Comparing the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of facility- versus community-based distribution of micronutrient powders in rural Uganda

Title:

Methods:

- Six sub-counties in Namutumba district, Uganda were randomly assigned to either distribute MNP via health facilities or community health workers.
- Cost data collected covered initial investments, start-up and on-going activities, and opportunity costs.
- An endline cross-sectional analysis was used to obtain point estimates for current consumption and adherence to protocol.
- The project calculated the cost and cost-effectiveness of hypothetical scale-up and integration scenarios.

Results:

- Coverage, intake adherence, and adherence to protocol were higher in areas where community health workers distributed MNP (Figure 4).
- Capacity building was the most expensive part of the intervention, followed by the MNP product (Figure 5).
- Community health worker distribution was costlier than via health facilities, but it was more cost-effective (Figure 5, 6).
- Integrating MNP distribution with other programs improved cost-effectiveness (Figure 6).

Conclusions:

- Community-based MNP delivery was more effective and more cost-effective at producing desired program outcomes.
- The substantial cost of the MNP intervention would make it difficult for countries to sustain. Integrating the intervention with other programs would be necessary to keep costs down.
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Figure 1. Vitamin and mineral power SBCC sticker

Figure 2. Data outputs

Figure 3. A community health worker distributes MNP

Figure 4. Program outcomes

Figure 5. Intervention costs per distribution arm

Figure 6. Cost-Effectiveness Changes with Measures of Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale up Scenario</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Percent Budgetary</th>
<th>Cost per Child Currently Consumed</th>
<th>Cost per Child Adhered to Protocol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner scale up</td>
<td>$1,797,532</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$40.34</td>
<td>$60.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner scale up paid community health workers</td>
<td>$1,680,226</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>$53.87</td>
<td>$56.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner integrated scale up</td>
<td>$1,230,519</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>$27.61</td>
<td>$41.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health takeover</td>
<td>$1,617,804</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$49.94</td>
<td>$54.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Health takeover paid community health workers</td>
<td>$1,508,228</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>$46.56</td>
<td>$50.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>