

Title: Listening to older voices: Results of a cross-sectional survey of older patient-reported experiences of facility-based healthcare in Nouna, Burkina Faso

Authors

Ellen M Goldberg¹

Mamadou Bountogo²

Guy Harling³

Till Barnighausen⁴

Justine I Davies (co-senior)⁵

Lisa R Hirschhorn (co-senior)⁶

1. University of Chicago Pritzker School of Medicine, Chicago, USA
2. Centre de Recherche en Santé de Nouna, Nouna, Burkina Faso
3. Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, United Kingdom
4. Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, University of Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany
5. Institute of Applied Health Research, Birmingham University, Birmingham, United Kingdom
6. Medical Social Sciences, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, USA

Abstract

Background: Ensuring responsive healthcare which meets patient expectations and generates trust is important to increase rates of access and retention. This need is important for aging populations where non-communicable diseases (NCDs) are a growing cause of morbidity and mortality.

Methods: We performed a cross-sectional household survey including socio-demographic, morbidities, and health system utilization, responsiveness, and quality outcomes in individuals over age 40 in northwestern Burkina Faso. We describe results and use exploratory factor analysis to derive a contextually appropriate grouping of health system responsiveness (HSR) variables. We used linear or logistic regression to explore associations between socio-demographics, morbidities, and the grouped-variable, then between these variables and health system quality outcomes.

Results: Of 2,639 eligible respondents, 26.8% had least one NCD, 56.3% were frail or pre-frail and 23.9% had a recent visit, including only 1/3 of those with an NCD. Highest ratings of care experience (excellent/very good) included ease of following instructions (86.1%) and trust in provider skills (81.1%). The HSR grouping with the greatest factor loading included involvement in decision-making, clarity in communication, trust in the provider, and confidence in provider skills, termed as Shared Understanding and Decision Making (SUDM). In multivariable analysis, higher quality of life (OR 1.02, 95%CI 1.01-1.04), frailty (OR 1.47, 95%CI 1.00-2.16), and SUDM (OR 1.06, 95%CI 1.05-1.09) were associated with greater health system trust and confidence. SUDM was associated with overall positive assessment of the healthcare system (OR 1.02, 95%CI 1.01-1.03) and met healthcare needs (OR 1.09, 95%CI 1.08-1.11). Younger age and highest wealth quintile were also associated with higher met needs.

Conclusions: Recent healthcare access was low for people with existing NCDs, and SUDM was the most consistent factor associated with higher health system quality outcomes. Results highlight the need to increase continuity of care for aging populations with NCDs and explore strengthening SUDM to achieve this goal.

What is already known?

- Health system responsiveness and health system quality outcomes including meeting health needs and trust in the system are important to ensure patient centered care and increase access and retention.
- The process and outcomes of care experience of older adults in Burkina Faso and factors associated with ratings has not been widely studied, information needed to inform efforts to improve engagement in care particularly for individuals with non-communicable chronic diseases (NCDs)
- Shared decision making is emerging as an important component of care to improve engagement in care for people with chronic diseases with studies largely from high income countries

What are the new findings?

- We describe the patterns and gaps in care seeking of people age 40 or older in Burkina Faso, particularly those with non-communicable chronic diseases.
- Highest ratings of care experience included ease of following instructions and trust in provider skills, with lowest ratings in clarity of communication and involvement in decision making.
- We identified a grouped variable was identified using exploratory factors analysis, shared understanding and decision making (SUDM), which was associated with overall positive assessment of the healthcare system and met healthcare needs.

What do the new findings imply?

- Work is needed to increase longitudinal engagement in care for older adults, particularly those with NCDs,
- SUDM may offer an area for strengthening patient-centeredness of care to achieve these goals, but further research is needed to understand the relationships between SUDM and care outcomes, and the impact of strengthening in Burkina Faso.

Introduction

As access to care has improved in low and middle income country (LMIC) settings, understanding and ensuring the quality of this care has emerged as a critical step to reach effective universal health coverage and health-related sustainable development goals.(1) The Institute of Medicine has defined six domains of quality, including effectiveness (often measured by technical quality), safety, timeliness, equity, efficiency and patient-centeredness.(2) Patient-centeredness has been further emphasized through the World Health Organization's (WHO) initiative for Integrated People Centered Health Care, which puts the patient at the center of the health care system.(3)

Poor quality is now a leading cause of preventable mortality, overtaking access as a major cause; poor quality contributes to a persistent equity gap, and results in costs to the individual, health care system and individual society.(1,4) Gaps in quality are particularly apparent in non-communicable diseases (NCDs), which represent a growing burden across all countries as populations age.(5) Multiple studies are now showing the magnitude of gaps in quality of care and resulting clinical outcomes (having a condition recognized and adequately managed) in NCDs and among older individuals (1,6–10)

Receipt of person-centered care has been associated with improved healthcare utilization and better health outcomes and patient safety, while poor experiences and perceived quality due to non-responsive care is associated with delay in accessing or returning to care or bypassing the formal care system, whether because of personal experience or through word-of-mouth. (11–13) Confidence and trust in the health system is also an important outcome of the care system, critical for ensuring willingness to access and return to care, and therefore for the management of chronic conditions which are more frequent in the older populations.(14–16)

Measurement around patient-centeredness builds on the WHO Health Systems Responsiveness Framework which identified seven components of responsive outpatient care: dignity, confidentiality, involvement in decision making (autonomy), communication, choice of provider, prompt attention, and quality of basic amenities.(17) Larson directly linked health system responsiveness to experiential quality and proposed two areas for measurement: (1) patient experience of care, a process measure; and (2) patient satisfaction, a health system quality outcome measure of how well provided care meets patient needs and expectations.(18). The relationship between components of responsiveness of care and the health system quality outcomes is not well described, although recent work from Ghana found that higher reported responsiveness was associated with measures of outcomes including reported met medical needs (a measure of satisfaction) and confidence in the health care system.(19)

As health burden and care needs continue to shift to older individuals and those with NCDs, there is a need to expand the measurement of quality beyond providing technically correct care to care which is also empowering and meets older patients needs. (20) Including older individuals in decisions around their care through shared decision making (SDM) is particularly important, not least because it appears to be important for improving self-management and care outcomes.(21) SDM involves the patient and provider collaborating through better communication to identify preferences and making treatment choices that meet the patient's goals. This approach addresses health system responsiveness domains including autonomy, communication and trust between the patient and provider.

Burkina Faso is one of the poorest countries in the world, with 43.8% of the population live in extreme poverty. (22) Health care expenditure as a percentage of GDP has increased since 2000, reaching 7% by 2016, but out of pocket sources still contribute a large amount to healthcare funding.(23) Although NCDs are estimated to account for up to one-third of deaths in Burkina Faso (24), health services have historically been tailored towards maternal and child health and infectious diseases. Nevertheless, there is increasing attention given to NCDs, including establishment of an NCD division in Ministry of Health (MOH) and a national integrated NCD policy.(25)

We describe the causes of recent healthcare seeking and reported experiences of care in public sector primary and secondary level facilities among older adults in Nouna, a rural region in Burkina Faso. These results are important for providers and policy makers in Burkina Faso and similar settings to facilitate improved experiences of care to increase care seeking and retention of the aging population and begin to reverse the growing burden of NCD-related morbidity and mortality NCDs in Nouna and similar settings in the region.

Methods

Study setting

The study was set in the Nouna Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) area, led by the Centre de Recherche en Santé de Nouna (CRSN) in the Boucle du Mouhoun region, north-western Burkina Faso. The demographic surveillance area of the Nouna HDSS consists of the market town of Nouna and 59 surrounding villages with a total population of 107 000.(26)The formal public health system within the district level includes primary care centers (known as a Center for Health and Social Promotion (CSPS) and a district hospital (known as a medical center with surgical antennae) as well as private clinics and pharmacies.

Data collection

Data for this cross-sectional study were obtained during the baseline wave of the CRSN Heidelberg Aging Study (CHAS) and has been described in detail elsewhere.(27). Briefly, we randomly sampled 4000 older adults (over 40 years old) from the 2015 CRSN census population. In villages with more than 90 adults over the age of 40, a random sample of households with at least one age-eligible person was created, and one age-eligible adult in each selected

household was randomly selected to complete the survey. In villages with fewer than 90 adults over the age of 40, all households with one or more age-eligible individual were included. Data were collected using Open Data Kit (ODK) software on tablet computers at the participants' houses between May and July 2018. Interviews were conducted either in French or translated into the local languages of Dioula or Mooré by the interviewers.

The household survey contained questions on sociodemographics; self-reported presence of diseases or other health conditions; facility-type last attended; reasons for last health facility visit; reasons for not attending a facility in the last three months; and selected measures of health system responsiveness and health system quality outcomes (Table 1). Other measures included Anxiety (measured using the Generalized Anxiety Disorder question (GAD-2) score),(28) depression (using Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ- 9))(29) and Quality of life (measured using the validated EuroHIS 8-item version of WHOQOL)(30). Disability was measured using the 12 item WHO Disability Assessment Schedule, version 2 (WHODAS-II) disability score,(31). Cognitive functioning was assessed using CSI-D.(32) The Fried frailty score was constructed as described previously.(33)

Definition of variables

Health System Responsiveness and Health System quality outcomes

A subset of all possible health system responsiveness domains was included due to constraints of the survey length. Questions were selected based on discussion between investigators and their perceived relevance to the local context and focus on experiential quality. They were taken from published studies in sub-Saharan Africa (Appendix Table 1A).(Baltussen, 2002; Miller et al., 2014; Ratcliffe et al., 2020) and only asked for individuals with recent (within last three months) visit. Health system quality outcome questions included trust and confidence in receiving effective treatment, patient satisfaction (how well the received care met health need), and the overall view of the health system.

Demographic characteristics

Marital status was categorized as married/cohabiting versus single/widowed/divorced. Educational level was dichotomized as no education or any education. Participants were asked 37 questions on household assets and dwelling characteristics; from these, wealth quintiles were derived from the Filmer and Pritchett first principal component method.(34) Age was categorized in 10-year groups for the descriptive and univariate analysis and as a continuous variable in the multivariable analysis.

Disease categories

We included several self-reported conditions including non-communicable conditions (hypertension, diabetes, hypercholesteremia, heart disease, stroke, chronic respiratory disease, and epilepsy), and communicable diseases (HIV and tuberculosis (TB)). Self-reported chronic symptoms (lasting for more than 3 months) included cough,

headache, musculoskeletal or back pain, dental, or gastrointestinal manifestations. Some health conditions were captured as free text; these were translated and categorized through discussions among authors where necessary.

Participants were defined as having symptoms of anxiety based on a GAD-2 score ≥ 3 , depression based on PHQ-9 score ≥ 10 and cognitive functioning as possible/probable cognitive impairment for CSI-D score < 7 . Participants with at least one symptom of anxiety, depression, or cognitive impairment on testing were defined as having a neurological or mental health diagnosis. WHODAS-II and quality of life were normalized to 0-100. For frailty, participants were dichotomized as robust versus prefrail/frail/unable to complete assessment.

Analysis

Analytic sample

We limited our sample to those who sought care at their last visit from a public sector primary (Center for Health and Social Promotion or secondary level (District Hospital) facility, to reflect our focus on local care seeking and the most common sources of care (93% of individuals for the variables of interest (see CONSORT diagram Appendix Figure 1A). Using unweighted data, we described demographic characteristics, disease state, visit characteristics, and health system outcomes both among the whole sample surveyed and separately for participants who recently sought care (within the last 3 months) and those who did not. We then determined bivariate associations between these characteristics and health system quality outcomes for those who sought care versus those who did not using chi-squared, ranksum, or t-test as appropriate. We used a Bonferroni correction to adjust for multiple comparisons.

Health System Responsiveness and Health System Quality Outcomes

We conducted an exploratory factor analysis of the experiential quality questions (Appendix Figure 2A) to explore grouping of these variables, based on our assumption that one or more common constructs related to engagement in care and health system quality outcomes underlay our observed variables. We then used the variable with the greatest factor loading (“the HSR-group variable”) in subsequent analyses by scaling each individual component to 0-100 with 0 representing the lowest and 100 the highest rating and averaged them to arrive at a final variable between 0-100.

Bivariate analyses

We described individual responsiveness ratings among recent care seekers. We limited these analyses to individuals with a visit in the last 3 months to reduce recall bias. We then tested for bivariate associations between demographic characteristics, health status (one or more self-reported NCD, one or more self-reported “other” condition, one or more symptom of mental health disorder, quality of life, frailty and disability) facility type, financial access, wait time, and the HSR-group variable and the three health system quality outcomes. We did a similar analysis with the HSR-group variable as the outcome of interest.

Multivariable analyses

We ran logistic regression and linear regression for health system quality outcomes and the HSR-group variable respectively. Variables that met an inclusion criterion of $P < 0.2$ in the bivariate analyses were included. We also included age, sex, educational attainment, and wealth quintile, given their associations with reported experiential quality and selected health systems quality outcomes in previous studies.(19,35–37).

All statistical analyses were performed using Stata software (version 15.1; StataCorp LLC, College Station, Texas).

IRB: Ethical approval was obtained from Ethics Commission of the medical faculty Heidelberg (S-120/2018), the Burkina Faso Comité d’Ethique pour la Recherche en Santé (CERS) in Ouagadougou (2018-4-045) and the Institutional. Ethics Committee (CIE) of the CRSN (2018-04). Oral assent was sought from all village elders. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant and a literate witness assisted in cases of illiteracy.

Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research

Results

Population

Overall, 3,028 individuals responded to the survey including questions about care seeking with 177 excluded for missing data and 212 for care at a private sector facility or tertiary care hospital (Appendix Figure 1). Among the 2,639 who reported their last visit to a public sector primary or secondary level facility, 632 (23.9%) sought care at one of these facilities in the 3 months prior to the survey (Table 1). Overall, one half (50%) were women, with 42.8% age 40-49 and 10.5% age 70 or older. Education was low (83.8% reported no formal education), and three quarters (76.4%) were married or cohabitating. One quarter reported at least one NCD (26.8%), with lower rates of communicable diseases such as HIV or TB (2.8%). The median WHO DAS score was 8.3 (interquartile range (IQR) 0-22.9) and for QoL was 59.4 (IQR 46.9-65.6), while 56.3% were categorized as frail or pre-frail.

Table 1: sociodemographics, health conditions, reported medical care seeing and health system quality outcomes among individuals who attended versus did not attend a public primary or secondary level facility in the last visit 3 months prior to the survey

		Overall population	Attended facility in last 3 months	Did not attend facility in last 3 months	P-value
	Group	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Total		2639	632	2007	
Sex	Female	1315 (49.8)	338 (53.5)	977 (48.7)	0.035
Age	40-49	1141 (43.2)	271 (42.9)	870 (43.3)	0.079
	50-59	755 (28.6)	148 (23.4)	607 (30.2)	
	60-69	475 (18)	145 (22.9)	330 (16.4)	
	70-79	217 (8.2)	61 (9.7)	156 (7.8)	
	80+	53 (2)	11 (1.7)	42 (2.1)	
Educational attainment	No formal schooling	2215 (83.9)	515 (81.5)	1700 (84.7)	0.055
	Some education	424 (16.1)	117 (18.5)	307 (15.3)	
Marital status	Widowed/divorced/single	606 (23)	164 (25.9)	442 (22)	0.041
	Married or cohabitating	2033 (77)	468 (74.1)	1565 (78)	
Wealth quintile	1 (least wealthy)	499 (18.9)	103 (16.3)	396 (19.7)	<0.0001*
	2	522 (19.8)	103 (16.3)	419 (20.9)	
	3	525 (19.9)	124 (19.6)	401 (20)	
	4	549 (20.8)	132 (20.9)	417 (20.8)	
	5 (most wealthy)	544 (20.6)	170 (26.9)	374 (18.6)	
Self-reported non-communicable diseases (NCD) [†]	Hypertension	463 (17.5)	171 (27.1)	292 (14.5)	
	Diabetes	62 (2.3)	18 (2.8)	44 (2.2)	
	Hypercholesterolemia	11 (.4)	7 (1.1)	4 (.2)	
	Heart disease	163 (6.2)	61 (9.7)	102 (5.1)	
	Stroke	36 (1.4)	12 (1.9)	24 (1.2)	
	Chronic respiratory disease	92 (3.5)	33 (5.2)	59 (2.9)	
	Cancer	14 (.5)	9 (1.4)	5 (.2)	
	≥1 NCD	708 (26.8)	250 (39.6)	458 (22.8)	<0.0001*
Self-reported TB or HIV [†]	TB	26 (1)	12 (1.9)	14 (.7)	
	HIV	16 (.61)	6 (.9)	10 (.5)	
	HIV and/or TB	41 (1.55)	17 (2.69)	24 (1.2)	0.0001*
Self-reported other conditions for > 3 months [†]	Cough	17 (.6)	8 (1.3)	9 (.4)	
	Headache or dizziness	50 (1.9)	16 (2.5)	34 (1.7)	
	Musculoskeletal or back pain	189 (7.2)	60 (9.5)	129 (6.4)	
	Dental	17 (.6)	5 (.8)	12 (.6)	
	Gastrointestinal	85 (3.2)	40 (6.3)	45 (2.2)	
	≥1 other condition	502 (19)	181 (28.6)	321 (16)	<0.0001*

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#).

Symptoms of mental health disorders (MHD)†	Cognitive impairment on testing	163 (6.2)	36 (5.7)	127 (6.3)	
	Symptoms of anxiety on testing	301 (11.4)	89 (14.1)	212 (10.6)	
	Depressive symptoms on testing	202 (7.7)	55 (8.7)	147 (7.3)	
	≥1 MHD	518 (19.6)	142 (22.5)	376 (18.7)	0.039
Frailty	Not frail	1163 (44.1)	233 (36.9)	930 (46.3)	< 0.0001*
	Frail/pre-frail	1476 (55.9)	399 (63.1)	1077 (53.7)	
Disability	WHO DAS s††	8.3 (0 - 20.8)	14.6 (4.2 - 27.1)	6.3 (0 - 18.8)	<0.0001*
Quality of life	WHO QoL ††	59.4 (46.9 - 65.6)	56.3 (43.8 - 65.6)	59.4 (46.9 - 68.8)	<0.0001*
Facility type for last visit	Center for Health and Social Promotion	2206 (83.6)	496 (78.5)	1710 (85.2)	<0.0001*
	District Hospital	433 (16.4)	136 (21.5)	297 (14.8)	
Financial access	Did not borrow or sell anything	2250 (85.3)	539 (85.3)	1711 (85.3)	0.98
	Borrowed or sold something to attend clinic	389 (14.7)	93 (14.7)	296 (14.7)	
Outcomes					
Reported met need	Excellent	234 (8.9)	56 (8.9)	178 (8.9)	0.0058*
	Very Good	968 (36.7)	262 (41.5)	706 (35.2)	
	Good	1293 (49)	275 (43.5)	1018 (50.7)	
	Fair	116 (4.4)	33 (5.2)	83 (4.1)	
	Poor	28 (1.1)	6 (.9)	22 (1.1)	
Trust and confidence in health care system	Very confident	872 (33)	246 (38.9)	626 (31.2)	0.0003*
	Somewhat confident	1610 (61)	358 (56.6)	1252 (62.4)	
	Not very confident	138 (5.2)	26 (4.1)	112 (5.6)	
	Not at all confident	19 (.7)	2 (.3)	17 (.8)	
Overall view of the health care system in this country	Positive	1612 (61.1)	408 (64.6)	1204 (60)	
	Neutral	956 (36.2)	212 (33.5)	744 (37.1)	
	Poor	71 (2.7)	12 (1.9)	59 (2.9)	0.040
† P value represents ≥1 condition versus none or HIV/TB using chi square					
†† Scale from 0-100, median (IQR)					
* P < 0.05 when adjusted for multiple comparisons using a Bonferroni correction					
Table created by authors					

Individuals who attended care in the last 3 months were significantly wealthier than those who did not attend care in this timeframe, and more likely to have at least one NCD, have either HIV or TB or both, or other conditions lasting for more than 3 months. Despite individuals with chronic diseases having attended clinic more recently, 65% of respondents with these conditions did not report attending care in this timeframe, including 62.7% of patients reporting hypertension and 66.7% of individuals reporting diabetes.

People who had attended in the last 3 months also had significantly higher disability measured by DAS scores (14.6 versus 6.3), lower QoL (56.3 versus 59.4), and were more likely to be frail (63.1% versus 53.7%) than those with no visits in the last 3 months; all $p < .0001$.

Visits characteristics

The most common reasons overall for seeking care were for acute conditions (79.1%) including fever or malaria (51.6%), musculoskeletal pain (9.6%), and diarrhea or stomach-ache (8.4%). Chronic conditions accounted for care seeking in 12.9% including hypertension (6.2%), other cardiac conditions (2.1%) and diabetes (0.6%) (Appendix Table 2A). The most common reasons for care-seeking within the past 3 months were fever or malaria (37.8%), high blood pressure (12.8%), musculoskeletal pain (12.0%), complaints related to the ear, nose or throat (7.4%), or diarrhea or stomach-ache (7.0%). Not being sick was the most frequent reason for no recent care-seeking (87.3%) (Appendix Table 3A). Among those who stated other reasons for not seeking care, cost was the most common reason (50.4%), followed by preferring to see a traditional healer (11.6%) and poor previous experiences with the health system (6.0%).

Health System Quality outcomes

Overall, 32.7% of respondents were very confident that if they got sick, the health system could meet their needs. Compared with individuals with a visit over 3 months ago, individuals with recent visits had higher trust and confidence in the health system to provide effective care if they were sick (38.3% versus 30.8% very confident, $p < .0004$), although rates remained low. No differences were seen in their needs being met from their last visit or in overall opinion of the national health system (Table 1).

Experiences of care at facilities (Health System Responsiveness Variables)

Among individuals with a visit to a public sector primary (CSPS) or secondary level (district hospital) public facility in the last 3 months, the median wait time was 20 minutes (IQR 10-30) while time spent with the provider was 15 minutes (IQR 10-25). Financial access was a challenge with 14.7% borrowing money or selling something to pay for health care. The highest ratings of experience of care (defined as excellent or very good) were in ease of following instructions (86.1%) and trust in the skills and abilities of the facility providers (81.1%). Lower ratings were seen for provider medical knowledge and skills (51.2%), clarity of communications (48.2%), with the lowest ratings in involvement in decision making (30.7%) (Table 2).

The variable grouping with the greatest factor loading (the HSR-group variable) combined the results for questions on involvement in decision-making (autonomy), clarity in communication, trust in the provider, and confidence in providers' skills (factor loadings of 0.44, 0.73, 0.57, and 0.69, respectively) (Appendix). After discussion between authors, we agreed that these variables reflected components necessary for shared understanding and decision making and termed

the resultant variable as such (SUDM). We used the scaled variable as described in the methods and chose to not weight variable components as all were assumed to be equally important for SUDM. The median score for SUDM was 58.3 (Interquartile range (IQR) 50 - 75). In a multivariable analysis, only being seen in a district hospital was associated with higher SUDM (Adjusted odds ratio (aOR) 5.91 (95% CI 2.87 - 8.96)) (Table 3).

Table 2: Experience at last visit to a public sector primary or secondary level facility in the 3 months prior to survey.

Measure	Rating	N (%)
Clarity	Excellent	45 (7.1)
	Very Good	260 (41.1)
	Good	287 (45.4)
	Fair	39 (6.2)
	Poor	1 (.2)
Ease of following	Excellent	81 (12.8)
	Very Good	463 (73.3)
	Good	76 (12)
	Fair	11 (1.7)
	Poor	1 (.2)
Provider medical knowledge and skills	Excellent	64 (10.1)
	Very Good	259 (41)
	Good	280 (44.3)
	Fair	27 (4.3)
	Poor	2 (.3)
Trust in skills and abilities of health workers at the facility	Very much	104 (16.5)
	Quite a bit	408 (64.6)
	Some	105 (16.6)
	Very little	13 (2.1)
	Not at all	2 (.3)
Involvement in decision making	Excellent	35 (5.5)
	Very Good	159 (25.2)
	Good	268 (42.4)
	Fair	101 (16)
	Poor	69 (10.9)
Shared Understanding and Decision Making (SUDM)	Median (Interquartile range)	62.5 (50 - 75)
Borrowed money or sold anything to pay for health care	Yes	93 (14.7)
	No	539 (85.3)
Wait time (median, IQR)		20 (10 - 30)
Table created by authors		

Table 3: Bivariate and multivariable analysis of factors associated with higher shared understanding and decision making (SUDM) among individuals with a visit to a primary or secondary level public sector facility in the 3 months prior to the survey.

Sex		Bivariate analysis odds ratio(95% CI)	P value	Multivariable analysis odds ratio(95% CI)	P value
Sex	Male	Reference		Reference	
	Female	-1.74 (-4.01-0.54)	0.13	-2.43 (-4.76 - -0.11)	0.040

Age (per year)		0.12 (0.016 - 0.22)	0.023	0.072 (-0.046 - 0.19)	0.23
Educational attainment	No formal schooling	Reference		Reference	
	Some education	0.32 (-2.61 - 3.24)	0.83	-0.57 (-3.64 - 2.50)	0.72
Marital status	Widowed/divorced/single	Reference			
	Married/cohabitating	-0.44 (-3.03 - 2.15)	0.74		
Wealth quintile†	1	Reference		Reference	
	2	0.24 (-3.87 - 4.36)	0.91	-0.33 (-4.28 - 3.62)	0.87
	3	0.37 (-3.45 - 4.19)	0.85	0.15 (-3.64 - 3.94)	0.94
	4	-0.76 (-4.64 - 3.12)	0.70	-1.12 (-4.88 - 2.64)	0.56
	5	1.38 (-2.31 - 5.07)	0.46	-0.13 (-3.87 - 3.60)	0.95
Facility type	Center for Health and Social Promotion	Reference		Reference	
	Medical Center with Surgical Antenna	6.04 (3.32 - 8.76)	<0.001	5.48 (2.58 - 8.38)	< 0.001
Financial Accessibility	Borrowed or sold anything to attend clinic	Reference			
	Did not borrow or sell anything	1.06 (-2.14 - 4.27)	0.56		
Non-communicable diseases (NCD)	No NCDs	Reference		Reference	
	≥1 NCD	1.94 (-0.38 - 4.26)	0.10	1.28 (-1.09 - 3.64)	0.29
TB or HIV	No TB or HIV	Reference			
	TB and/or HIV	-4.05 (-11.07 - 2.96)	0.26		
Other conditions for > 3 months	No other conditions	Reference			
	≥1 other condition	-0.88 (-3.39 - 1.63)	0.49		
Mental health disorders (MHD)	No MHDs	Reference		Reference	
	≥1 MHD	2.51 (-0.20 - 5.23)	0.070	1.53 (-1.39 - 4.45)	0.30
Frailty	Not frail/pre-frail	Reference			
	Frail	1.16 (-1.19 - 3.51)	0.33		
Disability	WHO DAS score††	0.063 (0.00077 - 0.12)	0.047	0.013 (-0.06 - 0.09)	0.74
Quality of life	WHO QoL score ††	-0.036 (-0.11 - 0.039)	0.34		
Table created by authors					

Factors associated with health system quality outcomes

In the multivariable analysis higher quality of life (OR 1.02, 95% CI 1.01-1.04), frailty (OR 1.47, 95% CI 1.00-2.16) and SUDM (OR 1.06, 95% CI 1.05-1.09) were all associated with greater trust and confidence in the health system to provide effective care if they were sick (Table 4). SUDM was associated with overall positive assessment of the health care system in Burkina Faso (OR 1.02, 95% CI 1.01-1.03) and met healthcare needs in the last visit (OR 1.09, 95% CI 1.08-1.11). Younger age and highest wealth quintile were also associated with higher scores for met needs, while having at least one mental health condition was associated with less positive ratings of the overall health system.

Table 4: Multivariable regression for health system quality outcomes among respondents with a visit to a public sector primary or secondary level facility in the 3 months prior to the survey

		Trust and Confidence in healthcare system		Overall view of healthcare system		Health care needs met	
		Bivariate analysis	Multivariable analysis	Bivariate analysis	Multivariable analysis	Bivariate analysis	Multivariable analysis
		OR (95% CI)	OR (96% CI)	OR (95% CI)		OR (95% CI)	
Sex	Male	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Female	0.73 (0.53 - 1.01)	0.83 (0.58 - 1.19)	0.89 (0.64 - 1.23)	0.99 (0.70 - 1.40)	0.86 (0.63 - 1.17)	1.03 (0.71 - 1.49)
Age*		1.00 (0.98 - 1.01)	1.00 (0.98 - 1.01)	1.00 (0.99 - 1.01)	1.01 (0.99 - 1.03)	0.99 (0.98 - 1.01)	0.98 (0.97 - 1.00)
Education	No formal schooling	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	Some education	1.02 (0.68 - 1.54)	0.97 (0.60 - 1.56)	0.93 (0.61 - 1.42)	1.07 (0.67 - 1.70)	1.09 (0.73 - 1.63)	0.92 (0.56 - 1.50)
Wealth quintile	1	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	2	1.58 (0.90 - 2.79)	1.49 (0.79 - 2.81)	1.00 (0.56 - 1.77)	1.00 (0.55 - 1.80)	1.17 (0.68 - 2.03)	1.24 (0.65 - 2.35)
	3	1.86 (1.08 - 3.21)	1.60 (0.87 - 2.94)	1.05 (0.61 - 1.82)	1.03 (0.58 - 1.82)	1.53 (0.90 - 2.58)	1.58 (0.85 - 2.94)
	4	1.13 (0.66 - 1.96)	0.99 (0.53 - 1.83)	1.24 (0.71 - 2.14)	1.27 (0.72 - 2.25)	1.19 (0.71 - 2.00)	1.25 (0.68 - 2.30)
	5	1.31 (0.78 - 2.20)	0.88 (0.48 - 1.63)	0.77 (0.46 - 1.27)	0.77 (0.44 - 1.34)	1.83 (1.11 - 2.99)	1.85 (1.00 - 3.42)
Facility	CSPS	Reference		Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
	District Hospital	1.13 (0.77 - 1.66)		0.68 (0.46 - 1.00)	0.70 (0.46 - 1.08)	1.43 (0.98 - 2.10)	0.90 (0.56 - 1.45)
Financial access	Did not borrow/sell anything	Reference		Reference		Reference	
	Borrowed/sold something	0.94 (0.60 - 1.48)		0.85 (0.54 - 1.33)		1.24 (0.80 - 1.92)	
NCDs	None	Reference		Reference		Reference	
	≥1 NCD	1.05 (0.76 - 1.45)		0.86 (0.61 - 1.19)		1.21 (0.88 - 1.67)	
HIV or TB	None	Reference	Reference	Reference		Reference	
	HIV and/or TB	0.47 (0.15 - 1.47)	0.64 (0.19 - 2.18)	0.77 (0.29 - 2.08)		0.53 (0.19 - 1.45)	
MHD	None	Reference		Reference	Reference	Reference	
	≥1 MHD	1.07 (0.73 - 1.56)		0.51 (0.35 - 0.74)	0.52 (0.34-0.80)	1.18 (0.81 - 1.72)	
Frailty	Not frail/pre-frail	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference	
	Frail	1.32 (0.95 - 1.85)	1.47 (1.00-2.16)	0.75 (0.53 - 1.06)	0.83 (0.57 - 1.21)	1.12 (0.81 - 1.55)	

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#).

Disability (DAS)	DAS score††	1.00 (0.99 - 1.01)		0.99 (0.98 - 1.00)	0.99 (0.98-1.01)	1.00 (0.99 - 1.01)	
QOL	QoL score ††	1.02 (1.01 - 1.03)	1.02 (1.01 - 1.04)	1.00 (0.99 - 1.01)		1.01 (0.99 - 1.02)	
Wait time		0.64 (0.18 - 2.27)		2.18 (0.61 - 7.78)		1.19 (0.34 - 4.12)	
SUDM		1.06 (1.05 - 1.07)	1.06 (1.05 - 1.09)	1.02 (1.00 - 1.03)	1.02 (1.01-1.03)	1.09 (1.07 - 1.11)	1.09 (1.08 - 1.11)

*per year

CSPS: Center for Health and Social Promotion, NCD: Non communicable diseases, MHD: Mental health Disorder, QOL: Quality of Life SUDM: Shared Understanding and Decision making

Table created by authors

Discussion

Ensuring longitudinal preventive, promotive and curative primary care among older adults in resource constrained settings is critical to reduce the burden of morbidity and mortality related to NCDs. In this household survey of older individuals in Nouna, Burkina Faso, we found that about one-quarter of individuals sought care at a public primary or secondary care facility in the last three months. Individuals who reported higher wealth, presence of an NCD or communicable disease, high disability and frailty and lower quality of life were more likely to have received recent care. SUDM was found to be the most consistent factor associated with higher health system quality outcomes including satisfaction, confidence in the health systems and overall quality of care.

Acute conditions were the most common reason for care seeking among this older population overall, with one-fifth of recent care seeking for more chronic conditions. However, only one third of patients who self-reported an NCD and 41% of those with TB or HIV had a visit in the last three months, despite recommendations from many institutions including the World Health Organization that individuals with NCDs be seen at least every three months.(38) The lack of recent visits for individuals with chronic conditions requiring longitudinal care is of concern given the importance of ongoing management even when symptoms are not present. Data from Serra Leone found that knowledge about cardiovascular disease risk factors and costs were barriers to accessing care(39), but similar insights from Burkina Faso and among older adults were not found. More work to understand the scope and causes of this challenge in similar settings is needed to develop effective interventions to strengthen the quality of primary and secondary care to ensure not just once-off access but continuity and comprehensiveness of care, core dimensions of effective primary care.(40)(41)

Shared decision making is defined as "process jointly shared by patients and their health care provider". It aims at helping patients play an active role in decisions concerning their health, which is the ultimate goal of patient-centered care" (42). Shared decision making has been studied since the 1990's and increasingly important as the push for more people-centered primary care has emerged from the World Health Organizations and the Astana Declaration in 2018.(43) The importance of shared decision making and effective communication for management of chronic

conditions has been a focus of research in high income countries with lower rates of shared decision making have been found among older individuals and those with poorer health, and associated with lower adherence to care and treatment.(20,21) Achieving shared decision making requires engagement in decision making, effective communication and good provider-patient relationships, factors which were captured in our SUDM measure. Similar to our study, higher rates of shared decision-making rates have been associated with better satisfaction identifying an area for improving quality and outcomes of care for older individuals and people with NCDs.(44)

Rating of care experience variables, again pointed to areas where change is needed. Participants reported high ratings of some other areas of visit experience (ability to follow advice and trust in provider skills), while other areas were lower, with one-half or fewer reporting high provider technical skills, clarity of communication, or involvement in decision making. Compared with other studies, clarity of communications was lower in our study (48% versus 66-100% in Tanzania and close to 60% in Ghana), although variability in populations, survey questions and scoring makes comparisons challenging.(19)(45) In contrast, in Ghana female patients, gave lower ratings for involvement, although the population was younger overall than in our study.(19)

Trust and confidence in the health system was high, but lower among those not seeking recent care, as well reporting of met needs during the most recent care encounter, offering an opportunity for improving perceptions, engagement-in and delivery-of care. This finding is similar to results from a survey in Ghana of women. In a study in Burkina Faso, perceived quality of care was a determinant for retention in care at a site, important for the continuity needed for NCDs and effective primary care more broadly, and identifying an area where improvement is needed.(46)

While geographic access was only rarely given as a reason for no recent care seeking, 14.5% had to borrow or sell something to attend a clinic, representing a significant burden among a population with high poverty. This measure also may underestimate cost burdens such as individuals who had to forgo consumption of other goods or services such as food to access their health care. While the lower wealth among non-users was similar to findings to Dong et al they also found higher rates of financial access as a barrier than in our study.(47)

Our study had some key limitations. First, we were unable to collect all the dimensions of the traditional health systems responsiveness domains - aspects such as respect and confidentiality might have added to our understanding of care experience in this population. The self-reported nature of past condition information may have underestimated actual prevalence due to absent or forgotten diagnoses. We also limited our analyses to individuals visiting a public sector facility providing primary or secondary level care, excluding the small proportion of participants using private or higher-level facilities, to focus on the local care system delivery. However, given the expanding role of the private sector in many countries, future work focusing on these facilities should be planned.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#).

In conclusion, we provide a comprehensive and mixed picture of public-sector health facility care seeking behaviors and user quality experiences among older individuals in rural Burkina Faso. A minority of individual have sought recent care, most frequently for acute conditions, despite a burden of NCDs which need continuity of care. Among those with recent visits, the importance of shared understanding and engagement in decision making was seen across all measured health systems quality outcomes. Situating our findings was limited by the availability of comparable population-representative samples in rural, low-income settings – efforts to measure similar patient experiences should provide substantial benefit. Our findings provide insights into designing health system and care delivery interventions to improve the experience and involvement in care of the growing elderly population in rural LMICs. These interventions are particularly important for those with chronic conditions for whom ongoing care is critical to reduce preventable mortality and mortality.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank the team who managed and implemented the survey and the community members who shared their experiences with us and Dr Sie who was integral to the design and performance of the survey.

Contributors TB, JD, and GH conceived and designed the overall CSRN CHAS Study. MB and GH coordinated baseline data collection and preparation with support from JD, and LRH contributed to the design of the CSRN CHAS household survey. LRH and JD designed the current study. EMG conducted the analysis, and LRH, JD and EMG interpreted the analysis and developed, led the writing and revisions of the manuscript. All authors substantively reviewed manuscript, inputted into revisions and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

Funding Support for the CSRN Heidelberg Aging Study and for TB was provided by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation through the Alexander von Humboldt Professor award (no grant number exists) to TB, funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research. GH is supported by a fellowship [210479/Z/18/Z] from both the Wellcome Trust and Royal Society. This research was funded in whole, or in part, by the Wellcome Trust [Grant number 210479/Z/18/Z]. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright license to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

Competing interests

The authors report no competing interests

References

1. Kruk ME, Gage AD, Arsenault C, Jordan K, Leslie HH, Roder-Dewan S, et al. The Lancet Global Health Commission High-quality health systems in the Sustainable Development Goals era: time for a revolution. 2018;(18):1–57.
2. Institute of Medicine. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2001.
3. World Health Organization. Framework on integrated, people-centred health services. 2016;(A69/39):1–12.
4. Sharma J, Leslie HH, Kundu F, Kruk ME. Poor quality for poor women? Inequities in the quality of antenatal and delivery care in Kenya. PLoS ONE. 2017;12(1):1–14.
5. Piot P, Caldwell A, Lamprey P, Nyririnda M, Mehra S, Cahill K, et al. Addressing the growing burden of non-communicable disease by leveraging lessons from infectious disease management. Journal of Global Health. 2016;6(1):5–7.
6. Manne-Goehler J, Geldsetzer P, Agoudavi K, Andall-Brereton G, Aryal KK, Bicaba BW, et al. Health system performance for people with diabetes in 28 low-and middle-income countries: A cross-sectional study of nationally representative surveys. PLoS Medicine. 2019;16(3):1–21.
7. Kruk ME, Chukwuma A, Leslie HH. Variation in quality of primary-care services in Kenya , Malawi , Namibia , Rwanda , Senegal , Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania. Bulletin of the World Health Organization. 2017;95(6):408–18.
8. Das J, Holla A, Das V, Mohanan M, Tabak D, Chan B. In urban and rural India, a standardized patient study showed low levels of provider training and huge quality gaps. Health Affairs. 2012;31(12):2774–84.
9. Geldsetzer P, Manne-Goehler J, Marcus ME, Ebert C, Zhumadilov Z, Wesseh CS, et al. The state of hypertension care in 44 low-income and middle-income countries: a cross-sectional study of nationally representative individual-level data from 1·1 million adults. The Lancet. 2019;394(10199):652–62.
10. Davies JJ, Reddiar SK, Hirschhorn LR, Ebert C, Marcus ME, Seiglie JA, et al. Association between country preparedness indicators and quality clinical care for cardiovascular disease risk factors in 44 lower- And middle-income countries: A multicountry analysis of survey data. PLoS Medicine. 2020;17(11):1–25.
11. Odland ML, Whitaker J, Nepogodiev D, Aling' CA, Bagahirwa I, Dushime T, et al. Identifying, Prioritizing and Visually Mapping Barriers to Injury Care in Rwanda: A Multi-disciplinary Stakeholder Exercise. World Journal of Surgery. 2020;44(9):2903–18.
12. Kruk ME, Mbaruku G, McCord CW, Moran M, Rockers PC, Galea S. Bypassing primary care facilities for childbirth: A population-based study in rural Tanzania. Health Policy and Planning. 2009;24(4):279–88.
13. Doyle C, Lennox L, Bell D. A systematic review of evidence on the links between patient experience and clinical safety and effectiveness. BMJ Open. 2013;3(1).
14. Woskie LR, Fallah MP. Overcoming distrust to deliver universal health coverage: Lessons from Ebola. The BMJ. 2019;366.
15. Mirzoev T, Kane S. What is health systems responsiveness? Review of existing knowledge and proposed conceptual framework. BMJ Global Health. 2017;2(4).
16. Tille F, Röttger J, Gibis B, Busse R, Kuhlmeier A, Schnitzer S. Patients' perceptions of health system responsiveness in ambulatory care in Germany. Patient Education and Counseling. 2019;102(1):162–71.
17. de Silva A. A Framework for Measuring Responsiveness. WHO GPE Discussion Paper Series. 2000;(32).
18. Larson E, Sharma J, Bohren MA, Tunçalp Ö. When the patient is the expert: Measuring patient experience and satisfaction with care. Bulletin of the World Health Organization. 2019;97(8):563–9.
19. Ratcliffe HL, Bell G, Awoonor-Williams K, Bitton A, Kim JH, Lipstiz S, et al. Towards patient-centred care in Ghana: health system responsiveness, self-rated health and experiential quality in a nationally representative survey. BMJ open quality. 2020;9(2).

20. Spatz ES, Spertus JA. Shared decision making: A path toward improved patient-centered outcomes. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes*. 2012;5(6):75–7.
21. Joosten EAG, DeFuentes-Merillas L, De Weert GH, Sensky T, Van Der Staak CPF, De Jong CAJ. Systematic review of the effects of shared decision-making on patient satisfaction, treatment adherence and health status. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*. 2008;77(4):219–26.
22. World Bank. Burkina Faso Poverty and Equity Brief [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Jul 30]. p. 1–2. Available from: https://databank.worldbank.org/data/download/poverty/987B9C90-CB9F-4D93-AE8C-750588BF00QA/AM2020/Global_POVEQ_BFA.pdf
23. World Bank. World Health Organization Global Health Expenditure database [Internet]. [cited 2021 May 15]. Available from: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SH.XPD.CHEX.GD.ZS?locations=BF>
24. World Health Organization (WHO). Rapport de l'enquête nationale sur la prévalence des principaux risques communs aux maladies non transmissibles au Burkina Faso. 2014;78.
25. World Health Organization. Noncommunicable diseases country profiles 2018. Geneva, Switzerland; 2016.
26. Sié A, Louis ValérieR, Gbangou A, Müller O, Niamba L, Stieglbauer G, et al. The Health and Demographic Surveillance System (HDSS) in Nouna, Burkina Faso, 1993–2007. *Global Health Action*. 2010;3(1):5284.
27. Odland ML, Payne C, Witham MD, Siedner MJ, Bärnighausen T, Bountogo M, et al. Epidemiology of multimorbidity in conditions of extreme poverty: A population-based study of older adults in rural Burkina Faso. *BMJ Global Health*. 2020;5(3):1–14.
28. Anxiety and Depression Assoc of America. GAC-7 Anxiety [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jun 10]. Available from: https://adaa.org/sites/default/files/GAD-7_Anxiety-updated_0.pdfdisorder-gad
29. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity measure. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2001;16(9):606–13.
30. World Health Organization. WHOQOL: Measuring Quality of Life [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jun 10]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/tools/whoqol>
31. World Health Organization. WHO Disability Assessment Schedule 2.0 (WHODAS 2.0) [Internet]. [cited 2021 Jun 10]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/standards/classifications/international-classification-of-functioning-disability-and-health/who-disability-assessment-schedule>
32. Hall K, Gao S, Emsley C, Ogunniyi A, Morgan O, Hendrie H. Community screening interview for dementia (CSI 'D'); performance in five disparate study sites. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2000;15(6):521–21.
33. Harling G, Witham MD, Davies JI, Bärnighausen T, Bountogo M, Manne-Goehler J, et al. Frailty and physical performance in the context of extreme poverty: A population-based study of older adults in rural Burkina Faso. *Wellcome Open Research*. 2019;4:1–16.
34. Filmer D, Pritchett L. Estimating wealth effects without expenditure data-or tears: an application to educational enrollments in states of India. *Demography*. 2001;38(1):115–32.
35. Baltussen R. Perceived quality of care of primary health care services in Burkina Faso. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2002;17(1):42–8.
36. Geldsetzer P, Haakenstad A, James EK, Atun R. Non-technical health care quality and health system responsiveness in middle-income countries: A cross-sectional study in China, Ghana, India, Mexico, Russia, and South Africa. *Journal of Global Health*. 2018;8(2).
37. Peltzer K. Patient experiences and health system responsiveness in South Africa. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2009 Jan;9:117.
38. World Health Organization. WHO package of essential noncommunicable (PEN) disease interventions for primary health care. 2020.
39. Ignatowicz A, Odland ML, Bockarie T, Wurie H, Ansumana R, Kelly AH, et al. Knowledge and understanding of cardiovascular disease risk factors in Sierra Leone: A qualitative study of patients' and community leaders' perceptions. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(12):7–9.

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#).

40. Starfield B, Leiyu S, Macinko J. Contribution of Primary Care to Health Systems and Health. *The Milbank Quarterly*. 2005;83(3):457–502.
41. Bitton A, Ratcliffe HL, Veillard JH, Kress DH, Barkley S, Kimball M, et al. Primary Health Care as a Foundation for Strengthening Health Systems in Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*. 2016; 32(5):566-571
42. Truglio-Londrigan M, Slyer JT, Singleton JK, Worral PS. A qualitative systematic review of internal and external influences on shared decision-making in all health care settings. *JB I Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports*. 2014;12(5):121–94.
43. WHO, UNICEF. Declaration of Astana. WHO. 2018.
44. Milky G, Thomas J. Shared decision making, satisfaction with care and medication adherence among patients with diabetes. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2020;103(3):661–9.
45. Kapologwe NA, Kibusi SM, Borghi J, Gwajima DO, Kalolo A. Assessing health system responsiveness in primary health care facilities in Tanzania. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2020;20(1):1–10.
46. Mugisha F, Bocar K, Dong H, Chepng'eno G, Sauerborn R. The two faces of enhancing utilization of health-care services: Determinants of patient initiation and retention in rural Burkina Faso. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 2004;82(8):572–9.
47. Dong H, Gbangou A, De Allegri M, Pokhrel S, Sauerborn R. The differences in characteristics between health-care users and non-users: Implication for introducing community-based health insurance in Burkina Faso. *European Journal of Health Economics*. 2008;9(1):41–50.