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We already know this!

- Inequality is the measurable dimension of health inequity studies
  - Differences, gaps, variation
  - Of health status, exposure to risk factors, access to and utilization of health care services
  - Across several dimensions (or stratifiers)
    - Wealth, ethnicity, gender, education, age

- Absolute and relative
  - When comparing groups one can measure
    - Distance = absolute, by difference
    - Ratio = relative, by division
Inequality – absolute or relative

- **Absolute inequality**
  - Remains constant when all groups increase or decrease by the same amount (+ or – Y)
- **Relative inequality**
  - Remains constant when all groups increase or decrease by the same factor (× Y)

Will use the slope index of inequality (SII):
- a regression-based estimate of the difference between

Will use the concentration index (CIX):
- a Gini-like measure of concentration of intervention coverage across the population

![Graph showing the comparison of absolute and relative inequality](chart.png)
Trends in inequalities

• How to assess change in inequalities?
• Frequently, decreasing absolute and increasing relative inequality seen as contradictory
• We show that there is pattern
  • Both indicators must be used together to check what is happening
• The overall trend of the outcome
  • Increasing or decreasing
  • Makes a difference here
Increasing trend: intervention

Best case: decreasing inequality

Worst case: increasing inequality

Decreasing trend: mortality/morbidity

Worst case: increasing inequality

Best case: decreasing inequality
Absolute inequality increased, relative inequality decreased – intermediate scenario

Both relative and absolute inequalities decreased – best scenario

Both relative and absolute inequalities increased – worst scenario

Countdown to 2015
Maternal, Newborn & Child Survival

Absolute inequality increased,
relative inequality decreased
– intermediate scenario

Both relative and absolute
inequalities decreased
– best scenario

Both relative and absolute
inequalities increased
– worst scenario
Trend plot – how to interpret?

Equity trend for family planning need satisfied

- Best situation! Overall improvement
- Intermediate situation! Only relative inequality improved
- Worst situation

Dot size proportional to Q1 baseline coverage

How to interpret?

- A: Best situation
- B: Intermediate situation
- Q1: Worst situation

Change in absolute inequality
Change in relative inequality

Best situation! Overall improvement
Intermediate situation! Only relative inequality improved
Worst situation
Very little change

Dot size proportional to Q1 baseline coverage

Trend plot
Equity trend analysis

- Results for 36 countries
  - With two surveys about 10 years apart
- Family planning need satisfied
  - % women using contraception among those in need
  - Complex indicator based on many variables, some very subjective
  - Difficult to calculate
  - Makes more sense than contraceptive prevalence
- Antenatal care 1+ visit with skilled provider
  - At least 1 consultation with skilled provider during pregnancy
- Skilled birth attendant
  - Skilled attendant at child birth
  - Skilled = doctor, nurse or midwife (with some local adaptations)
Family planning: Equity trend for family planning need satisfied

In red: countries where coverage decreased for the richest

Equity trends for family planning need satisfied

28/35 countries = 80% improved mean coverage

In red: countries where coverage decreased for the richest
Let’s see the details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>cov. all</th>
<th>cov. Q5</th>
<th>CIX</th>
<th>SII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Both CIX & SII increased
- CIX decrease, SII increased
- Both CIX & SII decreased
Antenatal care (1+ skilled)

In red: countries where coverage decreased for the richest

Equity trend for antenatal care (1+ skilled)

28/36 countries = 78% improved mean coverage
Skilled birth attendant

Equity trend for skilled birth attendant

In red: countries where coverage decreased for the richest.

Change in relative inequality
Best performing countries in terms of improving equity for six RM interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FPS</th>
<th>CPMT*</th>
<th>CPMO*</th>
<th>ANC1</th>
<th>SBA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not presented in the graphs
A few conclusions

• Equity may seem complicated to assess
  • But it is not, if you understand the concept and the measures
• Most countries studied managed to improve overall coverage
  • Around 80% of them
• In contrast, only a handful of countries showed improvement in equity for each indicator
  • No more than 5 countries with very good improvement
  • No more than 10 countries with some improvement
• SBA was clearly the intervention that improved less in terms of equity