

Appendix 1. Detailed methods

Setting

The study was conducted in Ghana, Rwanda and South Africa. One rural and one urban area in each country was purposively selected to allow feasibility whilst being as representative of the general population as possible.

Ghana is a lower middle income country, it has an estimated population of 30.4 million people (2019), life expectancy is 63.8 years, and 7.56% of deaths and 7.24% of disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) are estimated to be due to trauma.¹⁵ While health service delivery is largely provided by government, private institutions provide substantial health services to the population.¹⁶ The National Ambulance Service (NAS) provides 24-hour prehospital care for accidents and emergencies.¹⁶ Until 2020, the NAS had only 55 active ambulances serving the entire nation. Recently, 307 new ambulances and a new hotline for emergency services to support the operations of the NAS have been added.¹⁷ Inequality in Ghana is high,¹⁵ as is out of pocket (OOP) health expenditure (37.69% of total health expenditure is OOP).¹⁵ Tamale Metropolitan Area and Yendi Municipal District were the urban and rural study areas chosen; both are in the north of Ghana.

Rwanda is a low income country of 12.6 million people, with a life expectancy of 68.7 years; 9% of all deaths are due to trauma.¹⁵ Community-Based Health Insurance (CBHI) was introduced in 1999/2000 to enable citizens in rural populations and the informal sector to access healthcare.¹⁸ Despite this, the health system is still challenged with deficiencies and inequalities.¹⁹ In Rwanda's national plan, the government has recognised the need to strengthen health systems to reduce the burden of avoidable mortality and morbidity after trauma.²⁰ The ambulance system has an emergency free call number and over 300

ambulances are in operation throughout the country. This study was conducted in the metropolitan area of the capital, Kigali, and the rural area of Burera.

South Africa is an upper middle-income country, with a population of 60.1 million and a life expectancy of 62.0 years. Injuries are estimated to be responsible for 10% of deaths and 11% of DALYs.²¹ Interpersonal violence is seven times higher and road traffic collisions are double the global rate. South Africa has the third biggest economy in Africa, although it is one of the most unequal societies in the world.¹⁵ Access to health care is also inequitable with 86% of the population served by the public sector which has a disproportionately low proportion of the human resources for health.²² Prehospital emergency care is delivered by both government-funded and private emergency medical services (EMS). Government-funded EMS service is available to everyone, reached via a toll-free national emergency number, and free of charge to all those earning below a threshold.²³ An air medical service with helicopter evacuation is available if needed.²⁴ This study was conducted in the urban township of Khayelitsha and the rural area of Worcester, both located in the Western Cape province.

Conceptual frameworks

On appraising the literature on frameworks for conceptualising access to quality healthcare, we did not find a developed framework that suited our aims exhaustively. However, three we considered would, in combination, comprehensively cover the dimensions of access to quality healthcare for injured people in LMICs. These were the four-delay framework to access to care as described above,^{14,25} the IoM framework for quality healthcare,²⁶ and the WHO health systems building blocks.²⁷ The IoM's framework for quality healthcare conceptualises quality of care as effective, safe, efficient, timely, patient centred, and equitable. The WHO building blocks include leadership/governance, financing, medicines

and equipment, information, human resources, and service delivery. Data collection and analysis were based on the domains in these frameworks.

Study design

The same methodologies were employed in each country. Data on barriers to equitable access of quality care were collected between June 2020 and May 2021 by trained local researchers. Data were analysed separately by in-country research teams, with support from the central investigator team (JC, JD, MLO, AI, AMAL). The results were then discussed, compared and integrated during a two-day investigator meeting held in Tamale, Ghana in May 2021. A summary of the methods for this study is presented in Table 1.

Data sources

1) Workshops with policy makers, infrastructure providers, service users, and healthcare workers to identify barriers to access to quality injury care and prioritise solutions to overcome these barriers.

We conducted a two-day workshop in each of the study countries. The workshops were designed as round table workshops (5-8 people per table) and plenary discussions. Methods are described for the Rwanda workshop in more detail elsewhere.²⁵ In brief, the process was informed by the four-delay framework with small working groups discussing and listing barriers occurring at each delay stage before presenting and discussing results in plenary and agreeing on the barriers. Working groups were formed of participants of similar backgrounds to prevent hierarchies limiting expression of opinions; participants were seated at tables relevant to their delay. Discussions were facilitated by study team members and

translators were used when needed. Outputs were captured as listed barriers. At the end of each workshop, barriers were prioritised by participant voting to identify the top prioritised barriers in each country.

2) Qualitative interviews and focus groups discussions with injured patients and community leaders

In each country, individual interviews (IDIs) and focus groups discussions (FGDs) were undertaken each with rural and urban residents who had accessed injury care for themselves in the past 6 months. Numbers of interviews continued until saturation of themes occurred. Two focus group discussions with community leaders and prominent members of the communities, one in urban and one in rural area, were also undertaken.

The IDIs and FGDs were undertaken by trained bilingual researchers in the appropriate languages. A topic guide was developed in English with questions structured around the four-delay framework, and open questions were asked with prompts given when necessary to explore replies of interest. Interviews and FGDs were audio recorded, transcribed and translated into English for analysis.

Data from each country were analysed thematically using Nvivo qualitative data analysis Software (2015, QSR International Pty Ltd). Coding was done deductively focusing on the domains of the four delays, IoM, and WHO building block frameworks and inductively, allowing additional themes to emerge from the data. A sample of interview transcripts was first read to identify the initial set of codes by local investigators and investigators from the

UK team. This generated a coding framework that was discussed between the data collectors, relevant country team members and investigators, and then used to code all remaining interview and focus group transcripts. Codes were gradually built into broader categories and themes through comparison across transcripts. The same process was repeated for all countries, generating three coding frameworks. Findings were written as a narrative summary. From that, an overall list of barriers across three countries was created. Key themes for each country can be found in appendices.

3) Surveys about experiences with the healthcare services, either as inpatients (the Inpatient Assessment of Health Care (I-PAHC)) or outpatients (the Outpatient Users Assessment of Health Care (O-PAHC)).

The I-PAHC and O-PAHC are brief (25 or 23 question, respectively) survey tools that have been developed and validated to explore experiences of care in low-income settings.²⁸ They were administered in each country to the persons who took part in the interviews or focus group discussions with the choice of tool dependent on whether participants had been in or outpatient users, or both. Surveys were administered in the local language by trained bilingual investigators after ensuring that the surveys were contextually appropriate. Most responses were captured as a four-part Likert scale from strongly agree (4 points) to strongly disagree (1 point), others were captured as a binary response, yes (2 points) or no, with each response given a score (1 point). We categorised questions into the following domains, based upon previous research and investigator discussions:²⁸ respectful care, communication, patients would recommend services, cleanliness of facilities, and pain control (captured in the I-PAHC survey only). Scores for each category were created by

dividing the total score achieved for all questions in each category by the total possible score for that category, and presented as a percentage. We selected a threshold of below 80% to indicate presence of a barrier to quality injury care, based upon the median score for the survey responses.

4) Survey for assessing the governance of the health system, based on the framework for healthcare governance developed by Siddiqi et al.²⁹

We adapted Siddiqi et al's survey for the injury care context on discussion between authors. The resultant survey contained 37 questions about presence or absence of a structure or function within 10 domains that reflect the health system context for injury care (Appendix 5). Domains were: strategic vision; participation and consensus orientation; rule of law; transparency; responsiveness; equity and inclusiveness; effectiveness and efficiency; accountability; intelligence and information; and ethics.

The survey was sent to policy makers, trauma opinion leaders, and lead trauma care providers. Initial participants were selected based upon investigator contacts and snowball sampling used to identify further participants. Questions from each domain were scored based on a pre-agreed scoring system, deriving an investigator assessed score calculated independently by two investigators (AMAL, MLO) and considering the participant's original score, their background, investigator knowledge, and evidence available. For example, if a trauma care provider stated that a policy was not available, but a policymaker stated that it

was, or the investigators had seen a copy of the policy, we prioritised the policymaker's response. Where investigators disagreed, cases were arbitrated by a third investigator (AI).

Appendix 2. List of the 121 barriers identified in Ghana, Rwanda and South Africa, and the number of methods used to identify them

Original framework	Category of barrier	Institute of Medicine Domain if relevant	Barrier	Ghana		South Africa		Rwanda	
				Present	Number of methods	Present	Number of methods	Present	Number of methods
WHO Building blocks	Leadership /Governance		Health policy or department in MoH for trauma	n	1	n	1	n	1
			Implementation of health policy for trauma	y	1	y	1	n	1
			Transparency of information on financial commitments/assessment of care provision	y	1	y	1	n	1
			Use of data on injuries to inform service provision or policy	n	1	n	1	n	1

			Information on equitable access to trauma care collected	y	1	y	1	y	1
			Mechanisms to report failing services	n	1	n	1	y	1
			Regulations to enforce high ethical standards in treatment of trauma patients	n	1	n	1	n	1
			Leader awareness of trauma issues	s	0	s	0	y	1
			Laws for bystanders (protecting them from costs or blame/arrest).	y	2	s	0	y	1
			Road infrastructure.	y	2	y	1	y	2

Traffic density.	y	1	s	0	y	2
Ambulance given priority	y	1	s	0	y	1
The “right” hospital location. The “right” acute care facility location – near to patients.	y	2	y	2	y	2
Rehabilitation services – available and near to patients.	y	1	y	1	y and n	2y and 1n
Ambulance transport availability	y	2	y	2	y and n	2y and 1n
Private investment in ambulances	s	0	s	0	y	1
Ambulance fleet maintenance	y	1	s	0	y	1
Geographical coverage of ambulance services	y	1	y	2	y	2

		Network for Ambulance deployment	y	1	s	0	s	0
		Facility infrastructure	y	1	y	1	y	1
		Safety en route to the facility	s	0	y	2	s	0
	Health system finance	Budget equitably allocated	y	1	y	1	y	1
		Funding for trauma in the health budget	y	1	n	1	y	1
		Free trauma care or pro poor policies	y	1	n	1	n	0
		Out of pocket payments	y	2	n	1	y and n	1y and 1n
		Absence of personal insurance	y	2	s	0	y	1
		Insurance system availability per se	y	1	y	1	y and n	1y and 2n
		Presence of mandatory insurance	y	1	s	0	y	1

		Costs of insurance	s	0	s	0	y	1	
		Comprehensiveness of insurance system (persons covered, diseases covered, treatment items covered, and health facilities covered).	y	2	s	0	y	2	
		Insurance renewal reminders	y	1	s	0	s		
	Service delivery	Traditional healers and their interface with the health system.	y	2	y	2	y	2y	
		Available health facility targets for trauma care	y	1	y	2	n	1	
		Timely	Opening hours of facilities.	s	0	y	2	y	1
			Organisation of facilities	y	1	y	1	y	1
	Wait time at facilities		y	2	y	2	y	1	

			Clear referral processes (within facilities, between facilities and including discharge)	y	1	y	2	y	1
			Triage at tertiary facilities	s	0	y	1	s	0
			Bureaucracy ie Paper work	y	1	s	0	s	0
			Necessity to provide insurance documentation.	y	2	s	0	y	1
			Follow up system	y	1	y	1	y	1
			Appropriate provision of services for the level of demand.	y	2	y	3	y	3
			Time taken for ambulance to reach trauma victim	y	1	s	0	s	0
			Reporting results	y	1	s	0	s	0

		Wait times for care post discharge for initial episode	y	1	y	1	s	0
	Patient centred	Availability of guidelines/SOPs	y	1	y	2	n	1
		Definitive care at health centres and district hospitals	s	0	y	1	s	0
		Resources (beds, equipment, ICU)	y	1	y	1	y	1
		Theatre availability	y	1	s	0	s	0
		ICU function	y	1	s	0	s	0
		Pain control	y	1	y	1	n	1
		Patient would recommend services	s	0	y	1	n	1
		Ambulance call centre coordination	y	1	s	0	s	0
		Health services respond to non-medical needs of patients	s	0	n	1	n	1

Health system are patient focussed	s	0	y	1	s	0
Data collected on patient outcomes or satisfaction	y	1	y	1	y	1
Respectful care/attitudes of staff towards patients	y	2	y	2	n	1
Perceptions of health workers attitude	s	0	y	1	s	0
Cleanliness of facilities	y	1	y	1	n	1
Trust in services	y and n	2	y	2	y	0
Power dynamics between patients and providers	s	0	y	1	s	0
Communication including explanation) between health workers and patients	y	2	y	2	s	1

			Health issues related to injury are still present a long time after the injury.	y	1	s	0	y	1
			Complications after injuries	s	0	y	2	y	0
			Laws to enforce a duty of care	s	0	n	1	y	2
			Distance to facility	y	1	y	1	s	0
			Interfacility transfer	y	3	y	3	y	2
	Information systems	Effective	Non-ambulance transport	y	1	y	1	s	0
			Patient education – when to seek care.	y	2	y	2	y	1
			Patient education – where to seek care.	y	2	y	2	y	2
			Patient education costs of care	s	0	y	1	s	0

		Awareness of on how to access ambulance	y	1	s	0	y	1
		Information on follow up care	s	0	y	1	y	1
		Existence of a national trauma registry	y	1	y	1	n	1
		Data on injuries collected in facilities	y	1	y	1	n	1
		Data on injury outcomes collected in facilities	y	1	y	1	n	1
		Staff understanding of data to be collected and tools to do so	y	1	y	1	y	1
		Availability of a functioning e-health system	s	0	s	0	y	1
		Ambulance divert systems	y	1	y	1	y	1

	Workforce	Available specialist staff.	y	2	s	0	y	2
		Outpatient personnel	s	0	y	1	s	0
		Effective communication between EMS and hospital	y	1	y	1	s	0
		Accreditation of providers	n	1	y	1	n	1
		Trained staff	y and n	2	y	3	y	2
		Staff supervision	y	1	s	0	y	1
		Professionalism	y	1	s	0	s	0
		Cost of capacity building (both health service and individual)	s	0	s	0	y	1
	Medicine and equipment	Available medications/other treatment	y	2	y	1	y	1
		Maintenance of medical equipment	y	1	s	0	y	1

			Available equipment.	y	2	y	2	y	2
Institute of Medicine Quality of Care	Equity		Cost of transport to get to hospital and between hospitals. (Cost of accessing ambulances)	y	2	y	2	y	1
			Costs of getting to and receiving care at follow up	y	2	y	1	y	2
			Loss of earnings due to entering or remaining in care (indirect costs).	y	2	n	1	y	1
			Poverty	y	1	s	0	s	0
			Timely communication with those who are marginalised	s	0	s	0	y	1
			Ability to call for help (phones)	s	0	y	2	y	1
			Gender	y	1	s	0	s	0
		Other	Time of day		Injuries at night	s	1	y	2

		Timing of injury occurrence	s	1	y	1	s	0
Location of injury		Geographical location (isolation in some areas, difficult to reach some area due to rivers and bad roads)	y	1	y	1	s	0
		Hot spots, red zones*	y	1	y	1	s	0
Socio-Cultural		Necessity to ask community leaders/head of family if care can be taken (pertains to going to care, having treatment, and having rehab)	y	1	s	0	s	0

		Prioritisation of community and of non medical expenses i.e. Wedding/Funeral	y	1	s	0	s	0
		Religious beliefs	y	1	s	0	s	0
Poor attitudes to care		Patient compliance	y	1	y	1	s	0
		Attitudes to follow up	y	2	y	1	s	0
Bystander help		Inadequate awareness of bystander responsibilities	s	0	y	1	y	1
		Bystander concern of having to pay for treatment if they help	y	1	s	0	s	0
		Bystanders influencing choice of facility to attend	y	1	s	0	s	0

		Bystander fear of injury	s	0	y	1	y	1
		bystanders providing help per se	s	0	y	1	y and n	1y and 1n
COVID		COVID related delays	s	0	y	1	y	1
Stigma		Stigma around rehabilitation and mental health**	s	0	y	1	s	0
		Community understanding of mental health issues in regards to injury	s	0	y	1	s	0
Miscellaneous		Fear of ambulance and unfamiliar surrounding	y	1	s	0	s	0
		Community/family members to encourage health seeking	y	1	y	1	s	0
		Patient agency to take ownership of continued care	s	0	y	1	s	0

		Violence (Gang violence, interpersonal violence)	y	1	y	1	s	0
		Personal security at certain time/places	s	0	y	1	y	1
Trauma prevention		Trauma prevention laws	y	1	n	1	n	1
Mitigating factors		Alcohol/substance abuse	y	1	y	1	s	0

*Areas too dangerous to enter without police because of crime

**Stigma around rehabilitation and mental health (I think this should read "stigma around rehabilitation for mental health". The barrier is related to those who require mental health services following injury. They may be reluctant to go for this follow-up due to the fear of being stigmatised)

Green indicates that the barrier is present in a country and the shade of green indicates using how many methods

Dark grey indicates that the barrier is not present in the country and shade of green indicates using how many methods

Light grey indicates the barrier has not been mentioned using any of the data collection methods in the country

Appendix 3 List of all the 121 barriers identified in all three study countries and the methods used to identify them

Bas is	catego ry	IoM domain if relevant	Barrier/component	Ghana		Methods				South Africa		Methods				Rwanda		Methods			
				Reported	Number of methods	Barriers workshop	IDI or FGD	governance survey	quant survey	Reported	Number of methods	Barriers workshop	IDI or FGD	governance survey	quant survey	Reported	Number of methods	Barriers workshop	IDI or FGD	governance survey	quant survey
WH O BB	Leadership/governance/infrastructure		Health policy or department in MoH for trauma	N	1	s	s	n	s	n	1	s	s	n	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
			Implementation of health policy for trauma	Y	2	Y	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
			Transparency of information on financial commitments/assessment of care provision	Y	1	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
			Use of data on injuries to inform service provision or policy	N	1	s	s	n	s	n	1	s	s	n	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
			Information on equitable access to trauma care collected	Y	1	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s

			Mechanisms to report failing services	N	1	s	s	n	s	n	1	s	s	n	s	y	1	s	s	y	s
			Regulations to enforce high ethical standards in treatment of trauma patients	N	1	s	s	n	s	n	1	s	s	n	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
			Leader lack of awareness of trauma issues	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
			Laws for bystanders (protecting them from costs or blame/arrest)	y	2	Y	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
			Road infrastructure	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s
			Traffic density	y	1	s	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s
			Ambulance priority	Y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
			The "right" hospital location. The "right" acute care facility location – near to patients.	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s

		Rehabilitation services – available and near to patients.	Y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	2y and n	3	y	y	n	s
		Ambulance transport availability	y	3	Y	y	n	s	s	y	2	y	y	n	s	2y and n	3	y	y	n	s
		Lack of private investment in ambulances	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
		Ambulance fleet maintenance	Y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
		Geographical coverage of ambulance services	Y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s
		Network for Ambulance deployment	Y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		Facility infrastructure	Y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
		Safety en route to the facility	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	s		s	s	s	s
	Health system finance (covers funding of	Budget equitably allocated	y	1	s	s	y	s	s	y	1	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s

health services, i.e: medical direct costs)	Funding for trauma in budget	y	1	s	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s	y	1	s	s	y	s
	Free trauma care or pro poor policies	y	1	s	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s	n	0	s	s	n	s
	Out of pocket payments	y	2	s	y	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s	y and n	2	s	y	n	s
	Absence of personal insurance	y	2	Y	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s
	Insurance system availability per se.	y	1	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s	y and 2n	3	n	y	n	s
	Mandatory insurance	y	1	s	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
	Costs of insurance	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	n	y		s
	Comprehensiveness of insurance system (persons covered, diseases covered, treatment items covered, and health facilities covered).	y	2	Y	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s
	Insurance renewal reminders	y	1	s	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s		s	s	s	s

Service delivery (is care delivered well/according to guidelines)	Traditional healers and their interface with the health system.	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s
	Available health facility targets for trauma care	y	1	s	s	y	s	y	2	y	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
	Opening hours of facilities.	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s
	Organisation of facilities	y	1	Y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	s	y		s
	Wait time at facilities	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s
	Clear referral processes (within facilities, between facilities and including discharge)	y	1	s	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s
	Triage at tertiary facilities	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
	Bureaucracy ie Paper work	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
	Necessity to provide insurance	y	2	Y	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s

documentat ion.																			
Follow up system	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
Appropriate provision of services for the level of demand.	y	2	Y	s	y	s	s	y	3	y	y	y	s	y	3	y	y	y	s
Reporting results	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
Availability of guidelines/S OPs	y	1	Y	s	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	n	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
Definitive care at health centres and district hospitals	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
Resources (beds, equipment, ICU)	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
Theatre availability	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
ICU function	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
Pain control	y	1	s	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	s	y	n	1	s	s	s	n
Patients would recommend services	s	0	s	s	s	n	s	y	1	s	s	s	y	n	1	s	s	s	n
Ambulance call centre coordinatio n	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
Time taken for	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s

		ambulance to reach trauma victim																	
Patient centred		Health services respond to non-medical needs of patients																	
		Health system are patient focussed																	
		Data collected on patient outcomes or satisfaction																	
		Respectful care/poor attitudes of staff towards patients																	
		Perceptions of health workers attitude																	
		Cleanliness of facilities																	
		Trust in services																	
		Power dynamics between patients and providers																	

		Communication including explanation) between health workers and patients	y	2	Y	s	s	y	y	2	y	s	s	y	s	1	s	s	s	y
	Effective	Health issues related to injury are still present a long time after the injury	y	1	s	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s
		Complications after injuries	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	0	s	y	s	s
	Safe	Laws to enforce a duty of care	s	0	s	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s	y	2	y	s	y	s
	Timely	wait times for care post discharge for initial episode	y	1	s	y	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		Distance to facility	Y	1	Y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		Non-ambulance transport	Y	1	Y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		Interfacility transfers	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s
Information systems		Patient education – when to seek care.	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s

(health system and beyond)	Patient education – where to seek care.	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s
	Patient education costs of care	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
	Awareness of on how to access ambulance	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
	Information on follow up care	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	Y	s	s	s
	Existence of a national trauma registry	y	1	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
	Data on injuries collected in facilities	y	1	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
	Data on injury outcomes collected in facilities	y	1	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
	Staff understanding of data to be collected and tools to do so	y	1	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s	y	1	s	s	y	s
	Availability of a functioning e-health system	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s

		Ambulance divert systems	y	1	Y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
Workforce (e.g. trained, available, competent)		Available specialist staff.	y	2	Y	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s
		Outpatient personnel	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		Interpersonal conflict between EMS and hospital	y	1	Y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		Accreditation of providers	n	1	s	s	n	s	y	1	s	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s
		Trained staff.	Y and N	2	Y	s	n	s	y	3	y	y	y	s	y	2	y	y	n	s
		Staff supervision	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	s	y		s
		Professionalism	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		Cost of capacity building	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
Medicine and equipment (e.g. available)		Available medications /other treatment	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s
		Maintenance of medical equipment	Y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	s	Y	s	s
		Available equipment.	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"> lo M qua lity </p>	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);"> Equity (covers individ ual availab le funds for non- medic al direc ts and indirec ts) </p>	Cost of transport to get to hospital and between hospitals. (Cost of accessing ambulances)	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	
		Costs of getting to and receiving care at follow up	y	2	Y	y	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	s
		Loss of earnings due to entering or remaining in care (indirect costs).	y	2	Y	y	s	s	n	1	n	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s
		Poverty	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s
		Timely communication with those who are marginalised	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s
		Ability to call for help (phones)	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s
		Gender	y	1	s	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s
		Injuries at night	s	1	Y	s	s	s	y	2	y	y	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s	s

		Timing of injury occurrence	s	1	Y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
Location of injury		Geographical location (isolated and unable to reach)	y	1	Y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		Hot spots, red zones	y	1	Y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		necessity to ask community leaders/head of family if care can be taken (pertains to going to care, having treatment, and having rehab)	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
Socio-Cultural		Prioritisation of community and of non medical expenses i.e. Wedding/Funeral	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		Religious beliefs	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
		Poor Patient compliance	y	1	Y	s	s	s	y	1	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
Patient attitudes to care		Attitudes to follow up	y	2	Y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s

Bystander help	Inadequate awareness of bystander responsibilities	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
	Expectation that bystanders will need to pay for treatment help with registration	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
	Bystanders influencing choice of facility to attend	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
	Bystander fear of injury	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s
	bystanders providing help per se	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y and n	2	y	n	s	s
	COVID related delays	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	s	y	s	s
Stigma	Stigma around rehabilitation and mental health	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s
	Community understanding of mental health issues in	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s

		regards to injury																	
Misc		Fear of ambulance and unfamiliar surrounding	y	1	Y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s
		Community /family members to encourage health seeking	y	1	Y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s
		Patient agency to take ownership of continued care	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s
		Personal security at certain time/places	s	0	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s
		Violence (Gang violence, interpersonal violence)	y	1	y	s	s	s	y	1	y	s	s	s	s	0	s	s	s
	Trauma prevention		Trauma prevention laws	y	1	s	s	y	s	n	1	s	s	n	s	n	1	s	s
Mitigating factors		Alcohol/substance abuse	y	1	s	s	s	s	y	1	y	y	s	s	s	0	s	s	s

Yes is a barrier, no is not a barrier, or silent is not mentioned

Appendix 4a Percentage scores from I-PAHC and O-PAHC from South Africa

Question I-PAHC	Question	Percentage score I-PAHC	Percentage score O-PAHC
1. During this hospital stay, how often did nurses treat you with courtesy and respect?	1. During this visit, nurses treated me with courtesy and respect?	78.4	75.0
2. During this hospital stay, how often did the nurses listen carefully to you?	2. During this visit nurses listened carefully to me?	81.8	72.2
3. During this visit hospital stay, how often did nurses explain things in a way you could understand?	3. During this visit nurses explained things in a way I could understand?	71.6	67.6
4. During this hospital stay, how often did doctors/health officers treat you with courtesy and respect?	4. During this visit, doctors/health officers treated me with courtesy and respect?	92.0	72.2
5. During this hospital stay, how often did doctors/health officers listen carefully to you?	5. During this visit doctors/health officers listened carefully to me?	79.5	68.5
6. During this hospital stay, how often did doctors/health officers explain things in a way you could understand	6. During visit doctors/health officers explained things in a way I could understand	77.3	66.7
7. I could distinguish between doctors/health officers and nurses	7. I could distinguish between doctors/health officers and nurses	81.8	83.3
8. During this hospital stay, how often was the room you were sleeping in kept clean?	8. The outpatient department was clean	89.8	48.1
9. During this hospital stay, how often was the area around you quiet at night?	9. The bathrooms/latrines were clean	81.8	75.9

10. During this hospital stay, how often did staff make sure you have enough privacy?		76.1	
12. During this hospital stay, how often was your pain well controlled?	10. I had enough time to discuss my medical problem with doctor/health officer or nurse	77.5	75.9
17. Were you given information in a way you could understand what symptoms or health problems to look out for after you leave the hospital?	11. Where you given information in a way you could understand	79.5	82.1
15. Before giving you any new medication, how often did staff tell you what the medicine was for?	13. Did the staff tell you what the medication was for?	81.3	93.8
16. Before giving you any new medication, how often did staff describe possible side effects in a way you could understand?	14. Did health facility staff describe its possible side effects in a way you could understand?	60.4	87.5
13. During this hospital stay, how often did staff do everything they could to help you with your pain?		77.5	
	15. Were all the medications you needed available at the drug dispensary here		93.8
18. Was it easy for you to find your way around the hospital?	16. Was it easy to find your way around the facility?	81.8	92.9
19. Is this your first time being treated at this hospital?	17. Is this your first time being treated at this health facility?	17 of 22 yes	13 yes out of 28

20. On a scale 0-10 (0 being the worst hospital, 10 being the best hospital), how would you rate this hospital?

21. Would you recommend this hospital to your friends and family?

22. Did you have to pay for this hospital stay? (if 1 skip 23)

23. Do you consider this hospital stay too expensive?

18. On a scale of 0-10, how would you rate this facility?

19. Would you recommend this outpatient department/clinic to your friends and family?

20. Did you have to pay for this outpatient visit? (if not skip 21)

21. Do you consider this outpatient visit too expensive?

	72.7	56.1
	76.1	64.3
7 yes skip pattern Q		4 yes out of 28
	85.7	87.5

Appendix 4b Percentage scores from I-PAHC and O-PAHC from Ghana

Question I-PAHC	Question O-PAHC	Percentage score I-PAHC	Percentage score O-PAHC
1. During this hospital stay, how often did nurses treat you with courtesy and respect?	1. During this visit, nurses treated me with courtesy and respect?	78.8	92.6
2. During this hospital stay, how often did the nurses listen carefully to you?	2. During this visit nurses listened carefully to me?	78.8	95.6
3. During this visit hospital stay, how often did nurses explain things in a way you could understand?	3. During this visit nurses explained things in a way I could understand?	59.6	83.8
4. During this hospital stay, how often did doctors/health officers treat you with courtesy and respect?	4. During this visit, doctors/health officers treated me with courtesy and respect?	76.9	91.2
5. During this hospital stay, how often did doctors/health officers listen carefully to you?	5. During this visit doctors/health officers listened carefully to me?	76.9	92.6
6. During this hospital stay, how often did doctors/health officers explain things in a way you could understand	6. During visit doctors/health officers explained things in a way I could understand	63.5	83.8
7. I could distinguish between doctors/health officers and nurses	7. I could distinguish between doctors/health officers and nurses	75.0	67.6

8. During this hospital stay, how often was the room you were sleeping in kept clean?	8. The outpatient department was clean	78.8	79.4
9. During this hospital stay, how often was the area around you quiet at night?	9. The bathrooms/latrines were clean	80.8	45.6
10. During this hospital stay, how often did staff make sure you have enough privacy?		78.8	
12. During this hospital stay, how often was your pain well controlled?	10. I had enough time to discuss my medical problem with doctor/health officer or nurse	77.1	76.5
17. Were you given information in a way you could understand what symptoms or health problems to look out for after you leave the hospital?	11. Where you given information in a way you could understand	61.5	76.5
15. Before giving you any new medication, how often did staff tell you what the medicine was for?	13. Did the staff tell you what the medication was for?	58.3	88.5
16. Before giving you any new medication, how often did staff describe possible side effects in a way you could understand?	14. Did health facility staff describe its possible side effects in a way you could understand?	36.1	65.4
13. During this hospital stay, how often did staff do everything they could to help you with your pain?		72.9	

	15. Were all the medications you needed available at the drug dispensary here		65.4
18. Was it easy for you to find your way around the hospital?	16. Was it easy to find your way around the facility?	91.7	94.1
19. Is this your first time being treated at this hospital?	17. Is this your first time being treated at this health facility?	7 out of 13 yes	6 yes out of 17
20. On a scale 0-10 (0 being the worst hospital, 10 being the best hospital), how would you rate this hospital?	18. On a scale of 0-10, how would you rate this facility?	76.2	78.8
21. Would you recommend this hospital to your friends and family?	19. Would you recommend this outpatient department/clinic to your friends and family?	82.7	92.2
22. Did you have to pay for this hospital stay? (if 1 skip 23)	20. Did you have to pay for this outpatient visit? (if not skip 21)	9 Yes skip pattern	8 Yes skip pattern
23. Do you consider this hospital stay too expensive?	21. Do you consider this outpatient visit too expensive?	55.6	75.0

Appendix 4c Percentage scores from I-PAHC and O-PAHC from Rwanda

Question I-PAHC	Question O-PAHC	Percentage score I-PAHC	Percentage score O-PAHC
1. During this hospital stay, how often did nurses treat you with courtesy and respect?	1. During this visit, nurses treated me with courtesy and respect?	79.5	92.6
2. During this hospital stay, how often did the nurses listen carefully to you?	2. During this visit nurses listened carefully to me?	82.1	95.6
3. During this visit hospital stay, how often did nurses explain things in a way you could understand?	3. During this visit nurses explained things in a way I could understand?	76.3	83.8
4. During this hospital stay, how often did doctors/health officers treat you with courtesy and respect?	4. During this visit, doctors/health officers treated me with courtesy and respect?	81.4	91.2
5. During this hospital stay, how often did doctors/health officers listen carefully to you?	5. During this visit doctors/health officers listened carefully to me?	84.0	92.6
6. During this hospital stay, how often did doctors/health officers explain things in a way you could understand	6. During visit doctors/health officers explained things in a way I could understand	75.6	83.8
7. I could distinguish between doctors/health officers and nurses	7. I could distinguish between doctors/health officers and nurses	69.9	67.6
8. During this hospital stay, how often was the room you were sleeping in kept clean?	8. The outpatient department was clean	88.5	79.4
9. During this hospital stay, how often was the area around you quiet at night?	9. The bathrooms/latrines were clean	81.4	45.6
10. During this hospital stay, how often did staff make sure you have enough privacy?		85.9	

12. During this hospital stay, how often was your pain well controlled?	10. I had enough time to discuss my medical problem with doctor/health officer or nurse	88.2	76.5
17. Were you given information in a way you could understand what symptoms or health problems to look out for after you leave the hospital?	11. Where you given information in a way you could understand	80.6	76.5
15. Before giving you any new medication, how often did staff tell you what the medicine was for?	13. Did the staff tell you what the medication was for?	76.5	88.5
16. Before giving you any new medication, how often did staff describe possible side effects in a way you could understand?	14. Did health facility staff describe its possible side effects in a way you could understand?	61.4	65.4
13. During this hospital stay, how often did staff do everything they could to help you with your pain?		89.7	
	15. Were all the medications you needed available at the drug dispensary here		65.4
18. Was it easy for you to find your way around the hospital?	16. Was it easy to find your way around the facility?	79.2	94.1
19. Is this your first time being treated at this hospital?	17. Is this your first time being treated at this health facility?	22 out of 36 yes	6 yes out of 17
20. On a scale 0-10 (0 being the worst hospital, 10 being the best hospital), how would you rate this hospital?	18. On a scale of 0-10, how would you rate this facility?	81.7	78.8
21. Would you recommend this hospital to your friends and family?	19. Would you recommend this outpatient department/clinic to your friends and family?	96.5	92.2

22. Did you have to pay for this hospital stay?
(if 1 skip 23)

23. Do you consider this hospital stay too
expensive?

20. Did you have to pay for this
outpatient visit? (if not skip 21)

21. Do you consider this outpatient
visit too expensive?

36 out of 36

8 Yes skip pattern

87.5

75.0

Appendix 5. List of authors in the EquiTrauma collaborative in random order

Maria Lisa Odland

Agnieszka Ignatowicz

Abdul-Malik Abdul-Latif

Justine Davies

Antonio Belli

Evangelos Balanikas

Anthony Howard

John Whitaker

Kathryn M. Chu

Karen Ferreira

Eyitayo O. Owolabi

Samukelisiwe Nyamathe

Stephen Tabriri

Sheba Mary Pognaa Kunfah

Mustapha Yakubu

Abebe Bekele

Barnabas Alyande

Pascal Nzasabimana

Jean-Claude Byiringiro