

1 **Examining National Health Insurance Fund Members' preferences and trade-offs for the**
2 **attributes of contracted outpatient facilities in Kenya: a discrete choice experiment**

3 Jacob Kazungu^{1*}, Edwine Barasa^{1,2,§}, Justice Nonvignon^{3,4}, Matthew Quaife⁵

4

5 **1** Health Economics Research Unit, KEMRI Wellcome Trust Research Programme,
6 Nairobi, Kenya

7 **2** Center for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine,
8 University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

9 **3** Department of Health Policy, Planning and Management, School of Public Health,
10 University of Ghana, Legon, Accra, Ghana

11 **4** Health Economics and Financing Programme, Africa Centres for Disease Control
12 and Prevention, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

13 **5** Department of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene
14 and Tropical Medicine, UK

15

16

17

18 ***Corresponding Author**(kjacob@kemri-wellcome.org)

19 **§ Joint Senior Author**

20

21

22 **KEYWORDS**

23 Patient Choice, Facility Choice, National Health Insurance Fund, DCE, Kenya

24

25

26 **Abstract**

27 Patient choice of health facilities is increasingly gaining recognition for potentially enhancing
28 the attainment of health system goals globally. In Kenya, National Health Insurance Fund
29 (NHIF) members are required to choose an NHIF-contracted outpatient facility before
30 accessing care. Understanding their preferences could support resource allocation decisions,
31 enhance the provision of patient-centered care, and deepen NHIF's purchasing decisions. We
32 employed a discrete choice experiment to examine NHIF members' preferences for attributes
33 of NHIF-contracted outpatient facilities in Kenya. We developed a d-efficient experimental
34 design with six attributes, namely availability of drugs, distance from household to facility,
35 waiting time at the facility until consultation, cleanliness of the facility, attitude of health
36 worker, and cadre of health workers seen during consultation. Data were then collected from
37 402 NHIF members in six out of 47 counties. Choice data were analysed using panel mixed
38 multinomial logit and latent class models. NHIF members preferred NHIF-contracted
39 outpatient facilities that always had drugs [$\beta=1.572$], were closer to their households [$\beta=-$
40 0.082], had shorter waiting times [$\beta=-0.195$], had respectful staff [$\beta=1.249$] and had either
41 clinical officers [$\beta=0.478$] or medical doctors [$\beta=1.525$] for consultation. NHIF members
42 indicated a willingness to accept travel 17.8km if drugs were always available, 17.7km to see a
43 medical doctor for consultation, and 14.6km to see respectful health workers. Furthermore,
44 NHIF members indicated a willingness to wait at a facility for 8.9 hours to ensure the
45 availability of drugs, 8.8 hours to see a doctor for consultation, and 7.2 hours to see respectful
46 health workers. Understanding NHIF member preferences and trade-offs can inform resource
47 allocation at counties, service provision across providers, and purchasing decisions of

48 purchasers such as the recently formed social health insurance authority in Kenya as a move
49 towards UHC.

50

51 **Introduction**

52 Kenya is among many low- and middle-income countries that have committed to achieving
53 universal health coverage (UHC) by 2030 (1, 2). To accelerate progress towards this goal, the
54 government of Kenya has prioritized purchasing reforms and identified social health
55 insurance through the National Health Insurance Fund (NHIF) as the ‘vehicle’ to drive the UHC
56 agenda (3).

57 Over the years, in a bid to transform the NHIF into a strategic purchaser of health services (3),
58 several purchasing reforms have been implemented, including the introduction of outpatient
59 cover and the empanelment and contracting of health providers (4). However, transforming
60 the NHIF into a strategic purchaser requires a continuous pursuit of better ways to act on the
61 strategic purchasing actions including provider identification and selection and understanding
62 of the population's needs, preferences, and values (5).

63 While the introduction of outpatient cover allowed NHIF members to choose their preferred
64 NHIF-contracted outpatient facilities with an option to change providers every quarter, there
65 is a dearth of evidence highlighting the health facility attributes influencing NHIF members’
66 choice of contracted outpatient facilities in Kenya. Understanding NHIF members’
67 preferences is essential to tailor services that are attractive to people and could encourage
68 demand thus informing health provider identification and contracting decisions by the NHIF.
69 Besides, understanding NHIF members’ preferences could offer insights into resource
70 allocation at the national and county levels. For instance, evidence of trade-offs such as NHIF
71 members’ willingness to travel further to get medicine can inform the prioritization of
72 medicines or training health workers to be respectful as opposed to the construction of new

73 ill-equipped facilities. We used a discrete choice experiment (DCE) to understand the
74 preferences NHIF members have for the attributes of NHIF-contracted outpatient facilities in
75 Kenya.

76 DCEs are stated preference elicitation methods where respondents are asked to choose
77 between two or more competing hypothetical alternatives with the alternatives differing
78 across a range of attribute levels (6-8). Particularly, DCEs are useful when the researcher aims
79 to understand trade-offs that respondents are willing to accept to compensate for other
80 attributes, for example, the distance they are willing to travel for facilities with preferred
81 characteristics.

82 Increasingly, DCEs are being used to examine either patients' or a population's preferences
83 for health facilities (9-13). Evidence from these studies has highlighted several attributes
84 summarised as 'structure', 'process', and 'outcome' attributes that influence
85 patients/population preferences for health facilities (12). For instance, waiting time has been
86 reported as the most important attribute in studies conducted in Western Cape Province (9),
87 England (14), Ethiopia (15), China (16), and Liberia (17). Besides, other attributes such as the
88 cost of care (18, 19), distance to facilities (15), availability of medicines and medical equipment
89 (9, 19, 20), and staff attitude (18, 20) have also been reported to influence the choice of a
90 facility. Despite the burgeoning evidence, these studies were either conducted in high-income
91 countries, did not focus on patients or populations covered by a social health insurance
92 scheme, and/or importantly, were not conducted in Kenya and therefore did not examine
93 preferences among NHIF members even though the NHIF will drive the UHC agenda in Kenya.

94 Consequently, we conducted a DCE among NHIF members in Kenya to understand context-
95 specific and policy-relevant attributes and trade-offs that can inform optimal provider
96 identification and selection by NHIF, resource allocation by other purchasers such as county
97 departments of health, and patient-centred service delivery by health providers.

98

99 **Materials and methods**

100 **Study setting and design**

101 Kenya runs a devolved governance system comprised of a national government and 47 semi-
102 autonomous county governments (21). As a result, health is one of the devolved functions in
103 Kenya where the Ministry of Health executes policy and regulatory functions whilst running
104 the national referral facilities (Level 6 facilities) whereas counties manage primary (Levels 2
105 to 4 facilities) and secondary facilities (Level 5 facilities). While the health financing system is
106 described in detail elsewhere (22), in summary, in 2018/19, the health system was financed
107 through government tax (47.6%), donor funding (19.1%), health insurance premiums (6.7%),
108 and out-of-pocket payments by households (26.6%).

109 Kenya has one of the oldest public health insurance schemes in Africa – the National Health
110 Insurance Fund (NHIF) - formerly known as the National Hospital Insurance Fund – started in
111 1966. As of 2022, the NHIF covered 24% of the population (23). Despite the relatively low
112 population coverage compared to other countries such as Ghana (58.2%), Rwanda (78.7%) and
113 Gabon (40.8%) (24), over the years, the NHIF has undergone several reforms aiming to
114 transform it into a strategic purchaser of healthcare services (3, 25, 26). In 2015, the NHIF

115 introduced an outpatient cover where members were required to voluntarily select
116 outpatient facilities to access outpatient care while providers were paid through capitation
117 (4). The NHIF contracts both public and private providers (both faith-based and private-for-
118 profit providers). While the choice of outpatient providers (single health facilities) is
119 voluntary, members are required to have selected an outpatient provider before accessing
120 care but have the opportunity to change providers quarterly.

121

122 **Survey development**

123 The study followed the recommended good research practices checklist for conducting DCEs
124 by the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research Conjoint
125 Analysis Task Force (27, 28).

126 While there are several preference elicitation methods in health (6), the study employed a
127 DCE to permit the quantification of preferences across multiple attributes, and the
128 quantification of the relative importance of the attributes whilst examining trade-offs NHIF
129 members would be willing to make when selecting contracted outpatient facilities in Kenya.
130 Besides, as a methodology, DCEs have been implemented in Kenya in several other topics such
131 as to examine the preferences of healthcare providers for capitation (29), community health
132 volunteer incentives (30), women's place of childbirth (31), and clinical officer job preference
133 (32), and thus considered appropriate for its use in this study.

134

135 **Attributes and levels**

136 Attributes and attribute levels for the study were developed following the four-stage process
137 of raw data collection, data reduction, attribute and attribute-level dropping, and wording
138 (33). Raw data collection and data reduction were conducted following a literature review
139 (34) and focus group discussions with NHIF members (35). The identified attributes (6 broad
140 attributes from the literature and 7 from the FGDs) and levels were then examined by the
141 researchers and 7 attributes were then piloted across 38 NHIF members. Based on the
142 findings from the pilot data analysis, a list of six attributes was selected (Table 1Table 1). One
143 attribute (opening hours of the facility) was dropped because it did not influence participants'
144 choices in the pilot (Results from the pilot – Supplementary file 1) and was ranked last in the
145 FGDs.

146 The definitions of all attributes are provided in Table 1. Further to the definition of the
147 attribute 'cadre of staff seen during the consultation', in Kenya, there are three main cadres
148 of staff that can see patients during a consultation: nurses, clinical officers, and medical
149 doctors. Nurses often run lower-level facilities (Level 2 – dispensaries) where they can see
150 patients for consultation but also provide support care such as drug administration, patient
151 care, and health promotion in higher-level facilities. However, clinical officers and medical
152 doctors often practice in higher-level facilities from Levels 3 to 6. While there are similarities
153 in roles, Table 2 summarizes the differences between nurses, clinical officers, and medical
154 doctors in Kenya.

155

156

157

158 **Table 1: NHIF-contracted outpatient facility attributes and levels**

Attribute	Stated levels	Definition	Attribute Type
Availability of drugs	Not always available	Whether prescribed drugs were available for free at the facility	Categorical
	Always available		
Distance from household to the facility	1KM	Distance from the household to the facility	Continuous
	3KM		
	5KM		
Waiting time at the facility for consultation	0.5 hours (30min)	Waiting time at the facility until consultation	Continuous
	1 hour		
	2 hours		
Attitude of health worker	Health worker is harsh and abusive	This referred to the way a health worker speaks to NHIF members at the facility	Categorical
	Health worker is respectful		
Cleanliness of the facility	Facility (toilets-rooms-floors) Not always clean	Whether the toilets, consultation rooms and floors were always clean	Categorical
	Facility (toilets-rooms-floors) Always clean		
The cadre of health workers seen for consultation	Nurse	The cadre of health workers seen by an NHIF member during consultation.	Categorical
	Clinical Officer		
	Medical Doctor		

159

160 **Table 2: Summary of key differences between Nurses, Clinical Officers, and Medical Doctors**

Aspect	Nurses	Clinical Officers	Medical Doctors
--------	--------	-------------------	-----------------

Education	Diploma or Bachelor's degree in Nursing	Diploma or Bachelor's degree in clinical medicine	Bachelor's degree in medicine and surgery
Patient care	Patient care, health promotion, prevention. However, they also do diagnosis and treatment in lower-level facilities	Diagnosis, treatment, and minor surgical skills	Diagnosis, treatment, and major surgical skills

161

162

163 **1. Construction of choice tasks and experimental design**

164 All six attributes (full profiles) were used to generate a fractional D-efficient experimental
 165 design in Ngene software 1.3.0 (36) using priors generated from the analysis of the pilot data
 166 (an orthogonal design used for the pilot and data analysed following a conditional logit
 167 model) – see Supplementary File 1 for priors obtained from the pilot. In this design,
 168 respondents were asked to choose between two unlabelled health facility alternatives
 169 (Health Facility A or Health Facility B) – Table 3. An opt-out option was not included in this
 170 design as it was deemed unrealistic as NHIF members must have chosen an outpatient facility
 171 before accessing care. In the choice tasks, we bolded some keywords in the levels to make
 172 them more visible for respondents to easily distinguish from the other levels of the attribute.

173 Given that having too many choice tasks has been associated with a cognitive burden on
 174 respondents (8, 37), our final design had 12 choice tasks. The 12 choice tasks were deemed
 175 appropriate as respondents had handled 12 choice tasks easily during the pilot and were
 176 within the number of tasks included in a majority of other studies (38, 39).

177

178

179 **Table 3: Sample choice task**

	Health Facility A	Health Facility B
Availability of Drugs	Drugs are Not Always available	Drugs are Not Always available
Distance from household to the facility (Kilometres)	1 Kilometre	5 Kilometres
Waiting time at the facility for consultation (Hours)	1 Hour	3 Hours
Attitude of health worker	Health worker is harsh and abusive	Health worker is respectful
Cleanliness of the facility	Facility (toilets-rooms-floors) always clean	Facility (toilets-rooms-floors) NOT always clean
Cadre of health worker you see for consultation	Medical Doctor	Clinical officer
Which facility would you choose? (Tick one only)		

180

181

182

183

184 2. Questionnaire development

185 After the final experimental design, we developed a paper-based questionnaire that
186 contained five sections. Section A collected general information about the area where the
187 survey was being conducted. Section B collected socio-demographic information about the
188 respondents (including age, gender, and level of education). Section C explained the
189 attributes and attribute levels while Section D depicted the 12 choice tasks. Section E asked
190 for supplementary information about the respondents such as whether they had any chronic
191 conditions or had already selected an NHIF-contracted outpatient facility.

192 3. Sampling and data collection

193 Data for the DCE survey were collected across six counties: Kilifi, Taita Taveta, Makueni,
194 Migori, Uasin Gishu, and Nyeri. These six counties were randomly selected from a list of all 47
195 counties in Kenya following a stratified simple random sampling approach without
196 replacement (40). Prior to selection, counties were sorted from lowest to highest using the
197 proportion of NHIF-accredited health facilities calculated as:

$$198 \left(\frac{\text{Number of NHIF – accredited facilities in the county}}{\text{Total number of health facilities in the county}} \right) * 100\%$$

199

200 Counties were then stratified into three categories: 1) counties with a low proportion of NHIF-
201 accredited facilities – operationally defined as counties with a proportion of less than 50% (a

202 total of 17 counties); 2) counties with a medium proportion of NHIF-accredited facilities –
 203 operationally defined as counties whose proportion of NHIF accredited facilities was between
 204 50% and less than 70% (a total of 16 counties; and 3) counties with a high proportion of NHIF-
 205 accredited facilities – operationally defined as counties with a proportion of 70% and above (a
 206 total of 14 counties). Two counties were then randomly selected within each stratum. The
 207 data for the total number of health facilities in each county and that of the number of NHIF-
 208 accredited facilities in each county was obtained from the Kenya Master Health Facility List
 209 (KMHFL) (41) and the list of health facilities offering the National Scheme was obtained from
 210 NHIF (42) respectively (Table 4).

211 **Table 4: Selected County health facility statistics and sample sizes**

County	Total Number of facilities in the county (A)	Total Number of NHIF-accredited facilities (B)	The proportion of outpatient NHIF-accredited facilities offering the National scheme (%) [(B/A) *100]	Target number of NHIF members (sample size)	The actual number of respondents
Makueni	344	80	23%	67	64
Nyeri	452	151	33%	67	67
Kilifi	343	188	54%	67	65
Migori	279	187	67%	67	64
Uasin Gishu	230	161	70%	67	68
Taita Taveta	113	81	72%	67	70

212

213 From the S-error estimate of the D-efficient design, a minimum sample size of 310 respondents
 214 was estimated as required. However, to account for a potentially low response rate,
 215 uncertainty in the priors used from the pilot, and to allow proper distribution of respondents

216 across the counties, we increased the minimum sample size by 30% resulting in a sample size
217 of 403 which was distributed proportionally across the counties, thus, targeting 67 NHIF
218 members in each of the counties. Each of the counties was then divided into rural and urban
219 areas. Given challenges at the qualitative phase to randomly select participants from lists of
220 NHIF members at NHIF (35), we used community health volunteers/promoters across rural
221 and urban settings in each of the counties, to purposefully mobilize groups of 10-15 NHIF
222 members from households to convene at a central location either in the rural or urban areas
223 to complete the questionnaire. Data collectors guided the respondents throughout the entire
224 process of completing the questionnaire. They ensured that each question was clearly
225 understood by the respondents. Data collection was conducted between 21/11/2022 and
226 24/02/2023.

227 **Statistical analyses**

228 The analysis of DCE data is grounded in the random utility theory (RUT) framework (8) and
229 until recently, the random regret minimization theory (RRM) (43). The RUT assumes
230 individuals are utility maximizers when selecting competing alternatives. Following
231 Lancaster's theory of consumer choice, individuals derive utility not from the goods or
232 services themselves but from the attributes of the goods or services (44). Consequently, the
233 utility an individual i derives from an alternative j in a choice scenario s can be broken down
234 into a systematic component (specified as a function of the attributes of the alternative) V_{ijs}
235 and a random (unexplainable) component (representing unmeasured variations in
236 preferences) ε_{ijs} (8, 27).

237
$$U_{ijs} = V_{ijs} + \varepsilon_{ijs}$$

238 In the analysis, all attributes were dummy-coded except distance and waiting time which were
239 continuous in kilometers and hours respectively. Based on the attributes presented in Table
240 1, the utility function of our DCE was defined as below:

241

242
$$U_{ijs} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{distance}_{ijs} + \beta_2 \text{wait time}_{ijs} + \beta_3 \text{health worker attitude}_{ijs} + \beta_4$$

243
$$\text{cleanliness}_{ijs} + \beta_5 \text{clinical officer}_{ijs} + \beta_6 \text{medical doctor}_{ijs} + \varepsilon_{ijs}$$

244 Several models were fitted in this analysis. First, we fitted a panel mixed multinomial logit
245 model (MMNL) to account for preference heterogeneity between respondents whilst
246 relaxing the independent from irrelevant alternatives (IIA) assumption under a conditional
247 logit (MNL) model (7, 45). In this model, all parameters were assumed to be randomly
248 distributed.

249 Second, we estimated the relative importance of the attributes following an approach
250 described elsewhere (46). Essentially, using absolute coefficients from an MNL model, we 1)
251 calculated the maximum effect by taking the product of the attribute coefficient and the
252 largest difference between the attribute levels of the attribute, 2) summed up all the
253 maximum effect values, 3) calculated the relative importance by dividing the maximum effect
254 (computed in 1) by the sum of the maximum effects (computed in 2).

255 Third, following the panel MMNL model above, we computed two marginal willingness to
256 accept (WTA) estimates in willingness to pay (WTP) space. Calculating WTA in WTP space has
257 been shown to result in realistic values as opposed to estimating them in preference space
258 (47), avoiding the generation of a Cauchy distribution as the ratio of two randomly distributed

259 variables. In this study, we used distance and waiting time and estimated respondents'
260 willingness to accept travelling (WTT) to a facility and willingness to wait (WTW) in queue until
261 getting a consultation. The *mixlogitwtp* command was used to compute the marginal WTA
262 estimates in WTP space in Stata version 16.1 (48, 49).

263 Fourth, we fitted a latent class (LC) model with fixed parameters to explore unobserved
264 heterogeneity (50). LC models assume that there are segments (classes) of the respondents
265 where preferences are homogeneous within the classes but heterogeneous between the
266 classes. We used the Akaike information criteria (AIC) and Bayesian Information Criteria (BIC)
267 to select the optimal number of classes by comparing models with two to ten classes (49).
268 The *llogit* command was used to fit the LC model.

269

270 **Ethics statement**

271 Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Scientific Ethics Review Unit (SERU) of
272 KEMRI (Ref: KEMRI/SERU/CGMR-C/191/4019). We obtained permissions in the form of letters
273 of support or stamps from County Departments of Health in all study counties that facilitated
274 entry into the county and facilities. Also, we obtained permission to conduct the study from
275 the NHIF, the National Commission for Science, Technology, and Innovation (NACOSTI), and
276 the Council of Governors in Kenya. Participants were taken through a consent process before
277 completing the study questionnaire and once they understood the process of their
278 involvement, they signed a consent form.

279

280 **Results**

281 **Descriptive analysis**

282 A majority of the NHIF members engaged in the survey were male (52.2% [95% CI: 47.3 – 57.1]),
 283 with a median age of 37 years[Inter-quartile range (IQR): 30 – 49], employed in the informal
 284 sector (36.1% [95% CI: 31.5 – 40.9]), liked that they were let to choose their NHIF contracted
 285 outpatient facilities (95.3% [95% CI: 92.7 – 97.0]), and had already selected an NHIF-contracted
 286 outpatient facility (86.8% [95% CI: 83.1 – 89.8]) (Table 5).

287

288 **Table 5: Characteristics of NHIF members engaged in the DCE**

	n	%	95% Confidence Intervals	
			Lower	Upper
Gender				
Female	192	47.8	42.9	52.7
Male	210	52.2	47.3	57.1
County				
Kilifi	65	16.2	12.9	20.1
Migori	68	16.9	13.6	20.9
Makueni	64	15.9	12.7	19.8
Nyeri	67	16.7	13.3	20.6
Uasin Gishu	68	16.9	13.6	20.9
Taita Taveta	70	17.4	14.0	21.4
Age				
Mean	402	40.0	38.7	41.3
Median (Inter-quartile range)	402	37.0	30.0	49.0
Employment status				
Not employed	136	33.8	29.4	38.6
Employed in the informal sector	145	36.1	31.5	40.9
Employed in the formal sector	121	30.1	25.8	34.8
Distance to nearest contracted NHIF facility (KM)				
Mean (95% Confidence Interval)	402	9.5	8.2	10.9
Median (Inter-quartile range)	402	5.0	2.0	11.0
Mode of transport to nearest NHIF-contracted outpatient facility				

Walking	95	23.6	19.7	28.0
Boda Boda (Motorbike)	170	42.3	37.5	47.2
Tuktuk	4	1.0	0.4	2.6
Public Transport/Matatu or Bus	127	31.6	27.2	36.3
Private car	6	1.5	0.7	3.3
Whether respondent likes that they can choose an outpatient facility				
No	19	4.7	3.0	7.3
Yes	383	95.3	92.7	97.0
Whether the respondent had chosen an NHIF-contracted outpatient facility				
No	53	13.2	10.2	16.9
Yes	349	86.8	83.1	89.8

289

290 For the respondents that had already selected an NHIF-contracted outpatient facility (n=349),
 291 they were nearly equally distributed by gender, chose facilities where drugs were always
 292 available, lived on an average of 8.7 Kilometres (95% CI: 7.4 – 10.0) from their selected NHIF-
 293 contracted outpatient facility, and used Boda Boda (motorcycle) when traveling to their
 294 selected facility. On average, NHIF members waited at the facility for 1.3 hours (95% CI: 1.2 –
 295 1.5), had selected facilities where health workers were respectful and saw a medical doctor
 296 during a consultation (Table 6).

297 **Table 6: Socio-demographic and health facility factors for NHIF members that had selected**
 298 **an NHIF-contracted outpatient facility.**

	n	Percentage	95% Confidence Intervals	
			Lower	Upper
Gender				
Female	173	49.6	44.3	54.8
Male	176	50.4	45.2	55.7
Availability of Drugs at the selected facility				
Not always available	140	40.1	35.1	45.4
Always available	209	59.9	54.6	64.9

Distance from household to selected facility (KM)				
Mean (95% Confidence Interval)	349	8.7	7.4	10.0
Median (Inter-quartile range)	349	5.0	2.0	10.0
Travel time to the selected facility				
Mean (95% Confidence Interval)	349	1.1	0.8	1.5
Median (Inter-quartile range)	349	0.6	0.5	1.0
Means of transport used to travel to the facility				
Walking	75	21.5	17.5	26.1
Boda Boda (Motorcycle)	175	50.1	44.9	55.4
Tuktuk	9	2.6	1.3	4.9
Public Transport	85	24.4	20.1	29.2
Private car	5	1.4	0.6	3.4
Waiting time at the facility until consultation				
Mean (95% Confidence Interval)	349	1.3	1.2	1.5
Median (Inter-quartile range)	349	1.0	0.5	2.0
Attitude of health workers at the chosen facility				
Health worker is harsh and abusive	19	5.4	3.5	8.4
Health worker is respectful	330	94.6	91.6	96.5
Cleanliness of the chosen facility				
Facility (toilets-rooms-floors) are not always clean	41	11.8	8.8	15.6
Facility (toilets-rooms-floors) are always clean	307	88.2	84.4	91.2
Cadre of health worker seen at the facility during a consultation				
Nurse	41	11.8	8.8	15.7
Clinical Officer	146	42.2	37.1	47.5
Medical Doctor	159	46.0	40.7	51.2

299

300 Preferences and marginal WTT and WTW estimates

301 Overall, the preference weights for each attribute level had the expected signs (Figure 1 and
 302 Table 7). NHIF members preferred facilities where drugs were always available ($\beta = 1.572$; p-
 303 value= <0.001), with health workers that were respectful ($\beta = 1.249$; p-value= <0.001), with

304 clinical officers ($\beta = 0.478$; $p\text{-value} < 0.001$) or medical doctors ($\beta = 1.525$; $p\text{-value} < 0.001$) for
305 consultation and were always cleaner ($\beta = 0.689$; $p\text{-value} < 0.001$). NHIF members did not
306 prefer facilities that were further away from their households ($\beta = -0.082$; $p\text{-value} < 0.001$) or
307 having to wait longer at the facility until they could get a consultation ($\beta = -0.195$; $p\text{-value} < 0.001$). All standard deviations across all attributes were significant ($p\text{-value} < 0.001$)
308 except for distance and waiting time indicating the presence of inter-respondent
309 heterogeneity in preferences.

311 Findings from the willingness to pay (WTP) space for the marginal willingness to accept travel
312 (WTT) and willingness to accept waiting (WTW) at a facility highlighted key trade-offs among
313 NHIF members (Table 8). First, on WTT, NHIF members were willing to travel up to 17.8
314 kilometres [(95% CI: 12.7 – 22.9), $p\text{-value} < 0.001$] to a facility where drugs were always available,
315 compared to a facility where they were not. Besides, NHIF members were willing to travel
316 14.6, 7.7, 5.7, and 17.7 kilometres to an NHIF-contracted outpatient facility where health
317 workers were respectful, it was always clean and could be seen by a clinical officer and medical
318 doctor for consultation compared to a facility where health workers were not respectful, not
319 always clean and could see a nurse for consultation respectively. However, NHIF members
320 were willing to accept a reduction of up to 2.0 Kilometres [(95% CI: -2.8 to -1.2), $p\text{-value} < 0.001$]
321 for an additional hour of waiting time at a facility until they got a consultation.


322 Second, when waiting time was considered as the “monetary or price” attribute, similar
323 trends were observed. For instance, NHIF members were willing to wait at a facility for up to
324 8.9, 8.8, 7.2, 3.8, and 2.8 hours as long as they would always get drugs, could be seen by a
325 medical doctor during a consultation, health workers were respectful, the facility toilets,

326 rooms, and floors were always cleaner and could be seen by a clinical officer during
327 consultation respectively. However, all things constant, NHIF members were willing to accept
328 a reduction in waiting time of up to 30 minutes [0.5 hours (95% CI: -0.7 to -0.3), p-value<0.001]
329 if they had to travel to a facility that was 1 Kilometre further away from their households.

330 **Relative importance of the attributes**

331 Table 9 and Figure 2 summarize the findings of the exploration of the most important
332 attributes. The cadre of staff seen during a consultation was the most important attribute
333 (0.277 [95% CI: 0.276 – 0.278]) followed by availability of drugs (0.273; 95% CI: 0.272 – 0.273),
334 attitude of health worker (0.216 [95% CI: 0.216 – 0.217]), and cleanliness of the facility (0.123
335 [0.122 – 0.123]). Waiting time (0.053 [95% CI: 0.053 – 0.053]) and distance from the household
336 to a facility (0.059 [95% CI: 0.058 – 0.059]) had the least importance scores.

337



338

339 **Figure 1: Mean preference weights from the panel MMNL model outputs. The change in**
 340 **utility associated with a change in the levels of each attribute is represented by the vertical**
 341 **distance between any two levels of the attribute. The utility of the base level was set at 0.0.**

342

343 **Table 7: Main effects panel MMNL model preference weights and marginal WTT and WTW estimates**

Attributes	Preference estimates			Standard Deviation estimates		
	Coefficient	95% CI	P-value	Coefficient	95% CI	P-value
Availability of Drugs						
Not always available	Ref. (0)					
Always available	1.572	1.353 to 1.790	<0.001	1.25	1.043 to 1.458	<0.001
Distance from household to facility	-0.082	-0.106 to -0.058	<0.001	0.002	-0.01 to 0.013	0.768
Waiting time at the facility until consultation	-0.195	-0.241 to -0.148	<0.001	0.018	-0.025 to 0.060	0.413
Attitude of health workers						
Health worker is harsh and abusive	Ref. (0)					
Health worker is respectful	1.249	1.097 to 1.401	<0.001	0.901	0.734 to 1.068	<0.001
Cleanliness of the facility						
Facility (toilets-rooms-floors) are not always clean	Ref. (0)					
Facility (toilets-rooms-floors) are always clean	0.689	0.570 to 0.807	<0.001	0.658	0.494 to 0.821	<0.001
Cadre of health worker seen during a consultation						
Nurse	Ref. (0)					
Clinical Officer	0.478	0.325 to 0.630	<0.001	0.608	0.417 to 0.799	<0.001
Medical Doctor	1.525	1.296 to 1.753	<0.001	0.837	0.594 to 1.079	<0.001
Model fit statistics						
Log-likelihood (final)	-2728.892					
Number of Observations	9648					
Number of decision-makers (n)	402					
Draws (Halton)	1000					

344 **Table 8: Marginal willingness to travel (WTT) and willingness to wait (WTW) estimates in willingness to pay space.**


Attributes	Marginal WTT estimates in WTP space			Marginal WTW estimates in WTP space		
	Coefficient	95% CI	P-value	Coefficient	95% CI	P-value
Availability of Drugs						
Not always available	Ref. (o)			Ref. (o)		
Always available	17.839	12.744 to 22.933	<0.001	8.885	6.376 to 11.394	<0.001
Distance from household to facility	WTT denominator			-0.497	-0.680 to -0.314	<0.001
Waiting time at the facility until consultation	-2.03	-2.816 to -1.244	<0.001	WTW denominator		
Attitude of health workers						
Health worker is harsh and abusive	Ref. (o)			Ref. (o)		
Health worker is respectful	14.617	10.728 to 18.506	<0.001	7.207	4.975 to 9.439	<0.001
Cleanliness of the facility						
Facility (toilets-rooms-floors) are not always clean	Ref. (o)			Ref. (o)		
Facility (toilets-rooms-floors) are always clean	7.739	5.182 to 10.295	<0.001	3.804	2.612 to 4.996	<0.001
Cadre of health worker seen during a consultation						
Nurse	Ref. (o)			Ref. (o)		
Clinical Officer	5.69	3.651 to 7.729	<0.001	2.833	1.560 to 4.106	<0.001
Medical Doctor	17.743	12.657 to 22.830	<0.001	8.827	6.249 to 11.405	<0.001
Model fit statistics						
Log-likelihood (final)	-2722.291			-2718.378		
Number of Observations	9648			9648		
Number of decision-makers (n)	402			402		
Draws (Halton)	1000			1000		

346 **Table 9: Relative importance of attributes**

Attribute	Effect	Maximum Effect	Relative Importance			
			Relative Importance	Standard error	95% CI	
					Lower	Upper
Availability of Drugs	1.101	1.100	0.273	0.00045	0.272	0.273
Distance from household to the facility	-0.059	0.236	0.059	0.00028	0.058	0.059
Waiting time at the facility for consultation	-0.143	0.214	0.053	0.00020	0.053	0.053
Attitude of health worker	0.874	0.873	0.216	0.00033	0.216	0.217
Cleanliness of the facility	0.493	0.495	0.123	0.00029	0.122	0.123
Cadre of staff seen during the consultation	1.119	1.118	0.277	0.00047	0.276	0.278
Total		4.037				

347

348



349

350 **Figure 2: Relative importance of attributes in percentage**


351

352 **Unobservable preference heterogeneity**

353 Figure 3 presents the findings from the three-class LC model (Supplementary File 2). The
354 largest class (hereafter referred to as the ‘drug-focused’ class) had a membership probability
355 of 63.4%. Preferences of participants most likely to be in this class were primarily driven by
356 drugs being always available as opposed to drugs not being always available [$\beta=1.55$; p-
357 value<0.001]. Besides, members in this class also had lower preferences for facilities that were
358 further away from their households [$\beta=-0.06$; p-value<0.001] and had longer waiting times
359 [$\beta=-0.167$; p-value<0.001].

360 The second largest class (hereafter referred to as the ‘cadre-focused’ class) had a class
361 membership probability of 19.8%. The preferences of members in this class were primarily
362 driven by the cadre of staff seen during a consultation, particularly medical doctors [$\beta=3.49$;
363 p-value<0.001] and clinical officers [$\beta=2.08$; p-value<0.001] as opposed to nurses, hence
364 referred to here as the ‘cadre-focused’ class. Other preferences were similar to those
365 described above.

366 The third and smallest class (hereafter referred to as the ‘attitude-focused’ class) had a
367 membership probability of 16.8%. In this class, NHIF members’ choices were driven by the
368 attitudes of health workers [$\beta=3.52$; p-value<0.001]. Interestingly, members of this class were
369 averse to the cadre of staff seen during a consultation ((Medical Doctors [$\beta=-0.03$; p-
370 value=0.950]); Clinical Officers [$\beta=-0.615$; p-value=0.073] even though this was not statistically
371 significant.



372

373 **Figure 3: Latent Class Model results**

374 **Discussion**

375 Patient choice is increasingly gaining attention as an approach to enhancing provider
376 competition and providing patient-centred care towards attaining health system goals.
377 Understanding the preferences of users especially in low- and middle-income countries
378 (LMICs) such as Kenya is crucial to informing decision-makers design of patient-centred care
379 that aligns with UHC goals. This study examined the preferences of NHIF members for the
380 attributes of NHIF-contracted outpatient facilities, marginal WTT and WTW, and preference
381 heterogeneities. We found that, first, NHIF members preferred NHIF-contracted outpatient

382 facilities where drugs were always available, were closer to their households, had shorter
383 waiting times, had respectful health workers, and could see clinical officers or medical doctors
384 during consultation. This is further strengthened by the findings from the relative importance
385 of the attributes where the cadre of staff seen during a consultation, availability of drugs, and
386 attitude of health workers were found to be the top three most important attributes. Second,
387 NHIF members were willing to accept travelling to a further away facility or wait longer at a
388 facility if the facility always had drugs, respectful health workers, and could be seen by a
389 clinical officer or medical doctor. Third, our findings highlighted inter-respondent
390 heterogeneity in NHIF members' preferences and WTT and WTW parameters. Besides, we
391 established three class memberships where choices in these classes were driven by the
392 availability of drugs, the cadre of staff seen during a consultation, and the attitude of health
393 workers. These findings can be explained.

394 NHIF members preferred facilities where drugs were always available. These findings are
395 similar to those reported in other studies (9, 11, 51). Besides, the findings on the relative
396 importance of attributes reflect the NHIF members' focus on quality-related attributes which
397 further highlights the importance of quality in patient-centred health systems (52). This is
398 further corroborated by our WTT and WTW estimates where NHIF members indicated a
399 willingness to accept travelling up to 17.8 kilometres from their households and wait up to 8.9
400 hours at an NHIF-contracted outpatient facility that always had drugs (Table 8Table 7). This
401 could be explained by the contribution of drugs or medication costs to overall healthcare
402 costs. For instance, studies in Kenya and other settings have highlighted drugs as the major
403 contributor to healthcare costs (53-55). While ideally medicines should be provided for free to

404 NHIF members seeking outpatient care, a recent study in Kenya did not find any significant
405 evidence that NHIF provided financial protection to NHIF members with hypertension and
406 diabetes (56). Even though that study was disease-specific, it highlights some nuances to the
407 continued payment of out-of-pocket payments for services such as medication or drugs that
408 should rather be free.

409 NHIF members preferred NHIF-contracted health facilities that were closer and had shorter
410 waiting times. This finding corroborates evidence from other studies that have reported
411 distance and waiting time as major factors influencing the choice of facilities (12, 34). Distance
412 is crucial, especially in a setting like Kenya where transport costs were estimated to account
413 for 31.4% of direct healthcare costs (53). Besides, evidence from another study in Kenya
414 highlighted transport costs as the second largest contributor to the total direct diabetes
415 healthcare costs (54). On the other hand, waiting time until consultation has been reported
416 as the most used ‘structure’ attribute (12). In a Danish study, Pedersen et al. found waiting
417 time until an appointment to be the most preferred attribute, more than the distance to the
418 facility (57). In another study that examined patient preferences for facilities in Western Cape
419 Province, Chiwire et al. also found waiting time as the second most important attribute (9).
420 While gender differences were also reported in the Western Cape Province study, gender
421 interaction with waiting time in our study did not reveal any significant difference between
422 male and female NHIF members' waiting time. However, this could be attributed to the high
423 informality in employment (Table 5) and poverty levels in Kenya. Perhaps, NHIF members
424 would want to resume their jobs in the informal settings given the lack of access to social
425 protections often offered to formal sector workers such as sick leave days (58).

426 NHIF members preferred NHIF-contracted outpatient facilities with respectful health
427 workers. These findings are similar to those reported in Tanzania where respondents
428 preferred health facilities where doctors provided them with kind/respectful treatment (20).
429 Similarly, Aridi et al. found women preferred health facilities that had kind and supportive
430 health workers (19). This is in line with the quality of care standards where patients are entitled
431 to receive treatment respectfully (59).

432 The cadre of staff seen during a consultation was also an important factor that influenced the
433 choice of NHIF-contracted outpatient facilities among NHIF members. Most importantly, NHIF
434 members preferred facilities where clinical officers or medical doctors would attend to them
435 during consultation. Similar findings have been reported elsewhere. For instance, Caldwell et
436 al showed that respondents preferred to be attended to by a general practitioner (GP) than a
437 practice nurse (60). While the preference for a specific cadre of staff may result from the
438 perceived severity of a condition, clinical officers and medical doctors are perceived to be
439 better skilled and knowledgeable in diagnosing illnesses as opposed to nurses (60).

440 **Implications for policy**

441 Findings from this study offer several implications for policy in Kenya and other countries with
442 similar settings. First, contracting outpatient facilities by purchasers such as the NHIF should
443 prioritize facilities that always have drugs. For example, given the willingness to accept
444 travelling and waiting at facilities, counties should prioritize equipping available facilities with
445 required medication rather than building newer facilities that end up being ill-equipped with
446 staff and commodities.

447 Second, interventions that aim to enhance the quality of care delivered across facilities should
448 prioritize addressing waiting times and the attitudes of health workers. For instance, health
449 workers could receive refresher training periodically to enhance their responsiveness and
450 attitudes (particularly in treating patients with respect) when engaging with NHIF members
451 and patients in general. These will then enhance user satisfaction whilst promoting the
452 attainment of the responsiveness health system goal. Besides, there is a need to strengthen
453 monitoring and accountability systems such as patient feedback mechanisms as levers for
454 providing patient-centred care.

455 Third, given that the health workforce is a central health system building block (61), there is a
456 need for the Kenyan government to deploy more health workers across the facilities
457 particularly clinical officers and medical doctors. Besides, NHIF should strengthen its
458 purchasing function to ensure the availability of required health workers across all the
459 facilities it contracts.

460

461 **Study strengths and limitations**

462 First, this is the first study that quantitatively examined the preference of NHIF members for
463 attributes of NHIF-contracted outpatient facilities in Kenya. Given the role of NHIF as the main
464 public health purchaser and the ‘vehicle’ of the UHC agenda in Kenya, these findings are
465 crucial to providing evidence of who the NHIF should contract. Second, our study provides
466 details of the trade-offs NHIF members were willing to make which can inform the tailoring of
467 interventions such as employment of health workers, construction of facilities and equipping

468 of facilities with essential medicines and supplies. Third, the use of the DCE in this study
469 allowed the examination of NHIF members' preferences in the absence of revealed
470 preference data.

471 However, these findings should be interpreted in light of the following limitations.
472 Methodologically, DCEs have been associated with hypothetical bias resulting from the
473 difference between what people say they would do versus what they actually do (62, 63).
474 While we aimed to assess the external validity (hypothetical bias) in this study and we
475 collected data for respondents that had selected an NHIF-contracted outpatient facility, we
476 could not fit models using the revealed preference data due to inadequate specification of
477 the revealed preference choice variable. Future studies should assess this. Finally, the
478 purposiveness in sampling NHIF members may have introduced a bias, however, we don't
479 anticipate this to have affected the findings.

480

481 **Conclusion**

482 Findings from this study highlight the preferred NHIF-contracted outpatient health facility
483 attributes and trade-offs NHIF members are willing to make. Consequently, there is a need for
484 the NHIF, counties and health providers to prioritize these attributes and trade-offs when
485 contracting providers, allocating resources, and providing services respectively. These
486 attributes offer insights for the recently formed Social Health Authority (SHA) as the
487 institution takes over the mandate of NHIF.

488

489 **Author Contribution**

490 **Conceptualization:** Jacob Kazungu

491 **Formal Analysis:** Jacob Kazungu, Matthew Quaife

492 **Methodology:** Jacob Kazungu, Edwine Barasa, Justice Nonvignon, Mathew Quaife

493 **Visualization:** Jacob Kazungu

494 **Writing – original draft:** Jacob Kazungu

495 **Writing – review & editing:** Jacob Kazungu, Edwine Barasa, Justice Nonvignon, Matthew
496 Quaife

497 **Supervision:** Edwine Barasa, Justice Nonvignon, Matthew Quaife

498

499 **Acknowledgments**

500 This work was funded by Wellcome Trust Masters Fellowship grant number 212347 awarded
501 to JK. The funders had no role in the study design, data analysis, decision to publish, drafting,
502 or submission of the manuscript.

503 **Conflict of Interest Statement**

504 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

505 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

506 The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the
507 corresponding author.

508

509 **References**

- 510 1. MOH. Roadmap towards Universal Health Coverage in Kenya 2018–2022. 2018.
511 2. MOH. Kenya Health Policy 2014–2030: Towards attaining the highest standard of
512 health. 2014.

- 513 3. HEFREP. The NHIF we want - Report of the Health Financing Reforms Expert Panel for
514 the transformation and repositioning of National Hospital Insurance Fund as a strategic
515 purchaser of health services for the attainment of Universal Health Coverage by 2022. 2019.
- 516 4. Mbau R, Kabia E, Honda A, Hanson K, Barasa E. Examining purchasing reforms towards
517 universal health coverage by the National Hospital Insurance Fund in Kenya. *International*
518 *journal for equity in health*. 2020;19:1-18.
- 519 5. Honda A. What is strategic purchasing for health? 2014.
- 520 6. Ali S, Ronaldson S. Ordinal preference elicitation methods in health economics and
521 health services research: using discrete choice experiments and ranking methods. *British*
522 *medical bulletin*. 2012;103(1):21-44.
- 523 7. Hensher DA, Rose JM, Greene WH. *Applied choice analysis: a primer*: Cambridge
524 *university press*; 2005.
- 525 8. Ryan M, Gerard K, Amaya-Amaya M. *Using discrete choice experiments to value health*
526 *and health care*: Springer Science & Business Media; 2007.
- 527 9. Chiwire P, Beudart C, Evers SM, Mahomed H, Hilgsmann M. Enhancing public
528 participation in public health offerings: patient preferences for facilities in the western cape
529 province using a discrete choice experiment. *International Journal of Environmental Research*
530 *and Public Health*. 2022;19(1):590.
- 531 10. Dixon A, Robertson R, Appleby J, Burge P, Devlin NJ. *Patient choice: how patients*
532 *choose and how providers respond*: King's Fund; 2010.
- 533 11. Dündar C. Health-seeking behavior and medical facility choice in Samsun, Turkey.
534 *Health Policy*. 2017;121(9):1015-9.
- 535 12. Kleij K-S, Tangermann U, Amelung VE, Krauth C. Patients' preferences for primary
536 health care—a systematic literature review of discrete choice experiments. *BMC health*
537 *services research*. 2017;17(1):476.
- 538 13. Kuunibe N, Dary SK. Choice of healthcare providers among insured persons in Ghana.
539 *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*. 2012;2(10):88-97.
- 540 14. Lagarde M, Erens B, Mays N. Determinants of the choice of GP practice registration in
541 England: evidence from a discrete choice experiment. *Health Policy*. 2015;119(4):427-36.
- 542 15. Lendado TA, Bitew S, Elias F, Samuel S, Assele DD, Asefa M. Effect of hospital attributes
543 on patient preference among outpatient attendants in Wolaita Zone, Southern Ethiopia:
544 discrete choice experiment study. *BMC health services research*. 2022;22(1):1-11.
- 545 16. Liu Y, Kong Q, de Bekker-Grob EW. Public preferences for health care facilities in rural
546 China: a discrete choice experiment. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2019;237:112396.
- 547 17. Kruk ME, Rockers PC, Tornorlah Varpilah S, Macauley R. Population preferences for
548 health care in Liberia: insights for rebuilding a health system. *Health services research*.
549 2011;46(6pt2):2057-78.
- 550 18. Jayanthi T, Suresh S, Padmanaban P. Primary health centres: preferred option for
551 birthing care in Tamilnadu, India, from users' perspectives. *Journal of health, population, and*
552 *nutrition*. 2015;33(1):177.
- 553 19. Oluoch-Aridi J, Adam MB, Wafula F, Kokwaro G. Understanding what women want:
554 eliciting preference for delivery health facility in a rural subcounty in Kenya, a discrete choice
555 experiment. *BMJ open*. 2020;10(12):e038865.

- 556 20. Larson E, Vail D, Mbaruku GM, Kimweri A, Freedman LP, Kruk ME. Moving toward
557 patient-centered care in Africa: a discrete choice experiment of preferences for delivery care
558 among 3,003 Tanzanian women. *PloS one*. 2015;10(8):e0135621.
- 559 21. Kenya LO. The constitution of Kenya: 2010: Chief Registrar of the Judiciary; 2013.
- 560 22. Kazungu J, Mbithi L, Onyes U, Nwaononiwu E, Marangu M, Mamo A, et al. Changing
561 the game in purchasing health services: findings from a provider-purchaser engagement in
562 Kenya. 2022.
- 563 23. KNBS and ICF. Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2022. Key Indicators Report.
564 Nairobi, Kenya and Rockville, Maryland, USA: KNBS and ICF; 2023.
- 565 24. Barasa E, Kazungu J, Nguhiu P, Ravishankar N. Examining the level and inequality in
566 health insurance coverage in 36 sub-Saharan African countries. *BMJ Global Health*.
567 2021;6(4):e004712.
- 568 25. Mbau R, Kabia E, Honda A, Hanson K, Barasa E. Examining purchasing reforms towards
569 universal health coverage by the National Hospital Insurance Fund in Kenya. *International
570 journal for equity in health*. 2020;19(1):19.
- 571 26. Barasa E, Rogo K, Mwaura N, Chuma J. Kenya National Hospital Insurance Fund
572 Reforms: Implications and Lessons for Universal Health Coverage. *Health Systems & Reform*.
573 2018;4(4):346-61.
- 574 27. Hauber AB, González JM, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CG, Prior T, Marshall DA, Cunningham
575 C, et al. Statistical methods for the analysis of discrete choice experiments: a report of the
576 ISPOR conjoint analysis good research practices task force. *Value in health*. 2016;19(4):300-15.
- 577 28. Bridges JF, Hauber AB, Marshall D, Lloyd A, Prosser LA, Regier DA, et al. Conjoint
578 analysis applications in health—a checklist: a report of the ISPOR Good Research Practices for
579 Conjoint Analysis Task Force. *Value in health*. 2011;14(4):403-13.
- 580 29. Obadha M, Chuma J, Kazungu J, Abiiro GA, Beck MJ, Barasa E. Preferences of
581 healthcare providers for capitation payment in Kenya: a discrete choice experiment. *Health
582 Policy and Planning*. 2020;35(7):842-54.
- 583 30. Abuya T, Mwanga D, Obadha M, Ndwiga C, Odwe G, Kavoo D, et al. Incentive
584 preferences for community health volunteers in Kenya: findings from a discrete choice
585 experiment. *BMJ open*. 2021;11(7):e048059.
- 586 31. Oluoch-Aridi J, Adam MB, Wafula F, K'okwaro G. Eliciting women's preferences for
587 place of child birth at a peri-urban setting in Nairobi, Kenya: A discrete choice experiment. *Plos
588 one*. 2020;15(12):e0242149.
- 589 32. Takemura T, Kielmann K, Blaauw D. Job preferences among clinical officers in public
590 sector facilities in rural Kenya: a discrete choice experiment. *Human resources for health*.
591 2016;14(1):1-10.
- 592 33. Helter TM, Boehler CEH. Developing attributes for discrete choice experiments in
593 health: a systematic literature review and case study of alcohol misuse interventions. *Journal
594 of substance use*. 2016;21(6):662-8.
- 595 34. Kazungu J, Quaife M, Nonvignon J, Barasa E. What influences patients' choice of health
596 facilities and does it enhance provider competition in low- and middle-income countries? A
597 scoping review [Unpublished manuscript]. 2024.

- 598 35. Kazungu J, Nonvignon J, Quaife M, Barasa E. Assessing the choice of National Health
599 Insurance Fund contracted outpatient facilities in Kenya: A qualitative study. *Int J Health Plann*
600 *Manage.* 2023.
- 601 36. Choice Metrics. *Ngene Verson 1.3. 0.* Sydney, New South Wales: ChoiceMetrics Pty Ltd.
602 2021.
- 603 37. Watson V, Becker F, de Bekker-Grob E. Discrete choice experiment response rates: A
604 meta-analysis. *Health economics.* 2017;26(6):810-7.
- 605 38. de Bekker-Grob EW, Ryan M, Gerard K. Discrete choice experiments in health
606 economics: a review of the literature. *Health economics.* 2012;21(2):145-72.
- 607 39. Clark MD, Determann D, Petrou S, Moro D, de Bekker-Grob EW. Discrete choice
608 experiments in health economics: a review of the literature. *Pharmacoeconomics.*
609 2014;32:883-902.
- 610 40. Aoyama H. A study of stratified random sampling. *Ann Inst Stat Math.* 1954;6(1):1-36.
- 611 41. Kenya Master Health facility List [Internet]. 2021 [cited 25/04/2021]. Available from:
612 http://kmhfl.health.go.ke/#/facility_filter.
- 613 42. Outpatient services: List of Medical Facilities Offering National Scheme [Internet]. 2019
614 [cited 13/11/2019]. Available from: <http://www.nhif.or.ke/healthinsurance/outpatientServices>.
- 615 43. Chorus C, van Cranenburgh S, Dekker T. Random regret minimization for consumer
616 choice modeling: Assessment of empirical evidence. *Journal of Business Research.*
617 2014;67(11):2428-36.
- 618 44. Lancaster KJ. A new approach to consumer theory. *Journal of political economy.*
619 1966;74(2):132-57.
- 620 45. Lancsar E, Fiebig DG, Hole AR. Discrete choice experiments: a guide to model
621 specification, estimation and software. *Pharmacoeconomics.* 2017;35:697-716.
- 622 46. Maaya L, Meulders M, Surmont N, Vandebroek M. Effect of environmental and
623 altruistic attitudes on willingness-to-pay for organic and fair trade coffee in Flanders.
624 *Sustainability.* 2018;10(12):4496.
- 625 47. Hole AR, Kolstad JR. Mixed logit estimation of willingness to pay distributions: a
626 comparison of models in preference and WTP space using data from a health-related choice
627 experiment. *Empirical Economics.* 2012;42:445-69.
- 628 48. StataCorp. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 16.1.* 2021.
- 629 49. Hole AR, editor *Mixed logit modeling in Stata--an overview.* United Kingdom Stata
630 Users' Group Meetings 2013; 2013: Stata Users Group.
- 631 50. Walsh DA, Boeri M, Abraham L, Atkinson J, Bushmakin AG, Cappelleri JC, et al.
632 Exploring patient preference heterogeneity for pharmacological treatments for chronic pain:
633 a latent class analysis. *European Journal of Pain.* 2022;26(3):648-67.
- 634 51. Honda A, Ryan M, van Niekerk R, McIntyre D. Improving the public health sector in
635 South Africa: eliciting public preferences using a discrete choice experiment. *Health policy and*
636 *planning.* 2015;30(5):600-11.
- 637 52. Kruk ME, Pate M. The Lancet global health Commission on high quality health systems
638 1 year on: progress on a global imperative. *The Lancet global health.* 2020;8(1):e30-e2.
- 639 53. Barasa EW, Maina T, Ravishankar N. Assessing the impoverishing effects, and factors
640 associated with the incidence of catastrophic health care payments in Kenya. *International*
641 *journal for equity in health.* 2017;16(1):31.

- 642 54. Oyando R, Njoroge M, Nguhiu P, Sigilai A, Kirui F, Mbui J, et al. Patient costs of diabetes
643 mellitus care in public health care facilities in Kenya. *The International journal of health*
644 *planning and management*. 2020;35(1):290-308.
- 645 55. Kazungu J, Meyer CL, Sargsyan KG, Qaiser S, Chukwuma A. The burden of catastrophic
646 and impoverishing health expenditure in Armenia: An analysis of Integrated Living Conditions
647 Surveys, 2014–2018. *PLOS Global Public Health*. 2022;2(10):e0000494.
- 648 56. Oyando R, Were V, Koros H, Mugo R, Kamano J, Etyang A, et al. Evaluating the
649 effectiveness of the National Health Insurance Fund in providing financial protection to
650 households with hypertension and diabetes patients in Kenya. *International journal for equity*
651 *in health*. 2023;22(1):107.
- 652 57. Pedersen LB, Kjær T, Kragstrup J, Gyrd-Hansen D. Do general practitioners know
653 patients' preferences? An empirical study on the agency relationship at an aggregate level
654 using a discrete choice experiment. *Value in Health*. 2012;15(3):514-23.
- 655 58. Oladosu AO, Khai TS, Asaduzzaman M. Factors affecting access to healthcare for
656 young people in the informal sector in developing countries: a systematic review. *Frontiers in*
657 *Public Health*. 2023;11:1168577.
- 658 59. WHO. Standards for improving quality of maternal and newborn care in health facilities.
659 2016.
- 660 60. Caldwell J, Bond C, Ryan M, Campbell NC, Miguel FS, Kiger A, et al. Treatment of minor
661 illness in primary care: a national survey of patient satisfaction, attitudes and preferences
662 regarding a wider nursing role. *Health Expectations*. 2007;10(1):30-45.
- 663 61. Organization WH. Everybody's business—strengthening health systems to improve
664 health outcomes: WHO's framework for action. 2007.
- 665 62. Haghani M, Bliemer MC, Rose JM, Oppewal H, Lancsar E. Hypothetical bias in stated
666 choice experiments: Part II. Conceptualisation of external validity, sources and explanations
667 of bias and effectiveness of mitigation methods. *Journal of choice modelling*. 2021;41:100322.
- 668 63. Quaife M, Terris-Prestholt F, Di Tanna GL, Vickerman P. How well do discrete choice
669 experiments predict health choices? A systematic review and meta-analysis of external
670 validity. *The European journal of health economics*. 2018;19(8):1053-66.

671