## 18 Belize

October 5, 2025

# 1 How has the relationship between prenatal care coverage and skilled birth attendance evolved in Belize between 1998 and 2016?

#### 1.1 Abstract

Using World Bank World Development Indicators (WDI), this study examines the evolution of maternal health service coverage in Belize between 1998 and 2016, focusing on prenatal care and skilled birth attendance. Over this eighteen-year period, both indicators rose overall, though the trajectory was not linear. After an initial increase up to around 2000, both measures experienced a moderate decline between 2000 and 2005 before resuming steady growth through 2016. By the end of the period, prenatal care and skilled attendance rates had nearly converged, suggesting an increasingly integrated maternal health system. These findings highlight Belize's gradual progress toward universal maternal care and underscore the link between early health interventions and safe delivery outcomes.

#### 1.2 1. Question

How has the relationship between prenatal care coverage and skilled birth attendance evolved in Belize between 1998 and 2016?

- Prenatal care proxy: Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%)
- Skilled birth proxy: Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total)

### 1.3 2. Data

- Source: World Bank World Development Indicators (WDI)
- Indicators:
  - Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%)
  - Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total)
- Coverage: Belize, 1998–2016
- Notes: National-level data only

#### 1.4 3. Method

- 1. Filtered dataset for Belize.
- 2. Selected relevant columns: Year, Indicator Name, Value.
- 3. Pivoted prenatal care and skilled birth attendance indicators into separate columns and sorted by year.

4. Produced a dual-axis line graph comparing trends in prenatal care coverage and skilled attendance at birth.

(Analysis is descriptive; no causal inference applied.)

#### 1.5 4. Results

- Prenatal care (% of pregnant women): Increased gradually from 1998 to around 2000, followed by a moderate decline through 2005, then a sustained rise through 2016.
- Skilled birth attendance (% of total births): Followed a nearly identical pattern, with both indicators converging toward similar high levels by 2016.
- Comparison: The close alignment of trends suggests that improvements in early maternal care were increasingly matched by skilled support during delivery, reflecting better continuity in health service provision.

(Figure 1. Prenatal Care vs Skilled Birth Attendance in Belize, 1998–2016)

(Table 1. Pivoted dataset)

#### 1.6 5. Interpretation

- Belize's trajectory reflects meaningful progress in maternal health coverage and system coordination.
- The temporary decline between 2000 and 2005 may correspond to health system transitions
  or data collection gaps, but the subsequent recovery suggests successful re-investment and
  institutional strengthening.
- The convergence of prenatal and skilled attendance rates indicates a more integrated approach to maternal health, where early care more consistently leads to safe, supervised deliveries.

#### 1.7 6. Limitations

- Analysis relies on national-level data and cannot capture subnational disparities or rural—urban divides
- Broader determinants such as income, education, and health infrastructure are not included.
- Descriptive analysis limits causal interpretation of health policy effects.

#### 1.8 7. Next Steps / Extensions

- Examine regional differences in prenatal and delivery care outcomes to identify internal equity gaps.
- Link maternal care coverage with maternal mortality and neonatal health indicators.
- Compare Belize's trajectory with other Central American countries to contextualize policy effectiveness.
- Assess the role of international aid, training programs, and community health initiatives in driving maternal health improvements.
- [1]: # How has the relationship between prenatal care coverage and skilled birth\_attendance evolved in Belize between 1998 and 2016?

import pandas as pd

```
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
import os
# Folders
data_raw_folder = "data_raw/"
data_clean_folder = "data_clean/"
figures_folder = "figures/"
# Load CSV
filename = "gender_blz_filtered.csv" # Filtered dataset with only relevant rows
df = pd.read_csv(os.path.join(data_raw_folder, filename))
# Keep only needed columns
df = df[["Year", "Indicator Name", "Value"]]
# Convert Year and Value to numeric, drop invalid rows
df["Year"] = pd.to_numeric(df["Year"], errors="coerce")
df["Value"] = pd.to_numeric(df["Value"], errors="coerce")
df = df.dropna(subset=["Year", "Value"])
# Pivot indicators into separate columns
df_pivot = df.pivot(index="Year", columns="Indicator Name", values="Value").
 →reset_index()
df_pivot = df_pivot.sort_values("Year")
print("Pivoted Belize dataset:")
display(df_pivot)
# Interpolate missing values for smooth plotting (optional)
df_plot = df_pivot.interpolate(method='linear')
# Plot the two indicators
plt.figure(figsize=(10,6))
plt.plot(df plot["Year"], df plot["Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%)"],
        marker='o', linestyle='-', label="Pregnant women receiving prenatalu
 plt.plot(df_plot["Year"], df_plot["Births attended by skilled health staff (% 

of total)"].
        marker='o', linestyle='-', label="Births attended by skilled health⊔
 ⇔staff (% of total)")
plt.title("Belize: Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) vs Births⊔
⇔attended by skilled health staff (% of total) (1998-2016)")
plt.xlabel("Year")
plt.ylabel("Percentage")
plt.legend()
plt.grid(True)
```

```
plt.tight_layout()
plt.savefig(os.path.join(figures_folder,__
 →"belize_pregnant_women_receiving_prenatal_care_vs_births_attended_by_skilled_health_staff.
 →png"))
plt.show()
# Save cleaned CSV
df_pivot.to_csv(os.path.join(data_clean_folder,_
 →"belize_pregnant_women_receiving_prenatal_care_vs_births_attended_by_skilled_health_staff")
  →index=False)
Pivoted Belize dataset:
```

12

13

14

0 1998 79.0 1 1999 83.8 2 2000 99.2 3 2002 97.0 4 2004 87.8 5 2005 89.3 6 2006 95.8 7 2007 90.7 8 2008 94.9 9 2009 93.5 10 2010 94.0 11 2011 2011 96.2 12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 10 NaN	Indicator Name	Year Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total)	
2 2000 90.2 3 2002 97.0 4 2004 87.8 5 2005 89.3 6 2006 95.8 7 2007 90.7 8 2008 94.9 9 2009 93.5 10 2010 94.0 11 2011 96.2 12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN	0	1998 79.0	
3 2002 97.0 4 2004 87.8 5 2005 89.3 6 2006 95.8 7 2007 90.7 8 2008 94.9 9 2009 93.5 10 2010 94.0 11 2011 96.2 12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 99.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN	1	1999 83.8	
4 2004 87.8 89.3 65 2005 89.3 66 2006 95.8 7 2007 90.7 8 2008 94.9 99.5 10 2010 94.0 11 2011 96.2 12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8	2	2000 90.2	
5       2005       89.3         6       2006       95.8         7       2007       90.7         8       2008       94.9         9       2009       93.5         10       2010       94.0         11       2011       96.2         12       2012       93.7         13       2013       93.0         14       2014       93.1         15       2015       93.5         16       2016       96.8     Indicator Name  Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%)  98.0  1  98.0  1  98.0  1  98.0  4  NaN  99.0  4  NaN  NaN  NaN  NaN  NaN  NaN  NaN	3	2002 97.0	
6 2006 95.8 7 2007 8 2008 94.9 9 2009 93.5 10 2010 94.0 11 2011 96.2 12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN	4	2004 87.8	
7 2007 90.7 8 2008 94.9 9 2009 93.5 10 2010 94.0 11 2011 96.2 12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 Nan 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 Nan 8 Nan 9 10	5	2005 89.3	
8 2008 94.9 9 2009 93.5 10 2010 94.0 11 2011 96.2 12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 94.0 7 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN	6	2006 95.8	
9 2009 93.5 10 2010 94.0 11 2011 96.2 12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 94.0 7 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN	7	2007 90.7	
10 2010 94.0 11 2011 96.2 12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN	8	2008 94.9	
11 2011 96.2 12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN	9	2009 93.5	
12 2012 93.7 13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN	10	2010 94.0	
13 2013 93.0 14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN	11	2011 96.2	
14 2014 93.1 15 2015 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 10 NaN	12	2012 93.7	
15 2015 16 2016 93.5 16 2016 96.8  Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN	13	2013 93.0	
Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 10 NaN	14	2014 93.1	
Indicator Name Pregnant women receiving prenatal care (%) 0 98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 10 NaN	15	2015 93.5	
98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN	16	2016 96.8	
98.0 1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN			
1 95.9 2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN		~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	
2 100.0 3 98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN			
98.0 4 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 9 NaN			
14 NaN 5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 10 NaN			
5 94.0 6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 10 NaN			
6 94.0 7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 10 NaN			
7 NaN 8 NaN 9 NaN 10 NaN		94.0	
8 NaN 9 NaN 10 NaN		94.0	
9 NaN 10 NaN		NaN	
10 NaN		NaN	
	9	NaN	
11 96.2			
	11	96.2	

NaN

NaN

NaN



