spent enough time surveying each household to obtain accurate information. This resulted in data for 82 children (41 intervention and 41 comparison) being excluded from the follow-up analysis, which was 10.2% of children in that round of surveys. We tested for sensitivity to excluding these observations by re-running our primary analyses including them, and this check is provided in supplement 3.

Variables

Our primary outcome of interest was treatment from a qualified provider if a child has suspected diarrhea, malaria, or acute respiratory infection (ARI) in the two weeks preceding the survey. Suspected malaria and diarrhea were defined by maternal report of fever and diarrhea, respectively. Suspected ARI was defined as maternal report of cough plus fast or difficult breathing.(17) Qualified providers were defined as facility-based providers, community health assistants, or general community health volunteers (GCHVs, a cadre of community health workers that preceded the NCHAP). Other non-qualified provider types included drugstores, black baggers (informal drug dispensers), and traditional providers. For our primary outcome, we assessed care for any of the three conditions; we analyzed each condition separately as secondary outcomes. As additional secondary outcomes, we assessed quality of care using maternal report of oral rehydration therapy for diarrhea and rapid diagnostic testing for malaria. We also assessed what providers were sources of care as secondary outcomes to determine whether care providers changed when the community health assistant program was implemented and to directly assess causal mechanisms.

Our exposure of interest was residence in implementation areas rather than comparison areas in the period after implementation. We treated the following variables as potential confounders: child's gender, child's age in months (continuous), maternal age in years (continuous), maternal education (categorized as none, some primary school, or completed at least primary school), whether the mother preferred to complete the survey in English or Bassa, whether the child was reported as having only one illness or more, the number of children under age five residing in the household (continuous), whether the household resides in a community with a primarily agricultural or mining economy, distance to the nearest health facility (log-transformed continuous variables), and quintiles of household wealth. We calculated household wealth using the Filmer-Pritchett approach, which uses the first principal component in a principal component analysis of responses to a household asset index.(18)

Statistical Analyses

204
205 We used a difference-in-differences approach to estimate whether before-to-after implementation period
206 changes were greater in the intervention than comparison areas. In the unadjusted analysis, we fit a linear
207 probability model with indicator variables for intervention versus comparison area, year, and their
208 interaction. We accounted for potential changes in the composition of the population over time by using
209 inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) to balance all of the covariates listed above except for
210 residence in a mining community across all four time-by-intervention groups. We assessed balance using
211 standard IPTW diagnostics (see supplement 1) and then fit an IPT-weighted linear probability model that
212 otherwise had the same form as the unadjusted analysis.(12,19–21)

213
214 We assessed changes in provider types using survey design-adjusted tests for differences in proportions.
215 We assessed equity in program outcomes by examining before-to-after changes in childhood disease
216 treatment in the intervention areas, stratified by distance from the nearest health facility (dichotomized as
217 5-9.9km versus 10 or more km based on prior research on distance as a barrier in a similar Liberian
218 setting (22)), household wealth (above or below the median), and maternal education (none versus some).

219
220 We conducted several sensitivity analyses (see supplement 3). First, we could not include residence in
221 mining rather than agricultural communities in the IPTW-adjusted models due to the small number of
222 mining communities, but we conducted supplemental analyses restricted only to agricultural
223 communities. Second, we accounted for confounders using regression adjustment rather than IPTW.
224 Finally, we re-ran analysis including observations we excluded for data quality assurance, as described
225 above.

226
227 All analyses incorporated sampling weights and accounted for stratification and clustering by Taylor
228 linearized standard errors. The IPTW propensity score model incorporated sampling weights, so the final
229 IPTW difference-in-differences model balances the weighted distribution of covariates and remains

population-representative.(23) Analyses used Stata 17.0 We provide more detail on statistical methods in supplement 1, and statistical code is provided in supplement 4.

Participants gave verbal informed consent. Approval for the surveys was provided by the institutional review boards at the University of Liberia (#18-11-140), Liberia Institute for Biomedical Research (#EC/LIBR/012/037), Partners Healthcare (#2013P002480/PHS), and Georgetown University (#2013-1385).

Results

Among households approached, response rates were 90% in 2018 and 83% in 2019. We included 2538 households in 2018 and 1313 households in 2019. Within eligible households, 95% of listed women participated in 2018 and 98% in 2019; information about 90% of listed children was provided in 2018 and 98% in 2019. No variable had more than 0.6% missing data.

In the analysis sample, we included data on a total of 1351 children under the age of five in 2018 and 721 in 2019. Among children under five, the burden of at least one childhood disease in the 2 weeks prior to the survey was 70.0% within intervention areas at baseline, 49.9% within intervention at follow-up, 64.0% and 65.6% within comparison areas at baseline, and follow-up respectively.

Overall, samples were similar across years and areas prior to inverse probability of treatment weighting (Table 1); however more households in the comparison group were in mining communities in both surveys, fewer surveys were completed in English in 2019 for both intervention and control, fewer illnesses were reported for children in 2019 for both intervention and control, and wealth was higher in the control group in 2019. In all groups, IPT weighting produced approximate balance, as measured by

standardized differences. We present full IPT weighting balance diagnostics and an IPT-weighted version of table 1 in supplement 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of Children with Fever, Acute Respiratory Infection, or Diarrhea in the Two Weeks before the Survey (Prior to Inverse Probability of Treatment Weighting)

	Pre-Intervention (n=894)		Post-Intervention (n=397)	
	Intervention (n = 347), % (95% CI) or Mean (95% CI)	Comparison (n = 547), % (95% CI) or Mean (95% CI)	Intervention (n = 214), % (95% CI) or Mean (95% CI)	Comparison (n = 183), % (95% CI) or Mean (95% CI)
Child's household located in mining community, %	0	12.8 (6.7, 23.0)	6.9 (1.8, 23.5)	11.7 (4.0, 29.4)
Child's gender, % female	47.9 (43.5, 52.3)	47.3 (43.3, 51.2)	40.7 (35.6, 46.0)	47.2 (39.2, 55.3)
Child's age in months, mean	23.6 (22.2, 25.1)	27.1 (25.9, 28.2)	24.2 (22.2, 26.3)	25.6 (23.4, 27.8)
Mother's education , %				
No education	69.2 (63.2, 74.6)	61.9 (57.1, 66.5)	73.9 (66.4, 80.2)	70.4 (61.6, 77.9)
Some primary education	24.9 (20.5, 29.8)	26.4 (22.4, 30.3)	21.8 (15.8, 29.2)	18.5 (12.5, 26.4)
Completed primary or higher	5.9 (3.5, 9.9)	12.0 (9.4, 15.2)	4.4 (2.3, 8.2)	11.1 (7.2, 16.9)
Mother's survey language, %				
English	45.0 (32.5, 58.2)	41.4 (35.2, 47.8)	20.6 (12.4, 32.4)	29.9 (18.7, 44.0)
Bassa	55.0 (41.8, 67.6)	58.7 (52.2, 64.9)	79.4 (67.6, 87.6)	70.1 (56.0, 81.3)
Mother married or cohabitating, %	82.3 (74.2, 88.3)	85.7 (82.1, 88.6)	91.2 (84.8, 95.1)	93.7 (88.2, 96.7)
Number of illnesses per child in the past 2 wk, %				

1 illness	38.7 (33.8, 43.8)	44.4 (39.9, 49.0)	56.2 (47.0, 65.0)	66.9 (58.9, 74.0)
≥ 2 illnesses	61.3 (56.2, 66.2)	55.6 (51.0, 60.2)	43.8 (35.0, 53.0)	33.1 (26.0, 41.1)
Child's household distance from facility in km, mean	15.9 (13.0, 18.9)	14.6 (12.5, 16.6)	15.6 (14.0, 17.2)	14.2 (10.9, 17.6)
Child's household wealth index score, mean	-0.18 (-0.52, 0.17)	-0.03 (-0.29, 0.23)	-0.58 (-0.76, -0.41)	0.09 (-0.25, 0.43)
Mother's no. of children, mean				
Aged < 5 y	1.6 (1.5, 1.7)	1.5 (1.5, 1.6)	1.5 (1.4, 1.6)	1.4 (1.2, 1.5)
Aged < 1 y	0.5 (0.4, 0.5)	0.3 (0.3, 0.4)	0.4 (0.3, 0.5)	0.3 (0.2, 0.4)
Mother's age, y, mean	29.0 (28.3, 29.8)	28.5 (27.9, 29.2)	28.8 (27.8, 29.8)	29.5 (28.2, 30.8)
Note: The sample sizes in this table are unweighted. The percentages were weighted by sampling weights but not by inverse probability of treatment weighting. Thus, they should be interpreted as population-representative distributions of each variable prior to balancing by IPTW. A version of this table showing balance after applying inverse probability of treatment weighting is available in supplement 1.				

Changes in Childhood Treatment and Care Source

In IPT-weighted models, treatment for all three illnesses from a qualified provider increased by 56.4 percentage points (95% CI: 45.7, 67.1) in intervention areas and decreased by 3.9 percentage points (95% CI: -15.2, 7.5) in comparison areas, a difference-in-differences of 60.3 percentage points (95% CI: 44.7, 76.0; $p < 0.001$) (Table 2; Figure 1). The disease-specific difference-in-differences between intervention and control areas were 64.5% (95% CI: 47.6, 81.4; $p < 0.001$) for fever, 74.3% (95% CI: 58.5, 90.0; $p < 0.001$) for diarrhea, and 48.2% (95% CI: 17.5, 79.0; $p = 0.002$) for ARI. The difference-in-differences for treatment of diarrhea with oral rehydration therapy (ORT) and receipt of malaria rapid diagnostic tests (RDT) for fever were 37.6% (95% CI: 19.5, 55.8; $p < 0.001$) and 38.5% (95% CI: 19.9, 57.0; $P < 0.001$), respectively. The regression-adjusted and unadjusted models showed similar results.

Results did not change meaningfully in any of the sensitivity analyses (supplement 3).

Fig 1. Differences in before-to-after changes in childhood illness treatment between intervention and comparison areas

Table 2. Difference-in-Differences in Childhood Illness Treatment

	Sample Size (unweighted)		Unadjusted Model		Inverse Probability of Treatment Weighted Model	
	Pre	Post	DiD % (95% CI)	p	DiD % (95% CI)	p
Care-seeking from qualified provider						
Any illness	894	397	55.2 (41.2, 69.3)	<0.001	60.3 (44.7, 76.0)	<0.001
Fever	691	293	60.7 (45.1, 76.2)	<0.001	64.5 (47.6, 81.4)	<0.001
Diarrhea	590	215	69.8 (54.5, 85.1)	<0.001	74.3 (58.5, 90.0)	<0.001
Acute Respiratory Illness	295	79	39.1 (10.9, 67.2)	0.007	48.2 (17.5, 79.0)	0.002
Oral rehydration therapy for diarrhea	586	215	32.9 (15.0, 50.7)	<0.001	37.6 (19.5, 55.8)	<0.001
Rapid diagnostic test for fever	686	293	41.9 (26.0, 57.8)	<0.001	38.5 (19.9, 57.0)	<0.001

There was a significant increase in the proportion of children receiving care from community health assistants (0% to 81.6%; $p < 0.001$) from baseline to follow-up in the intervention areas (Figure 2). In the comparison areas, care from a community health assistant also increased from 0% to 2.0% but this was not significant ($p = 0.154$). The increase in care seeking in the intervention area was accompanied by

decreases in care seeking to non-qualified providers including drugstores and informal providers, with similar changes not seen in the comparison areas.

Figure 2. Percent of Sick Children Receiving Treatment from Each Provider Type

Program Equity

At baseline in the intervention areas, treatment from a qualified provider was 14.6 percentage points more common for children living within 10km from a health facility than those farther than 10km. Treatment increased by 55.3 percentage points (95%CI 44.2, 66.3) after implementation in the farther communities and 63.0 percentage points (95%CI 48.9, 77.2) in the closer communities. The 7.7 percentage point widening of the gap was not significant (95%CI -10.2, 25.7, $p=0.395$) (figure 3). There were no significant differences in treatment from a qualified provider at baseline in intervention areas by maternal education or household wealth. After implementation, treatment by a qualified provider increased by 60.8 percentage points (95%CI 51.2, 70.3) among children whose mothers had no formal education, compared to 44.3 percentage points (95%CI 25.4, 63.3) for children of mothers with some education. The 16.5 percentage point greater improvement was not significant (95%CI -1.9, 34.8, $p=0.078$). Treatment from a qualified provider improved by 57.1 percentage points (95%CI 44.3, 69.9) after implementation for children in households below median wealth and 59.1 (95%CI 46.8, 71.3) for children in households above median wealth. The 1.9 percentage point difference in improvements was not significant (95%CI -14.4, 18.1, $p=0.816$).

Figure 3. Improvements in childhood illness treatment by key dimensions of equity in implementation areas.

Discussion

310
311 This study finds evidence that Liberia's National CHA Program led to substantial improvements in
312 treatment coverage for childhood fever, diarrhea, and ARI using a research approach designed to infer
313 causality. Care sought from qualified providers increased by 60 percentage points more in intervention
314 areas than comparison areas. Essential elements of care--ORT for diarrhea and RDT-based diagnoses for
315 malaria--also increased by about 40 percentage points more than in comparison areas. In support of the
316 role for the CHA program in causing these gains, we also found that care shifted predominantly to CHAs
317 and sharply away from traditional providers and unregulated drugstores and informal drug dispensers, as
318 well as a shift away from facility-based providers of about 15 percentage points. The substantial increases
319 in childhood treatment improvements were seen irrespective of wealth, distance from health facility, or
320 maternal education.

321
322 These findings are broadly consistent with the existing literature on CHW programs. Evaluation of
323 precursor programs to Liberia's National CHA Program found substantial improvements in childhood
324 illness care seeking from a qualified provider, including consistent improvements in treatment of
325 childhood fever, diarrhea, and acute respiratory illness by qualified providers.(11,12) Further, Liberian
326 community health assistants have been found to have acceptable levels of knowledge about childhood
327 disease treatment.(24) Finally, a recent analysis of Liberian District Health Information System data
328 found that, in areas served by community health assistants after the launch of the NCHAP program, a
329 little over half of malaria diagnoses had shifted from facilities to community health assistants, 95% of
330 diagnoses were confirmed with RDT or microscopy, and diagnosis appeared to be sustained during the
331 first nine months of the covid-19 pandemic.(25) While our evaluation only focuses on one portion of the
332 country, Liberia's national program now covers over 80% of communities greater than 5km from health
333 facilities, and we would expect similar impact across the national program.(14)

334

Our findings add to a body of literature indicating that CHWs are an important aspect of rural primary care systems. Systematic reviews, however, have differed about the strength of evidence that community health worker programs produce meaningful improvements in child health outcomes.(10,26) These differences likely result from variation in both the package of interventions and delivery model employed by different community health worker programs and the context in which they are implemented. Perry et al. showed that the most effective CHW programs employ staff who are rooted in the communities they serve while also integrated into the larger health system, with salaries and supervision and supplies and able to successfully refer patients who need care beyond what the CHWs can provide.(27) Further, reasonable concerns are often raised about the difficulty of taking CHW programs to national scale.(28) To that end, our results join evidence from other countries that public sector-led national programs can achieve can meaningfully improve care for childhood illnesses when they are able to induce demand for community-based services.(29–33)

Our results also corroborate existing literature about the equity and reach of CHW programs. We found improvements were similarly large among groups that have been traditionally disadvantaged as those that are relatively advantaged – such as those further from health facilities, with lower wealth, and with lower education. We interpret these results as suggesting equitable reach and acceptability of the program. Prior research has generally found improvements in child health outcomes across maternal education, household wealth, and rural versus urban residence.(34) However, so far as we could identify, prior research has not examined program equity by distance within rural areas, even though distance is a well-known determinant of health outcomes that CHW programs are designed to address.(35) It is particularly important to assess equity by distance because CHW supervision, supply chains, and referral networks all become more difficult in more remote communities.

This study has limitations. We lacked statistical power to directly assess changes in childhood mortality as a result of the community health assistant program, though we would expect that increases in coverage

of evidence-based interventions known to reduce amenable under-5 mortality would result in decreases in mortality, based on prior literature.(36) We are executing a subsequent study in 2022 that is powered to assess child mortality. We discarded one enumerator's data because of concerns about data quality. However, because data were discarded evenly from both intervention and comparison areas, we do not have reason to believe it caused any bias and, in a sensitivity analysis, results did not change meaningfully when that enumerator's data were included. Finally, our study is subject to the recall, reporting, and recording errors that can occur in survey research. We reduced these risks by using standardized Demographic and Health Survey items, building reporting validation into the data collection program, and through training and supervision of enumerators. Parental report of malaria diagnostic testing, in particular, has previously been found to be less than 70% sensitive, which may explain differences between improved fever care and RDT use.(37) Social desirability may have encouraged respondents to decrease reporting of use of unqualified providers, but this would not explain the magnitude of overall increases in coverage we observed. Data entry errors are inevitable, but in previous assessment of our data systems, we found recording error rates below 2%.(38)

Overall, this study provides evidence that Liberia's National Community Health Assistant Program has resulted in significant improvements in the treatment of common child health illnesses, which are estimated to cause about half of under-five deaths in Liberia.(39) Not only did treatment coverage increased dramatically in intervention areas while it remained approximately constant in comparison areas, but the quality of care also improved along with a shift from unqualified providers mainly to community health assistants. All of these findings suggest that the Liberian National Community Health Assistant Program as implemented has been successful in strengthening the systems of care and reinforces the value of well-designed public-sector community health worker programs to expand the delivery of equitable, quality care.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Last Mile Health Liberia programs and monitoring, evaluation and learning teams for their commitment to supporting the Liberia MOH and Grand Bassa County Health Team in implementing the program and in conduct of the household survey, and our External Advisory Committee for their inputs into study design and interpretation. We also would like to thank the women who responded to the questions, and the CHAs for their remarkable commitment to delivery of quality care to the members of their community.

References

1. Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geo-Information Services, Ministry of Health, ICF. Liberia Demographic and Health Survey 2019-2020 [Internet]. Monrovia, Liberia: Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geo-Information Services; 2021. Available from: <https://www.dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR362/FR362.pdf>
2. Lee PT, Kruse GR, Chan BT, Massaquoi MB, Panjabi RR, Dahn BT, et al. An analysis of Liberia's 2007 national health policy: lessons for health systems strengthening and chronic disease care in poor, post-conflict countries. *Glob Health*. 2011;7(1):37.
3. Svoronos T, Macauley RJ, Kruk ME. Can the health system deliver? Determinants of rural Liberians' confidence in health care. *Health Policy Plan*. 2015 Sep;30(7):823–9.
4. Siekmans K, Sohani S, Boima T, Koffa F, Basil L, Laaziz S. Community-based health care is an essential component of a resilient health system: evidence from Ebola outbreak in Liberia. *BMC Public Health*. 2017 Dec;17(1):84.

- 409 5. Kentoffio KJ, Kraemer J, Griffiths T, Kenny A, Panjabi R, Sechler GA, et al. Charting Health
410 System Reconstruction in Rural Liberia Prior to the Ebola Epidemic: A Comparison of Three
411 Population-based Surveys of Maternal and Child Healthcare Utilization. Work Pap Rev. 2016;
- 412 6. Kenny A, Basu G, Ballard M, Griffiths T, Kentoffio K, Niyonzima JB, et al. Remoteness and
413 maternal and child health service utilization in rural Liberia: A population-based survey. J Glob
414 Health. 2015 Dec;5(2):020401.
- 415 7. Liberia Ministry of Health. Service Availability and Readiness Assessment (SARA) & Quality of
416 Care (QOC) 2018 Final Report. Monrovia, Liberia; 2018.
- 417 8. Kok MC, Dieleman M, Taegtmeier M, Broerse JE, Kane SS, Ormel H, et al. Which intervention
418 design factors influence performance of community health workers in low- and middle-income
419 countries? A systematic review. Health Policy Plan. 2015 Nov;30(9):1207–27.
- 420 9. Black RE, Taylor CE, Arole S, Bang A, Bhutta ZA, Chowdhury AMR, et al. Comprehensive review
421 of the evidence regarding the effectiveness of community-based primary health care in improving
422 maternal, neonatal and child health: 8. summary and recommendations of the Expert Panel. J Glob
423 Health. 2017 Jun;7(1):010908.
- 424 10. Freeman PA, Schleiff M, Sacks E, Rassekh BM, Gupta S, Perry HB. Comprehensive review of the
425 evidence regarding the effectiveness of community-based primary health care in improving
426 maternal, neonatal and child health: 4. child health findings. J Glob Health. 2017 Jun;7(1):010904.
- 427 11. Luckow PW, Kenny A, White E, Ballard M, Dorr L, Erlandson K, et al. Implementation research on
428 community health workers' provision of maternal and child health services in rural Liberia. Bull
429 World Health Organ. 2017 Feb 1;95(2):113–20.

12. White EE, Downey J, Sathananthan V, Kanjee Z, Kenny A, Waters A, et al. A Community Health Worker Intervention to Increase Childhood Disease Treatment Coverage in Rural Liberia: A Controlled Before-and-After Evaluation. *Am J Public Health*. 2018 Sep;108(9):1252–9.
13. Ministry of Health. Revised National Community Health Services Policy 2016-2021 [Internet]. Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Health; 2015 [cited 2021 Oct 19]. Available from: <https://www.exemplars.health/-/media/files/egh/resources/community-health-workers/liberia/revised-community-health-services-policy-20162021.pdf>
14. Healey J, Wiah SO, Horace JM, Majekodunmi DB, Duokie DS. Liberia's Community Health Assistant Program: Scale, Quality, and Resilience. *Glob Health Sci Pract*. 2021 Mar 15;9(Supplement 1):S18–24.
15. Statistics LI of, Services G-I. 2008 National Population and Housing Census: Final Results [Internet]. 2009. Available from: http://www.lisgis.net/pg_img/NPHC%202008%20Final%20Report.pdf
16. Community Health Workers in Liberia [Internet]. Exemplars in Global Health. 2019 [cited 2021 Oct 19]. Available from: <https://www.exemplars.health/topics/community-health-workers/liberia>
17. Croft TN, Marshall AMJ, Allen CK, ICF. Guide to DHS Statistics: DHS-7 [Internet]. Rockville, MD: ICF; 2020 Aug [cited 2020 Jun 8]. Available from: https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/DHSG1/Guide_to_DHS_Statistics_DHS-7.pdf
18. Filmer D, Pritchett LH. Estimating wealth effects without expenditure data—or tears: an application to educational enrollments in states of India. *Demography*. 2001 Feb;38(1):115–32.

19. Stuart EA, Huskamp HA, Duckworth K, Simmons J, Song Z, Chernew ME, et al. Using propensity scores in difference-in-differences models to estimate the effects of a policy change. *Health Serv Outcomes Res Methodol*. 2014 Dec;14(4):166–82.
20. Austin PC, Stuart EA. Moving towards best practice when using inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) using the propensity score to estimate causal treatment effects in observational studies. *Stat Med*. 2015 Dec 10;34(28):3661–79.
21. Nyblade L, Addo NA, Atuahene K, Alsoufi N, Gyamera E, Jacinthe S, et al. Results from a difference-in-differences evaluation of health facility HIV and key population stigma reduction interventions in Ghana. *J Int AIDS Soc* [Internet]. 2020 Apr [cited 2020 May 4];23(4). Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/jia2.25483>
22. Ly J, Sathananthan V, Griffiths T, Kanjee Z, Kenny A, Gordon N, et al. Facility-Based Delivery during the Ebola Virus Disease Epidemic in Rural Liberia: Analysis from a Cross-Sectional, Population-Based Household Survey. Kruk ME, editor. *PLOS Med*. 2016 Aug 2;13(8):e1002096.
23. DuGoff EH, Schuler M, Stuart EA. Generalizing Observational Study Results: Applying Propensity Score Methods to Complex Surveys. *Health Serv Res*. 2014 Feb;49(1):284–303.
24. Downey J, McKenna AH, Mendin SF, Waters A, Dunbar N, Tehmeh LG, et al. Measuring Knowledge of Community Health Workers at the Last Mile in Liberia: Feasibility and Results of Clinical Vignette Assessments. *Glob Health Sci Pract*. 2021 Mar 15;9(Supplement 1):S111–21.
25. Rozelle JW, Korvah J, Wiah O, Kraemer J, Hirschhorn LR, Price MR, et al. Improvements in malaria testing and treatment after a national community health worker program in rural Liberia. *J Glob Health Rep* [Internet]. 2021 Aug 9 [cited 2021 Oct 8]; Available from: <https://www.joghr.org/article/25979-improvements-in-malaria-testing-and-treatment-after-a-national-community-health-worker-program-in-rural-liberia>

26. Lewin S, Munabi-Babigumira S, Glenton C, Daniels K, Bosch-Capblanch X, Wyk BE van, et al. Lay health workers in primary and community health care for maternal and child health and the management of infectious diseases. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2010 Mar 17;(3):CD004015. doi(3):CD004015.
27. Perry HB, Rassekh BM, Gupta S, Freeman PA. Comprehensive review of the evidence regarding the effectiveness of community-based primary health care in improving maternal, neonatal and child health: 7. shared characteristics of projects with evidence of long-term mortality impact. *J Glob Health*. 2017 Jun;7(1):010907.
28. Bradley EH. Community Health Workers Are Effective but How to Scale-Up? *Am J Public Health*. 2018 Sep;108(9):1129–30.
29. Assefa Y, Gelaw YA, Hill PS, Taye BW, Van Damme W. Community health extension program of Ethiopia, 2003–2018: successes and challenges toward universal coverage for primary healthcare services. *Glob Health*. 2019 Dec;15(1):24.
30. Karim AM, Admassu K, Schellenberg J, Alemu H, Getachew N, Ameha A, et al. Effect of Ethiopia's Health Extension Program on Maternal and Newborn Health Care Practices in 101 Rural Districts: A Dose-Response Study. Eisele T, editor. *PLoS ONE*. 2013 Jun 4;8(6):e65160.
31. Amouzou A, Hazel E, Shaw B, Miller NP, Tafesse M, Mekonnen Y, et al. Effects of the integrated Community Case Management of Childhood Illness Strategy on Child Mortality in Ethiopia: A Cluster Randomized Trial. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2016 Mar 2;94(3):596–604.
32. Rocha R, Soares RR. Evaluating the impact of community-based health interventions: evidence from Brazil's Family Health Program [Internet]. Bonn, Germany: Institute for the Study of Labor; 2009. Report No.: Discussion Paper No. 4119. Available from: <https://ftp.iza.org/dp4119.pdf>

33. Perry H, Zulliger R, Scott K, Javadi D, Gergen J, Shelley K, et al. Case studies of large-scale community health worker programs [Internet]. Washington, DC: USAID and MCHIP; 2017. Available from: <https://www.mcsprogram.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/CHW-CaseStudies-Globes.pdf>
34. Schleiff M, Kumapley R, Freeman PA, Gupta S, Rassekh BM, Perry HB. Comprehensive review of the evidence regarding the effectiveness of community-based primary health care in improving maternal, neonatal and child health: 5. equity effects for neonates and children. *J Glob Health*. 2017 Jun;7(1):010905.
35. Okwaraji YB, Edmond KM. Proximity to health services and child survival in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2012;2(4):e001196.
36. Amouzou A, Morris S, Moulton LH, Mukanga D. Assessing the impact of integrated community case management (iCCM) programs on child mortality: Review of early results and lessons learned in sub-Saharan Africa. *J Glob Health*. 2014 Dec;4(2):020411.
37. Eisele TP, Silumbe K, Yukich J, Hamainza B, Keating J, Bennett A, et al. Measuring Coverage in MNCH: Accuracy of Measuring Diagnosis and Treatment of Childhood Malaria from Household Surveys in Zambia. Osrin D, editor. *PLoS Med*. 2013 May 7;10(5):e1001417.
38. Kenny A, Gordon N, Griffiths T, Kraemer JD, Siedner MJ. Validation Relaxation: A Quality Assurance Strategy for Electronic Data Collection. *J Med Internet Res*. 2017 Aug 18;19(8):e297.
39. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Global Burden of Disease Compare: Liberia Under-Five 2019 Deaths [Internet]. GBD Compare. 2021 [cited 2021 Oct 28]. Available from: <http://ihmeuw.org/5m1c>

Treatment Difference-in-Differences

Treatment by a Qualified Provider for All Illnesses

Treatment by a Qualified Provider for ARI

Treatment by a Qualified Provider for Diarrhea

Received Oral Rehydrative Therapy for Diarrhea

Treatment by a Qualified Provider for Fever

Received Malaria Rapid Diagnostic Test if Had Fever

— intervention

— comparison

Percent of Sick Children Receiving Treatment from Each Provider Type

Intervention Areas

Comparison Areas

CHA hospital GCHV blackbagger drugstore traditional

Treatment by a Qualified Provider in Intervention Areas

Distance from Health Facility

Maternal Education

Household Wealth