Need for mapping

Facilities location not always known

There is some existing data on names available

Maximizing the use of existing data to get desired rough cartography of facilities

# Data

**Facilities Masterlist:** The problem we are willing to tackle presents itself essentially in the form of a list of facilities. In the case we are talking about, this list obtained through the DHIS2 database used for collection and management of health data in Nigeria. Each facilities are located in a Ward, each of which are located in Local Government Areas (LGA) which are situated in States. The lowest level of cartography available at that point is the borders of LGA. The average surface of a LGA is XXX km2. To our knowledge, no complete data was available as to geographic borders of Wards.

**OpenStreetMap:** OpenStreetMap (OSM) is an open and collaborative mapping platform. Users can contribute mapping features of areas they know. This data can be accessed openly online. Additionally, OSM data can easily be downloaded and parsed using R package OSMAR. We downloaded all OSM data lying inside of the bounding box of LGA borders maps.

**Validation set:** In order to validate our methods, we had to create a validation set for a number of facilities. Some facilities are mapped in OSM, by projects such as XXX. We matched manually the facilities in OSM with facilities in our masterlist. 933 facilities could be matched and constitute our validation set.

# Methods

The central hypothesis for our approach is that most health facilities in the public system have a name attached to their geographical location. Using this intuition, we defined a sequence of algorithms to map facilities. Each step in the sequence potentially relaxes precision of location, and thus we applied these methods sequentially, only attending to map in each stage facilities that had not been mapped previously. The steps are as follow:

1. Exact name matching: This first step is the most conservative. For each LGA, we attend to get an exact unique name match in the features names from OSM. If an exact match is returned, the facility is set as being at this location.
2. Feature partial matching: The second step was quite similar with the first, only stripping names of geographic features of their type indication. For example XXX hill was simplified into XXX. Here again, exact unique matching stratified on LGA was sought.
3. Exact name centroid: In the next step, we took into consideration facilities that returned multiple exact matches in the features. At that point, we set the location of the facility at the centroid of all features returning a match.
4. Partial name centroid: The fourth step was similar to the previous, but applied to facilities returning multiple partial matches in step 2.
5. Ward convex hull centroid: Finally, we looked at facilities matched. For each ward in which at least one facility was identified, we set all remaining facilities at the centroid of the convex hull formed by the different facilities already put on the map.

This analysis was carried out in R. R code is available on XXX.

# Results

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Step | N matched | Median precision on this step | Overall median precision |
|  | 6423 |  |  |
|  | 6622 |  |  |
|  | 6999 |  |  |
|  | 30231 |  |  |

Regarder les prédicteurs dans les covariables et voir si ça améliore quelque chose.