

1 **The effect of recall period on reported out-of-pocket health expenditure in Ghana**

2

3 Isaiiah Awintuen Agorinya\*<sup>1, 2,3,4</sup>, Amanda Ross<sup>1,2</sup>, Gabriela Flores <sup>6</sup>, , James Akazili<sup>4,5</sup>, Tessa Tan-  
4 torres Edejer<sup>6</sup>, Kim van Wilgenburg<sup>9</sup>, Maxwell Dalaba<sup>3,5</sup>, Nathan Mensah<sup>10</sup>, Le My  
5 Lan<sup>1,2,7</sup>, YadetaDassie Bacha<sup>8</sup>, Jemima Sumbuh<sup>5</sup>, Fabrizio Tediosi<sup>1,2</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute

8 <sup>2</sup>University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

9 <sup>3</sup>University of Health and Allied Sciences, Ho, Ghana

10 <sup>4</sup>INDEPTH-Network Secretariat, Accra, Ghana

11 <sup>5</sup>Navrongo Health Research Centre, Navrongo, Ghana

12 <sup>6</sup>World Health Organization (WHO), Geneva, Switzerland

13 <sup>7</sup>FilaBavi Health and Demographic Surveillance Site, Hanoi, Vietnam

14 <sup>8</sup>Department of Public Health, College of Health and Medical Sciences, Haramaya University, Harar,  
15 Ethiopia

16 <sup>9</sup>Department of Public Health and Management Health Economics, Erasmus University, the  
17 Netherlands

18 <sup>10</sup>Department of Health Information Management, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **\*Corresponding author**

26 Email: [iagorinya@gmail.com](mailto:iagorinya@gmail.com) (IAA)

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 40 **Abstract**

41 **Background:** Out-of-pocket health payments (OOPs) are a key indicator of health financing systems'  
42 performance. Measuring OOPs through household surveys is challenging and yet it is the primary  
43 source of information in the absence of comprehensive data on user charges in the public sector and  
44 market data from the private sector. The choice of the recall period has been identified as a source of  
45 bias in previous studies. This study investigates the effect of two different types of recall periods on  
46 the agreement between OOPs reported by households and providers.

47 **Methods:** Households were sampled for the community survey from the Navrongo Health and  
48 Demographic Surveillance System, Ghana. Two versions of a health expenditure module were  
49 developed differing only in the recall periods, "shorter recall periods" 2 weeks for medicines and  
50 outpatient care, 3 months for preventive care and 6 months for inpatient care and medical products. The  
51 longer recall periods were 4 weeks, 6 months and 12 months. Households from both community and  
52 provider sampling were randomly assigned to the two questionnaires. The providers included the  
53 hospital, one clinic and health facilities and drug shops in the area. We estimated the ratio between the  
54 overall mean household OOPs and overall mean provider OOPs. We assessed agreement between the  
55 individual matched household-provider OOPs using the Bland-Altman analysis.

56 **Findings:** The short and long recall period versions of the questionnaires were administered to 746  
57 and 480 households with matching success to provider records of 72% and 84%, respectively. The  
58 most common spending categories were inpatient care and medicines in this sample. The overall mean  
59 OOPs reported by the households were higher than provider records for both recall periods. For  
60 matched household-provider data, there was no evidence of a difference in the agreement between the  
61 household and provider OOPs for inpatient care, the ratio of household to provider for the 12 months  
62 recall was estimated to be 0.74 (95% CI 0.45, 1.19;  $p=0.22$ ) that of the ratio of household to provider  
63 for the 6-month period, where less than 1 indicates better agreement. For medicines, the ratio of 4  
64 weeks to 2 weeks was 1.26 (0.93, 1.39;  $p=0.39$ ).

65 **Conclusion:** There were considerable challenges in using provider data to assess the accuracy of  
66 reported OOPs in this setting. There was no evidence from this study that the agreement between  
67 household and provider data differed by recall period, however the confidence intervals of the effect  
68 were wide, and an effect cannot be ruled out.

69 **Keywords:** Recall period, out-of-pocket, universal health coverage, household survey, comparability,  
70 validation, Ghana

71

72

73

74

## 75 **Background**

76 Out-of-pocket (OOP) health payments are defined as direct payments individuals make at the point of  
77 service to access healthcare which are either in the form of informal payments, user chargers,  
78 coinsurance, copayments and/or deductibles [1]. These OOPs exclude any prepayment for health  
79 services in the form of insurance premiums, government subsidies and or taxes (1).

80 Globally, WHO estimated that OOP(s)accounted for 44% of current health expenditure in 2019, the  
81 latest year for which the evidence is currently available (3). OOP is used in all countries at all income  
82 levels to fund the health system but the extent to which they contribute to it varies markedly by  
83 country income group levels. It ranged between 44% in most Low-income countries, 40% in low-  
84 middle-Income Countries (LMICs), 34% in Upper-middle-middle income countries to 21% in High  
85 Income Countries (HICs)(4–6). In Ghana 36% of health care expenditure is OOP (3,7).

86 At the individual level, for some people, out-of-pocket health payments represent a financial barrier to  
87 access leading to foregone care. For those making such payments, on the other hand, they may not  
88 prevent themselves from seeking care, but they can be a source of financial hardship. Financial  
89 protection in health aims to eliminate both negative outcomes. It is a key component of Universal  
90 Health Coverage (UHC) (8, 9). Information on OOPs is used both for evidence-based health  
91 financing policy discussions and to track progress towards financial protection in health (10,11).

92

93 Household surveys are important for measuring both OOPs and the households' ability to pay in  
94 absolute or relative terms to calculate financial protection. OOPs tracked in household surveys are the  
95 primary source of information in LMICs to determine their contribution to the overall health spending  
96 landscape. Household surveys are the only source of information available across all countries at all  
97 income levels to gather information on both household's OOP and their ability to pay.

98 Despite the importance of household surveys, the design of the module(s) used to collect data on OOP  
99 is not standardized, neither across countries, nor within countries over time. One reason for this is the  
100 existence of several challenges in gathering such information. The most common ones are the Living  
101 Standards and Measurement Surveys (LSMS), the Household Budget Surveys (HBS), the Socio-  
102 Economic Surveys (SES) and Income and Expenditure Surveys (IES), as well as household  
103 expenditure and utilization surveys [6–8]. These surveys differ in the level of comprehensiveness and  
104 specificity of the health expenditure questions; the module used to collect the information on health  
105 spending, the overall focus of the survey and the recall period. The latter is the focus of this paper.

106 Differences in recall periods contribute to recall bias problems [5,9,12–14]. According to nationally  
107 representative survey-based studies, a short recall period leads to a larger estimate of OOP than a

108 long recall period in most countries [5,7,15]. However, very few studies have investigated the impact  
109 of recall period on reported OOPs tracked in household surveys[5,7,11].

110 What the optimum recall period should be is not well established. Stull *et al.* found that a single recall  
111 period is not appropriate for measuring and understanding all outcomes[16]. In the case of health  
112 payments, a single recall period is unlikely to be relevant given their different frequencies and costs.  
113 When different recall periods are used for health expenditures, the common choices are one month,  
114 six months or 12 months but there is no standard.

115 It is therefore important to investigate the effect of the recall period on the accuracy and reliability of  
116 data collected in household surveys on the components of out-of-pocket health expenditure [7]. To  
117 assess accuracy, reported OOPs need to be compared to actual cost although these are difficult to  
118 measure reliably.

119 This study is part of a larger project the INDEPTH-network household out of pocket expenditure  
120 (iHOPE)project, which was supported by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) in  
121 collaboration with the Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute (Swiss TPH) and the World Health  
122 Organization (WHO). The project set out to develop and compare alternative survey instruments for  
123 collecting valid and reliable out-of-pocket health expenditure data. As part of the iHOPE project, this  
124 study investigates the effect of different recall periods on amounts spent on various health goods and  
125 services out-of-pocket by comparing the agreement between household respondents and provider  
126 records. Provider records are an objective measure which does not depend on participants' recall but  
127 do depend on capturing information from all of the relevant providers.

128

## 129 **Methods**

### 130 **Study setting**

131 This study was implemented at the Navrongo Health and Demographic Surveillance System  
132 (NHDSS) site located in the northern part of Ghana. The site includes two administrative districts  
133 with an estimated total population of 160,000. Within this site, there is one hospital, a health research  
134 institution, one private clinic, seven health centers, and 27 community-based health compounds. A  
135 number of pharmacies and licensed chemical shops, petty traders, drug peddlers, herbalists, faith-  
136 based and traditional healers also operate in the area. The NHDSS maintains a demographic  
137 surveillance system that routinely collects vital Healthscope-demographic and economic data [19]

### 138 **Study design**

139 The iHOPE project compares responses on OOPs in a cross-sectional survey to provider data to assess  
140 accuracy. The agreement between household and provider OOPs was compared for two different  
141 questionnaire versions using different recall periods (Table 1). Households were randomized into two

142 groups. First, new modules of health expenditure questions were designed and integrated into existing  
143 survey tools (Ghana Living Standards Survey 6 questionnaire), then cross-sectional household and  
144 provider data collection was carried out in the field using the new questionnaires and then the survey  
145 data was matched with the provider data.

146

147 **Table 1: Spending categories and corresponding recall periods**

	<b>Questionnaire Version 1</b>	<b>Questionnaire Version 2</b>
<b>Health spending category</b>	<b>shorter recall period</b>	<b>Longer recall period</b>
Inpatient care	6 months	12 months
Preventive care	3 months	6 months
Other health services	2 weeks	4 weeks
Outpatient	2 weeks	4 weeks
Medicines	2 weeks	4 weeks
Health products	6 months	12 months

148

149

### 150 **Study population and Sampling**

151 The study population constituted all households registered in the Navrongo Health Research  
152 Demographic Surveillance System (NHDSS). Two sampling strategies were employed: standard  
153 household-based sampling was adopted for outpatient, medicines and preventive care whilst provider-  
154 based inpatient sampling was adopted for inpatient care expenditures due to the low frequency of  
155 inpatient spending. The sample size was based on the precision of estimating the agreement between  
156 household and provider records. As a rule of thumb for the Bland-Altman method of assessing  
157 agreement, between 100-200 observations would provide a sample size with sufficient precision of  
158 the estimates when assessing agreement[20]. Sample sizes for the survey were computed to  
159 achieve 100 household with positive OOPs per spending category. However, we accepted 50  
160 observations for each spending category per questionnaire version as adequate in spending categories  
161 where it was not feasible to obtain the 100 matched household observations.

162

### 163 **Household sampling**

164 The probability of spending on outpatient care was 15.5% within a two-week period [*unpublished*  
165 *Navrongo DHMT, 2015 data*]. In order to obtain a sample size of 100 households with outpatient  
166 spending in the two-week recall period, the number of households in this group would be 600. We  
167 added 10% to account for non-response to arrive at a total sample of 660 households for this  
168 questionnaire version. For the four-week recall period, the sample size required to get a minimum of  
169 100 households who incurred health expenditure would be 400, adding 10% to account for non-  
170 response gives a target of 440 households.


171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203

### Provider sampling

Only one hospital (public provider) in the study area provides inpatient care services. From this provider database, we randomly selected 220 households with positive expenditure to form the sample with inpatient care. Each recall period group (6 months and 12 months) was randomly assigned to 110 households.

### Randomization

For the household sampling, households were sampled using the Navrongo Health and Demographic Surveillance System (NHDSS). The Navrongo DSS is divided into five zones (North, South, East, West and Central), subzones and clusters. Households were selected randomly from the DSS database which contains all 33,000 households.



## 204 **The providers**

205 The health providers included all public and private health care providers operating within the study  
206 area. They include one hospital, one clinic, seven health centers and ten high volume pharmacy shops  
207 and around 50 chemical shops. This allows us to investigate agreement for the main spending  
208 categories reported by households. In order to obtain data from the providers, we identified and  
209 selected only providers that kept transactional records or were capable of recording such information  
210 and placed field staff to assist in recording transactions in providers that did not previous keep  
211 records.

212

## 213 **Data collection instruments**

### 214 **Household data collection instrument**

215 A health expenditure and utilization household survey was developed by WHO drawing on the  
216 structure of the World Health Survey[21] and adapted to the Ghana Living Standards Survey 6  
217 (GLSS6)[22]. The structure of the survey instrument included a household level questionnaire with  
218 questions about household OOPs as part of an expenditure module asked to a single respondent within  
219 the household, and an individual level questionnaire with information on utilization and health  
220 expenditures answered by the same respondent. The focus of this study is on the household level  
221 questionnaire. From the household questionnaire, 11 questions on OOPs were included in the survey.  
222 The questions were developed to map to the UN statistical classification of individual consumption  
223 according to purpose COICOP-2018. The final structure of this household questionnaire is illustrated  
224 S1 Fig1. S2 Table also shows how the health expenditure questions were framed and gives the  
225 instructions on how the questions were administered.

226 The respondent for the expenditure module was the head of the household or any other knowledgeable  
227 person assigned by the household head to provide such information. Trained field workers conducted  
228 face-to-face interviews using computer assisted personal interviews (CAPI). The questionnaire was  
229 piloted among households who were not part of the study sample. During the piloting, “under the  
230 table” or informal payments and levels of OOPs for different spending categories were enquired  
231 about. The pilot lasted two weeks (May 2017) and allowed the study investigators to fine-tune the  
232 questionnaires and the research design before final data collection. Data collection lasted 4 months,  
233 that is from July 2017 to October 2017 after the required sample size was achieved. Written informed  
234 consent was obtained from every household head before the study questionnaire was administered.

### 235 **Provider data collection and matching**

236 A template (S3 Table) was developed to collect patient data from different types of health care  
237 providers (all pharmacy and licensed chemical shops) who did not have previous experience in  
238 collecting patient data. The template was used to collect the name, address, phone number, referral



239 status, reason for consultation and cost of treatment/service. This information was requested from  
240 patients at the point of paying for the services after they had consented to be part of the study. Two of  
241 the high-volume pharmacy shops requested and received additional staff to assist in recording patient  
242 data. Public providers already have experience collecting patient data. OOPs records were extracted  
243 from their records database or books by the project field team. All provider records were collected for  
244 a total of 12 months to cover the different recall periods. Hospital records covering a period of 12  
245 months were extracted to capture inpatient expenditures over the past 12 and 6 months.  
246 Every household that reported OOPs within a given recall period for any of the spending categories  
247 was asked additional details about the transaction(s) and the provider(s) with whom transactions  
248 occurred. The details facilitated the matching process. Matching of household OOPs to provider  
249 records was done at the individual level but OOPs across household members were aggregated to  
250 perform the household-level analysis. S4 Fig shows a flowchart detailing the matching procedure.

### 251 **Health care financing in in the study setting**

252 Ghana is one of very few countries to have enacted a legislation (National Health Insurance Act 2003  
253 (Act 650) and begun the transition to universal health insurance coverage (National Health Insurance  
254 Scheme, NHIS) to replace the OOPs previously referred to as “Cash and Carry” system. The  
255 financing scheme is generally progressive and is largely financed through tax (Akazili, 2011) and a  
256 small proportion from contributions and donations. In 2014, the scheme covered only 40% of Ghana’s  
257 population (10.5 million active subscribers) with 69% of these exempted from any form of payment to  
258 the scheme (Wang, Otoo&Dsane-Selby, 2017). The exempted group include indigent people,  
259 pregnant women and very poor households covered by the social intervention programme called  
260 “Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty” (LEAP). The National Health Insurance Scheme covers  
261 95% of disease conditions reported in Ghana with services including primary curative care to care at  
262 tertiary facilities.

### 263 **Out-of-pocket payments in the study setting**

264 Despite the existence of the NHIS in Ghana, out-of-pocket payments for health care still persist within  
265 the health system contributing to 48% 2005/2006 to 36% by 2019 of the health care financing in  
266 Ghana. All subscribers accessing health care from NHIS accredited health facilities are assured of free  
267 services but maybe exposed to spending out-of-pocket for medicines, laboratory tests, vaccinations  
268 and other consumables which may not be available at the provider due for example to stock-outs  
269 (Addae-korankye, 2013). The uninsured population (accounting for about 60% in 2014) will be  
270 required to pay out-of-pocket to be able to access health care (Wang, Otoo&Dsane-Selby, 2017).  
271 Therefore, we expect some level of OOPs within the Ghana health system especially for medicines,  
272 preventive care and hospitalization. OOPs in Ghana are regressive and as a consequence, diminish the  
273 overall level of progressivity in the health care funding in Ghana (Akazili, Gyapong& McIntyre,



274 2011). “Under the table payments” or informal payments for health care were not found to be  
275 practiced in the study area. This was established during the pilot study phase of the iHOPE project  
276 which was conducted four weeks prior to the start of the actual data collection.

## 277 **Data analysis**

278 The design of this study makes it possible to estimate the effect of different recall periods on OOPs  
279 estimates. Two approaches were used. We first compared means of the households overall OOPs in  
280 the two recall period groups. The effect of the different recall periods was estimated as the ratio of the  
281 mean OOPs. This is what is typically investigated in published studies. The limitation is that it is not  
282 possible to know which recall period leads to the more accurate estimates. The second approach uses  
283 the matched responses to consider the level of agreement between the household responses and the  
284 provider data. The matched households are a subset of all households: we tabulated the characteristics  
285 of both to compare their characteristics and identify any potential source of bias in the type of  
286 households that matched. We then applied the Bland-Altman approach for method  
287 comparison[23,24]. For each spending category and questionnaire version, we estimated the overall  
288 agreement between the household and provider OOPs and the variability in the agreement between  
289 records. We calculated the ratio of household to provider OOPs rather than the difference since the  
290 difference was heavily dependent on whether the provider amounts were large or small. We also  
291 applied a log-transformation to the ratio before the Bland-Altman analysis as recommended when the  
292 distribution is skewed[23,24]. When back transformed to the OOPs scale, this gives us the geometric  
293 mean ratio. We present the estimates of variability as 95% limits of agreement which represent the  
294 range in which we expect 95% of the observed individual household to provider-ratios to lie.

295 We then investigated whether recall period affected the agreement between household and provider  
296 OOPs by following the regression method of Bland and Altman [23]. To investigate the effect of the  
297 questionnaire version, we fitted a regression model with the difference of the log OOPs between  
298 household and provider expenditures as the outcome variable[24] and questionnaire version as an  
299 explanatory variable. This allows us to estimate the effect of the questionnaire version on the  
300 geometric mean ratio of household to provider OOPs. We included a random effect parameter to  
301 account for the clustering of the households within clusters defined by the Navrongo DSS[19]. We  
302 estimated the effect of the questionnaire version on the variability by regressing the questionnaire  
303 version on the absolute values on the residuals of the previous model. Data was analyzed using  
304 STATA Version 14, Stata Corp.

## 305 **Results**

306 Of 1320 households selected, 1,226 (92.9%) households were interviewed. Of the households  
307 interviewed, 386 (50%) and 279 (58%) reported OOPs expenditure in version 1 and version 2

308 respectively. For those reporting expenditure, 278 (72%) and 226 (81%) of reported OOPs were  
 309 successfully matched with their respective provider data at individual levels in version 1 and 2  
 310 respectively (S4 Fig). The most frequently reported spending category was medicines in the  
 311 community-based household sampling and inpatient, care for the provider inpatient sample (Table  
 312 2). Due to challenges in identifying and locating households sampled from the provider records, only  
 313 17% and 41% of the targeted provider sample size was achieved in the 6 month and 12 month recall  
 314 periods respectively. Consequently version 2 has more households reporting OOPs for inpatient care  
 315 than version 1. The results presented in this paper are based on the combined sample including both  
 316 the community-based household sample and provider-based inpatient sampling. However, results  
 317 based on the analysis of the data from the household sample alone (which constitute about 90% of the  
 318 combined sample size) are very similar and are contained in S5 Table.

319

320 **Table 3: Composition of the combined sample of households from the community and provider**

321 **sampling**

Spending category				Version-1 Short recall period	Version-2 Long recall period			
	Recall period	Household sampling	Provider sampling	Total households	Recall period	Household sampling	Provider sampling	Total households
inpatient care services	6 months	89	19	108	12 months	55	45	100
Preventive services	3 months	18	10	28	6 months	19	2	21
Other health services	2 weeks	0	0	0	4 weeks	1	0	1
Outpatient	2 weeks	25	8	33	4 weeks	10	5	15
Medicines	2 weeks	278	17	295	4 weeks	185	19	204
health products	6 months	5	4	9	12 months	1	1	2
<b>Total</b>		415	58	473		271	72	343

322

323 **Demographic characteristics in all households in the survey and matched households only**

324 The demographic characteristics of the household heads were similar across the two questionnaire  
 325 versions for both the full combined sample and the matched households only (Table 2). Overall,  
 326 roughly 65% of the households are headed by males. Only 10% of heads were under 35 years and  
 327 58% of household heads were married.

328 **Table 3: General household and demographic characteristics by questionnaire version**

	all households			matched households		
	Version 1 (2wks/6months)	Version 2 (4wks/12months)	Total	Questionnaire Version 1 (2wks/6months)	Questionnaire Version 2 (4wks/12months)	Total
Total	N=800	N=480		N=278	N=235	N=513

numberofhouseholds	n	%	n	%	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
<b>Household Head</b>											
<b>Sex</b>											
Male	492	61	287	60	61	172	62	164	70	336	65
<b>Maritalstatus</b>											
Married	446	56	272	57	56	161	58	141	60	303	59
<b>Level of Education</b>											
Noeducation	538	67	289	60	65	187	67	140	60	326	64
Primary	111	14	104	22	17	46	17	53	23	99	19
Junior high school	70	9	43	9	9	23	8	25	11	48	9
Senior high school	22	3	25	5	4	4	1	9	4	13	3
Vocational/Technical/ College/Graduate	59	7	19	4	6	18	7	7	3	27	5
<b>Religion</b>											
Christians	349	44	236	49	46	110	40	118	50	228	44
Islam	19	2	35	7	4	6	2	10	4	16	3
Traditional	332	42	181	38	40	125	45	91	39	216	42
Noreligion	100	13	28	6	10	37	13	16	7	53	10
<b>Age group</b>											
15 - 19	33	4	16	3	4	11	4	12	5	23	4
20-34	47	6	34	7	6	17	6	18	8	35	7
35 - 64	420	53	282	59	55	150	54	138	58	288	56
65 +	300	38	148	31	35	100	36	67	29	167	33
Meanage (SD)	59 (17)		55 (17)			57 (17)		54 (17)			
<b>Householdsize</b>											
1 person	57	7	38	8	7	17	7	9	4	26	5
2-5 persons	421	53	301	63	56	127	46	143	61	270	53
6 andabove	322	40	141	29	36	134	48	83	35	217	42

329

### 330 **Proportion of households with health care utilization and expenditure**

331 In the combined sample, the proportions of households reporting OOPs in medicines and inpatient  
332 care were observed to be higher for the longer compared to the shorter recall period. The higher  
333 proportion observed for inpatient care in the longer recall period is largely attributed to the  
334 disproportionate contribution of samples from the provider inpatient sample into the two-recall period  
335 groups as observed in Table 2 (19 households in version 1 compared to 45 households in versions 2).  
336 Except for inpatient care, the addition of the provider sample did not influence the distribution of  
337 reported expenditures by recall period in the other spending categories.

338 **Table 4: Households reporting out of pocket payments by spending category for all and**  
339 **matched households**

	Questionnaire Version 1 (Short recall period)			Questionnaire Version 2 (Long recall period)		
		all households	matched only		all households	matched only
<b>Spending category</b>	Recall period	N=780 n (%)	N=278 n (%)	Recall period	N=480 n (%)	N=235 n (%)
inpatient care services	6 months	108 (14)	35 (12)	12 months	100 (21)	64 (27)
preventive services	3 months	28 (3)	20 (7)	6 months	21 (4)	18 (8)
Other health services	2 weeks	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 weeks	1 (0.2)	0 (0.0)
Outpatient	2 weeks	33 (4)	20 (7)	4 weeks	15 (3)	11 (5)

Medicines	2 weeks	295 (38)	234 (85)	4 weeks	204 (43)	167 (72)
health products	6 months	9 (1)	0 (0.0)	12 months	2 (0.4)	1 (0.43)

340

341

342 **Comparison of mean household reported OOPs by recall period**

343  
344 The mean of the household OOPs by recall period for the combined community and provider  
345 inpatient samples was calculated (Table 5). The variability between households in reported OOPs was  
346 large and there was no evidence of any significant differences in mean OOPs between the shorter and  
347 longer recall periods for each of the separate spending categories. Compared to the longer recall period,  
348 the shorter period tended to produce estimates in the direction of being larger. The medicines category  
349 had the greatest number of observations and the annual OOPs was estimated to be 1.59 (0.88, 2.29)  
350 times higher for the shorter compared to the longer recall period.

351

352 **Table 5 Comparison of mean OOPs in households by recall period**

Spending category	Questionnaire Version 1 (short recall period)			Questionnaire Version 2 (long recall period)			Non-annualized ratios	Annualized ratios
	N	Household (HH) Mean(SD)	Annualized total Estimates Mean(SD)	N	Household (HH) Mean (SD)	Annualized total Estimates Mean(SD)	Estimated ratio (HH-v1/HH-v2) 95% CI	Estimated ratio (HH-v1/HH-v2) 95% CI
<b>Inpatient</b>	108	462 (1573)	923 (3145)	100	419 (675)	419 (675)	1.10 (0.29, 1.89)	2.20 (0.53, 3.87)
<b>Medicines</b>	295	15 (43)	358 (1040)	204	19 (38)	226 (460)	0.79 (0.44, 1.13)	1.59 (0.88, 2.29)
<b>Outpatient</b>	28	43 (79)	1027 (1894)	11	27 (23)	327 (273)	1.59 (0, 3.22)	3.14 (0, 6.78)
<b>Preventive care</b>	22	25 (29)	99 (115)	21	93 (241)	187 (482)	0.26 (0, 0.82)	0.53 (0, 1.66)
<b>Other medical services</b>	0	0 (0)	0 (-)	1	200 (-)	2400 (-)	-	-
<b>Health products</b>	5	21 (21)	21 (21)	2	7 (4)	7 (4)	3 (0, 6.77)	3 (0, 6.77)
<b>Annualized total household OOPs</b>			627 (2095)			355 (681)		1.79 (1.10, 2.49)

353 Note: the currency used is the Ghana cedi (Ghc). US\$1 was equivalent to Ghc4.2 at the time of collecting data. **Short recall period:** 2  
354 weeks outpatient/medicines/other health services, 3 months for preventive care and 6 months for inpatient/medical products. **Longer recall**  
355 **period:** 4 weeks outpatient/medicines/other health services, 6 months for preventive care and 12 months for inpatient/medical products.  
356 We assume OOPs do not vary seasonally. The annualized estimates are based on this assumption to allow for comparison across the recall  
357 period annually

358 **Mean OOPs reported by households compared with provider data (matched data only)**

359 Household reported health expenditures tended to be higher on average than corresponding provider  
360 recorded expenditures and this was observed in both shorter and longer recall period groups and in all  
361 spending categories. However, the difference in OOPs reached statistical significance only for  
362 inpatient care and medicines. Expenditure records from health care providers were on average a third  
363 of the amount households would report to incur for inpatient care and about half the amount in  
364 medicines regardless of the recall period used (Table 6).

365 **Table 6: Mean OOPs household survey and provider OOPs for households that matched with**  
366 **provider data**

Spending category	Questionnaire Version 1 (short recall period)			Questionnaire Version 2 (Long recall period)		
	Provider OOPs	Household OOPs	Estimated ratio (HH/provider) of the means (95%)	Provider OOPs	Household OOPs	Estimated ratio (HH/provider) of the means

	N	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	CI	N	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	(95% CI)
<b>Inpatient</b>	35	94 (114)	298 (322)	3.17 (1.70, 4.65)	64	144 (167.)	427 (539)	2.94 (1.82, 4.10)
<b>Medicines</b>	234	5 (5)	10 (15)	2.1 (1.66, 2.46)	167	7 (7)	15 (31)	2.26 (1.60, 2.91)
<b>Outpatient</b>	11	3 (5)	46 (88)	14 (0, 38.16)	11	9 (9)	23 (20)	2.72 (0.58, 4.87)
<b>Preventive care</b>	9	6 (13)	18 (16)	2.98 (0, 7.78)	15	21 (60)	42 (76)	1.62 (0.56, 2.68)
<b>Other medical services</b>	0	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	0	0(0)	0 (0)	-
<b>Health products</b>	0	0 (0)	0 (0)	-	3	3 (0.5)	6 (4)	-

367 Note: the currency used is the Ghana cedi (GHC). US\$1 was equivalent to GHc4.2 at the time of collecting data. **Short recall period:** 2  
 368 weeks outpatient/medicines/other health services, 3 months for preventive care and 6 months for inpatient/medical products. **Longer recall**  
 369 **period:** 4 weeks outpatient/medicines/other health services, 6 months for preventive care and 12 months for inpatient/medical products

370

### 371 **Comparing agreement between individual matched household and provider data by recall** 372 **period**

373 This part of the analysis focuses on matched OOPs estimates for only transactions for inpatient care  
 374 and medicine as only a few households reported expenditures on the other spending categories and  
 375 therefore the sample size did not allow for the Bland-Altman approach.

376 The geometric mean of the individual household to provider ratios was greater than one indicating  
 377 higher household compared to provider OOPs for both recall periods (Table 7, column 3). This is  
 378 consistent with the previous analysis using the aggregated means rather than the individual matched  
 379 household records. There was substantial variation in these individual household-level ratios, shown  
 380 by the 95% limits of agreement (Table 7, column 4).

381 We compared the agreement between individual household and provider records by recall period.  
 382 There was no evidence of a difference in the geometric mean ratios (Table 7, column 5) by recall  
 383 period for either the medicines or inpatient categories. For inpatient spending, the mean ratio for the  
 384 12 month recall was estimated to be 0.74 (0.45, 1.19) times that of the 6 month recall ( $p=0.22$ ), and  
 385 for medicines 1.26 (0.93, 1.39,  $p=0.09$ ). The confidence intervals are wide and do not rule out the  
 386 possibility of an effect of recall period. There was an indication of a small increase in variability for  
 387 medicines only for the four-week compared to two-week recall period but this was not found for  
 388 inpatient spending (Table 7, column 6).

389 **Table 7. Mean bias and variability in measurement of OOPs by recall period**

Spending category	Number of observations	Geometric mean of the individual HH:provider ratios	95% limits of agreement	Estimated effect of the recall period on mean ratio: the ratio of the mean ratios (qu2 vs qu1) & CI & p-value	Estimated effect of recall period on variability: the ratio of standard deviations (qu2 vs qu1) & CI & p-value

Inpatient care					
6 month srecall period (qu1)	31	2.48	0.35 – 18.2	-	-
12 months recall period (qu2)	63	1.77	0.19 – 16.5	0.74 (0.45 - 1.19)	0.22 (0.77 - 1.37) 0.87
Medicines					
2 week recall period (qu1)	235	1.37	0.40 – 4.64	-	-
4 week recall period (qu2)	169	1.42	0.38 – 5.47	1.26 (0.93 - 1.39)	0.09 (1.03 - 1.49) 0.02

390 Note: Limits of agreement refer to the range in which 95% of the mean ratios are expected to lie. The mean ratio is the mean  
 391 of the ratios between household OOPs and provider OOPs  
 392

## 393 Discussion

394 This study investigated the effect of recall periods using household health expenditure modules and  
 395 provider records. In this study, the two major sources of household OOPs are inpatient care and  
 396 medicines.

397 The first finding was that shorter recall periods tended to produce higher annualized OOP estimates  
 398 than longer recall periods in the full sample, although not statistically significant. This is consistent  
 399 with previous reports of higher estimates for shorter recall periods from a study of hospitalization cost  
 400 in 43 countries( Lu et al, 2009), a study of health expenditure in Nepal[5] and a study of the share of  
 401 household expenditure on health [9]. The second finding was that household-reported OOP tended to  
 402 be higher than the provider records overall in the matched sample. The reasons for this are not known  
 403 but may stem from poor recall from the household members, problems with provider records and  
 404 selection of providers, or issues with matching the two together. For these reasons, the provider data is  
 405 not considered as a validation of the household-reported OOPs.

406 The sample size for the estimation of agreement was affected by number of households that could be  
 407 successfully matched to their corresponding provider data. Most of the providers had challenges  
 408 recording and extracting health expenditure records of clients since this was not routinely done. This  
 409 affected the completeness of the provider data and therefore households with zero expenditures and  
 410 those without accurate personal details could not be included and consequently affected the final  
 411 sample size for the analysis. Details of these challenges and how they can be addressed in future  
 412 studies have been explored by Agorinya et al, 2021 [27].

413 The third finding, and the main question of the study, was that there was no evidence of a difference  
 414 in the level of agreement between household and provider reported OOPs for the two sets of recall  
 415 periods. However, the confidence intervals around the point estimate of effect are wide and an effect  
 416 of recall period on recall bias cannot be ruled out. We recognize that we could not assess the impact  
 417 of recall period on the likelihood of remembering a transaction, only on the household and provider  
 418 amounts for transactions which had been recalled. Other studies on accuracy have had mixed results.  
 419 A vital and health statistics report[25] argued that reporting accuracy for inpatient care decreased



420 significantly after eight months, however Nester and colleagues[26] found no such evidence in their  
421 study using bounded and unbounded interviews.  
422 Hijinks and his colleagues[7] also found from 90 surveys in 64 countries using International  
423 Household Survey Network (IHSN) that most surveys preferred longer recall (12 months) periods in  
424 hospital spending and short recall periods (2 weeks) for outpatient and medicine spending in half of  
425 the surveys they evaluated. Several other studies have also confirmed the preference of longer recall  
426 period for infrequent events and shorter recall period for frequent events [7,17,18].  
427 Despite these limitations and challenges, this study adds to the body of evidence for guidance on the  
428 comparability of health expenditures across different surveys using different recall periods. It also  
429 provides information of the feasibility of using provider health records in a rural setting.

## 430 **Conclusion**

431 Using provider data to validate household-reported OOPs presented substantial challenges in this  
432 setting, particularly for completeness. This study did not find any evidence of an effect of recall  
433 period on the agreement between household and provider OOPs.

## 434 **Acknowledgements**

435 The authors wish to thank all the study participants and health facilities for participating in the iHOPE  
436 study. We are very grateful to all the field workers who helped in the data collection. We also  
437 appreciate the technical and logistical support from the staff of Navrongo Health Research Centre and  
438 INDEPTH-network.

439

## 440 **List of abbreviations**

441 CAPI Computer Assisted Personal Interviews  
442 DHS Demographic and Health Survey  
443 NHRC Navrongo Health Research Centre  
444 NHDSS Navrongo Health and Demographic Surveillance System  
445 GLSS Ghana Living Standards Survey  
446 COICOP Classification of Individual Consumption according to purpose.  
447 iHOPE INDEPTH-Network Household Out-of-pocket Expenditure  
448 HHS Household Health Survey  
449 SHA System of Health Accounts  
450 NHA National Health Accounts  
451 NHIS National Health Insurance Scheme

452 OOPs Out-of-Pocket Health Spending  
453 OPD Out-patient Department  
454 LMIC Low and Middle-income Countries  
455 HIC High income countries  
456 LSMS Living Standards Measurement Survey  
457 WHO World Health Organization  
458 WHS World Health Survey  
459

## 460 **Ethics approval and consent to participate.**

461 The Ethical Review Board of the Navrongo Health Research Centre, Ghana (NHRCIRB217)  
462 approved for the conduct of the study. Written Informed consent was obtained from all study  
463 participants.

## 464 **Consent for publication**

465 Written informed consent was obtained from all patients for publication of this manuscript.

## 466 **Availability of data and material**

467 The data is not publicly available. However, upon reasonable request, the data will be available from  
468 the corresponding author.

## 469 **Competing interests**

470 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

## 471 **Funding**

472 This project was funded by the INDEPTH-Network in Accra through a grant from Bill and Melinda  
473 Gates foundation, grant number OPP1113162. GF, TE, KvW, AR were partially supported by WHO.

## 474 **Authors' contributions**

475

476 Conceptualization: AI, TE, GF, JA, FT, YDB, NM, MD

477 Data Curation: IA, MD, NM, SC

478 Formal Analysis: IA, AR, LML, FT, SC

479 Methodology: TE, GF, JA, FT, YDB, IA, AR

480 Writing – Original Draft Preparation: IA, NM, MD, SC

481 Writing – Review & Editing: All authors contributed to writing and editing the manuscript.

482

## 483 Reference

- 484 1. WHO. New perspectives on global health spending for universal health coverage [Internet].  
485 World Health Organization; 2017 [cited 2019 Feb 24] p. 38. Available from:  
486 <http://www.who.int/iris/handle/10665/259632>
- 487 2. O'Donnell O. Financial protection against medical expense. Tinbergen Inst Discuss Pap. 2019  
488 Jan;47.
- 489 3. Boerma T, Eozenou P, Evans D, Evans T, Kieny M-P, Wagstaff A. Monitoring Progress  
490 towards Universal Health Coverage at Country and Global Levels. PLOS Med. 2014 Sep  
491 22;11(9):e1001731.
- 492 4. WHO. Tracking Universal Health Coverage: 2017 Global Monitoring Report [Internet]. WHO,  
493 Geneva: World Health Organization and International Bank for Reconstruction and  
494 Development / The World Bank; 2017 [cited 2019 Oct 1] p. 88. Report No.: ISBN 978-92-4-  
495 151355-5. Available from:  
496 <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/259817/9789241513555-eng.pdf?sequence=1>
- 497 5. Lu C, Chin B, Li G, Murray CJ. Limitations of methods for measuring out-of-pocket and  
498 catastrophic private health expenditures. Bull World Health Organ. 2009 Mar;87(3):238–44.
- 499 6. WHO, editor. Monitoring the building blocks of health systems: a handbook of indicators and  
500 their measurement strategies. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010. 92 p.
- 501 7. Heijink R, Xu K, Saksena P, Evans D. Validity and Comparability of Out-of-pocket Health  
502 Expenditure from Household Surveys: A review of the literature and current survey instruments  
503 [Internet]. World Health Organization; 2011 [cited 2019 Feb 24]. Available from:  
504 [https://www.who.int/health\\_financing/documents/dp\\_e\\_11\\_01-oop\\_errors.pdf?ua=1](https://www.who.int/health_financing/documents/dp_e_11_01-oop_errors.pdf?ua=1)
- 505 8. O'Donnell O, van Doorslaer E, Wagstaff A, Lindelow M. Analyzing Health Equity Using  
506 Household Survey Data: A Guide to Techniques and their Implementation [Internet]. The World  
507 Bank; 2007 [cited 2019 Feb 26]. Available from:  
508 <http://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/book/10.1596/978-0-8213-6933-3>
- 509 9. Lavado RF, Brooks BP, Hanlon M. Estimating health expenditure shares from household  
510 surveys. Bull World Health Organ. 2013 Jul 1;91(7):519-524C.
- 511 10. Rannan-Eliya RP. World Health Organization Geneva. :44.
- 512 11. Scott C, Amenuvegbe B. Effect of recall duration on reporting of household expenditures: an  
513 experimental study in Ghana. Washington, D.C: World Bank; 1990. 19 p. (Social dimensions of  
514 adjustment in Sub-Saharan Africa, Surveys and statistics).
- 515 12. Neter J. Measurement Errors in Reports of Consumer Expenditures. J Mark Res. 1970;7(1):11–  
516 25.
- 517 13. Pravin V, Pal S. Poverty and Living Standards in Asia [Internet]. The World Bank; 1980 [cited  
518 2019 Mar 27]. Available from:  
519 <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/902691468739267476/pdf/multi0page.pdf>
- 520 14. Anand S, Harris CJ. Choosing a Welfare Indicator. Am Econ Rev. 1994;84(2):226–31.
- 521 15. SHA. A System of Health Accounts [Internet]. OECD Publishing; 2011 [cited 2017 Jul 12].  
522 Available from: [http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/a-system-of-health-accounts\\_9789264116016-en](http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/a-system-of-health-accounts_9789264116016-en)  
523

- 524 16. Stull DE, Leidy NK, Parasuraman B, Chassany O. Optimal recall periods for patient-reported  
525 outcomes: challenges and potential solutions. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2009 Apr 1;25(4):929–42.
- 526 17. Kjellsson G, Clarke P, Gerdtham U-G. Forgetting to remember or remembering to forget: A  
527 study of the recall period length in health care survey questions. *J Health Econ.* 2014 May  
528 1;35:34–46.
- 529 18. Bhandari A, Wagner T. Self-Reported Utilization of Health Care Services: Improving  
530 Measurement and Accuracy. *Med Care Res Rev.* 2006 Apr;63(2):217–35.
- 531 19. Oduro AR, Wak G, Azongo D, Debpuur C, Wontuo P, Kondayire F, et al. Profile of the  
532 Navrongo Health and Demographic Surveillance System. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2012 Aug  
533 1;41(4):968–76.
- 534 20. Bland JM. Sample size for a study of agreement between two methods of measurement  
535 [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2019 Feb 28]. Available from: [https://www-](https://www-users.york.ac.uk/~mb55/meas/sizemeth.htm)  
536 [users.york.ac.uk/~mb55/meas/sizemeth.htm](https://www-users.york.ac.uk/~mb55/meas/sizemeth.htm)
- 537 21. WHO. WHS: Guide to administration and question by question specifications [Internet]. World  
538 Health Organization; 2002 [cited 2019 Oct 11]. Available from:  
539 <https://www.who.int/healthinfo/survey/whsshortversionguide.pdf?ua=1>
- 540 22. GLSS6 Report. Ghana Living Standards Survey Round 6 (GLSS6) Main Report [Internet].  
541 Ghana Statistical Service; 2014 Aug [cited 2019 Oct 11] p. 244. Report No.: 6. Available from:  
542 [http://www.statsghana.gov.gh/gssmain/fileUpload/Living%20conditions/GLSS6\\_Main%20Rep](http://www.statsghana.gov.gh/gssmain/fileUpload/Living%20conditions/GLSS6_Main%20Report.pdf)  
543 [ort.pdf](http://www.statsghana.gov.gh/gssmain/fileUpload/Living%20conditions/GLSS6_Main%20Report.pdf)
- 544 23. Bland JM, Altman DG. Measuring agreement in method comparison studies. 1999;(Statistical  
545 Methods in Medical Research):26.
- 546 24. Giavarina D. Understanding Bland Altman analysis. *Biochem Medica.* 2015 Jun 5;25(2):141–  
547 51.
- 548 25. NCHS. A summary of studies of interviewing methodology. *Vital Health Stat Ser 2 Data Natl*  
549 *Surv Fam Growth.* 1977;69:89.
- 550 26. Neter J, Waksberg J. A Study of Response Errors in Expenditures Data from Household  
551 Interviews. *J Am Stat Assoc.* 1964 Mar 1;59(305):18–55.
- 552 27. Agorinya, Isaiah Awintuen, Maxwell Dalaba, Nathan Kumasenu Mensah, Samuel TamtiChatio,  
553 Lan My Le, Yadeta Dassie Bacha, Jemima Sumboh, Gabriela Flores, Tessa Tan-torresEdejer,  
554 Amanda Ross, Fabrizio Tediosi, and James Akazili. 2021. ‘Challenges and Experiences in Linking  
555 Community Level Reported Out-of-Pocket Health Expenditures to Health Provider Recorded Health  
556 Expenditures: Experience from the IHOPE Project in Northern Ghana’. *PLOS ONE* 16(9):e0256910.  
557 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0256910

558

Fig 1: Design of Household Health Survey Instrument




Figure 1

**Fig 2: Sample size and matching summary**




Figure 2