## **Appendices**

Appendix table 1 - Mechanism of injury according to wealth quintile, for all those injured in past 12

months with number of males in brackets.

		<u> </u>							
Wealth	Fall	Fall from	Struck /	Cut /	Gunshot	Fire /	Poisoning	Animal	Other
Quintile	N (n of	motorcycle	hit by	stabbed	N (n of	Heat	N (n of	bite N (n	N (n of
	males)	or bicycle	object	N (n of	males)	Burn N	males)	of males)	males)
	ŕ	N (n of	N (n of	males)	,	(n of	,	· ·	,
		males)	males)	,		males)			
1	6 (4)	3 (3)	10 (7)	11 (5)	1 (1)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	4 (2)
2	5 (1)	6 (5)	17 (13)	2 (1)	2 (2)	1 (1)	3 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)
3	9 (5)	12 (6)	12 (8)	15 (11)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	3 (2)
4	3 (3)	13 (10)	20 (11)	5 (5)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	2 (2)	3 (1)
5	3 (2)	19 (15)	17 (9)	13 (8)	1 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	3 (2)	0 (0)
Total	26 (15)	53 (39)	76 (48)	46 (30)	4 (3)	5 (1)	4 (1)	8 (6)	10 (5)

Appendix table 2 - Binary logistic regression for falling from a motorcycle or bicycle and wealth quintile.

	Odds Ratio	95% C.I.	P Value
Quintile 1 (ref)			
Quintile 2	2.26	0.52 - 9.80	0.277
Quintile 3	3.50	0.91 - 13.42	0.068
Quintile 4	4.33	1.14 - 16.55	0.032
Quintile 5	5.83	1.59 - 21.43	0.008

Appendix table 3 - Opinion and experience of healthcare received by those seeking care following

an injury and those seeking care for another reason at last visit.

	Cooking some often an accident on	
	Seeking care after an accident or	Seeking care for another reason n %
	injury % (95% CI)	(95% CI)
	Number responders (N) = 119	Number responders (N) = 2882 unless
	unless otherwise stated	otherwise stated
Opinion of care received		
Confident that would receive ef	fective treatment if very sick tomorrow	
Very or somewhat confident	95.8 (90.5 – 98.2)	93.5 (92.6 – 94.4)
Not very or not at all confident	4.2 (1.8 – 9.5)	6.5(5.6-7.4)
•		
Overall view of national healtho	are system	
Needs to be rebuilt or major changes needed	46.2 (37.5 – 55.2)	38.0 (36.3 – 39.8) (N=2909)
Only minor changes needed	53.8 (44.9 – 62.5)	62.0 (60.2 - 63.7) (N=2909)
	,	
Overall how well did received c	are meet health needs at last visit?	
Excellent, very good or good	90.0 (83.2 – 94.1)	94.4 (93.5 – 95.2)
Fair or poor	10.0 (5.9 – 16.8)	5.5 (4.8 – 6.5)
Do you trust in the skills and ab	illities of the HCW at the facility?	
Very much, quite a bit or some.	96.6 (91.7 – 98.7)	97.7 (97.1 – 98.2) (N=2879)
Very little or not at all	3.4 (1.3 – 8.3)	2.3 (1.8 – 2.9) (N=2879)
,	, /	
What is your opinion of the care	e provider's knowledge and skills?	
Excellent, very good or good	95.0 (89.4 – 97.7)	94.5 (93.3 – 95.0) (N=2873)
Fair or poor	5.0 (2.3 – 10.6)	5.5 (5.0 - 6.7) (N=2873)
'	, ,	, , , , ,
What do you think about the pro-	ovider's ability to explain things in a wa	y that you could understand?

		T.	
Excellent, very good or good	95.0 (89.4 – 97.7)	94.2 (93.3 – 95.0) (N=2864)	
Fair or poor	5.0 (2.3 – 10.6)	5.8 (5.0 - 6.7) (N=2864)	
How easy or difficult was it for	you to follow the provider's advice	?	
Very Easy, easy or fair	99.2 (95.4 – 99.9)	97.8 (97.3 – 98.3) (N=2877)	
Hard or very hard	0.8 (0.2 – 4.6)	2.2 (1.7 – 2.8) (N=2877)	
Nhat do you think about your e	experience of being involved in ma	king decisions for your treatment?	
Excellent, very good or good	74.3 (65.6 – 81.5) (N=113)	77.7 (76.1 – 79.2) (N=2748)	
Fair or poor	25.7 (18.5 – 34.4) (N=113)	22.3 (20.8 - 23.9) (N=2748)	
Experience of care processe	S		
Did care provider refer to another facility? - Yes	9.3 (5.2 – 15.8)	5.4 (4.6 – 6.3) (N=2872)	
Did care provider ask for further tests? - Yes	10.3 (6.0 – 17.1) (N=117)	7.8 (6.9 – 8.8) (N=2859)	
Did the care provider ask you to come back? - Yes	81.4 (72.7 – 86.8)	51.8 (50.0 – 53.6) (N=2881)	
Had to borrow or sell to pay for health care episode? - Yes	21.2 (14.7 – 29.7) (N=113)	14.3 (13.0 – 15.6) (N=2881)	
How long did you wait before your consultation (minutes)?	10 (5-15) (N=118)	20 (10-30) (N=2885)	
Median and IQR) (Mann- Witney U)		P = 0.002	
How much time did you spend with the care provider	20 (15-30) (N=118)	15 (20-25) (N=2885)	
(minutes)? (Median and IQR) (Mann-Witney U)		P = 0.002	