

SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH IMPROVEMENT

Prof. Ankur Sarin

Associate Professor

Public Systems Group

Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad

Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India

Abstract

Social entrepreneurship has become an important pathway for addressing community health challenges that are not adequately resolved through public services, private markets, or short-term charitable activity alone. It combines a social mission with entrepreneurial methods to create sustainable solutions for health access, prevention, awareness, affordability, and local participation. In communities facing weak primary care, limited transport, low health literacy, gender barriers, fragmented referrals, or financial hardship, social enterprises can contribute by organizing services closer to where people live and by designing models that respond to local priorities.

This study examines the role of social entrepreneurship in improving community health through inclusive and mission-driven enterprise models. It considers community clinics, low-cost diagnostic services, mobile outreach, telehealth facilitation, social pharmacies, health education enterprises, sanitation initiatives, nutrition programmes, assistive-device services, and livelihood-linked health interventions. Attention is given to the relationship between enterprise design and public-health value, including affordability, trust, quality assurance, workforce development, referral systems, financial sustainability, and the inclusion of women, older persons, persons with disabilities, and low-income households.

The paper adopts a descriptive, analytical, and comparative approach based on published literature, health-policy reports, and documented social-enterprise practices. It evaluates how different models can improve access to preventive and primary care, reduce information barriers, strengthen local accountability, and complement public-health systems. The analysis indicates that social entrepreneurship is most effective when local communities participate in problem definition and governance, enterprises maintain a clear health mission, services are linked to qualified providers and referral networks, and financial models protect access for people who cannot pay full market prices. Community health improvement is more likely to be sustained when social enterprises are treated as partners within an accountable local health ecosystem rather than as isolated projects.

Keywords: Social entrepreneurship; Community health; Primary health care; Health equity; Social enterprise; Health access; Preventive care; Health innovation; Community participation; Sustainable development

1. INTRODUCTION

Community health is shaped by more than the availability of hospitals and medicines. It is influenced by whether people can obtain timely information, travel safely to services, afford consultation and treatment, understand preventive practices, trust providers, and continue care over time. In many low-resource communities, health needs remain unmet because services are distant, fragmented, expensive, difficult to navigate, or poorly aligned with local realities. The consequences are often visible in delayed treatment, preventable illness, high out-of-pocket expenditure, disrupted livelihoods, and unequal

health outcomes among women, children, older persons, migrants, persons with disabilities, and households with low incomes.

Social entrepreneurship offers one response to these challenges by combining social purpose with practical innovation, organizational discipline, and revenue-generating activity. Unlike a conventional business, a social enterprise prioritizes a defined social problem and seeks to create measurable public value. Unlike a purely grant-dependent project, it usually aims to develop an operating model that can continue through a mix of earned revenue, cross-subsidy, partnerships, philanthropic support, public procurement, or blended

finance. In the health field, this may involve designing services that are affordable, accessible, culturally appropriate, and financially viable enough to reach communities consistently.

The relevance of social entrepreneurship to community health has increased because many health challenges require action beyond clinical treatment. Prevention of non-communicable diseases, maternal and child health support, mental-health awareness, sanitation, nutrition, disability inclusion, health navigation, and chronic-disease follow-up all depend on sustained community engagement. Social enterprises can work at this interface by translating health information into locally useful services, creating trusted points of contact, training community workers, and using technology appropriately to reduce distance and delay.

However, social entrepreneurship should not be treated as a substitute for public responsibility in health. Essential health services require government stewardship, regulation, skilled professionals, public financing, and protection against exploitation. The value of social enterprises lies in their potential to complement public systems: reaching underserved groups, testing adaptable delivery approaches, improving communication, supporting referral pathways, and mobilizing local resources. Their health contribution depends on whether they maintain ethical standards, quality assurance, transparent pricing, and accountability to the communities they serve.

Therefore, this paper examines social entrepreneurship for community health improvement, focusing on the health problems that social enterprises can address, the principal models used in practice, the conditions that shape their effectiveness, and the institutional arrangements needed for long-term social impact. The discussion connects enterprise sustainability with health equity, local participation, and responsible coordination with public-health systems.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on social entrepreneurship describes it as a field concerned with innovative action for social value creation. Early conceptual work emphasizes that social entrepreneurs identify neglected needs, mobilize resources creatively, and pursue

change beyond the limits of conventional market exchange. Later research has expanded this understanding by examining hybrid organizations that combine social missions with commercial activities, charitable support, public partnerships, and community ownership. In health-related settings, this perspective is useful because health needs frequently involve market failure, information asymmetry, and unequal purchasing power.

Research on community health consistently shows that access is multidimensional. A health facility may exist within a district, yet remain inaccessible because of transport costs, waiting time, social stigma, language barriers, low awareness, disability-related obstacles, or a lack of trust. Social enterprises can respond to some of these barriers by taking services closer to households, creating flexible payment options, involving community members, and using low-cost technology for triage, education, follow-up, or referrals. Their contribution is not defined only by the number of services delivered; it also involves whether the service is acceptable, reliable, safe, and equitable.

Studies of health social enterprises identify several recurring models. Some provide affordable clinical or diagnostic care through cross-subsidy, standardized procedures, and efficient operations. Others work through community health workers, digital platforms, social franchising, non-profit pharmacies, disability-support services, or health-financing mechanisms. The diversity of these models indicates that social entrepreneurship is not a single intervention. Its forms depend on the local burden of disease, the availability of qualified providers, regulatory conditions, community demand, infrastructure, and the balance between mission and revenue.

The literature also warns that hybrid organizations face mission-drift risks. Pressure to earn revenue can lead an enterprise to serve easier-to-reach customers while neglecting the groups it was created to support. In health, this risk is particularly serious because quality, confidentiality, continuity of care, and equitable access cannot be compromised in pursuit of financial performance. Governance structures, transparent social metrics, patient feedback, independent oversight, and partnerships with public-health institutions are

therefore central to responsible enterprise design.

2.1 SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND COMMUNITY HEALTH NEEDS

Community health needs are often interconnected with income insecurity, education, sanitation, nutrition, housing, gender norms, and access to transport and communication. A social enterprise that provides low-cost health services without understanding these conditions may have limited reach. For example, a clinic may be affordable in monetary terms but inaccessible to women who cannot travel alone, workers who cannot take time off, or older persons who require assisted transport. Effective social enterprises begin with local diagnosis and recognize that people experience health services through their daily social and economic circumstances.

Social entrepreneurship can create value by filling coordination gaps. It may connect households to public schemes, help patients navigate referrals, bring preventive screenings to community locations, train local women as health educators, develop safe sanitation services, or link nutrition support to local producer groups. These functions are valuable where formal services are present but poorly connected to users. They also demonstrate that health improvement can be pursued through practical, small-scale changes that make care more understandable and usable.

A central insight from the literature is that community participation strengthens both relevance and trust. When community members are consulted only after a service has been designed, the enterprise may overlook local beliefs, seasonal work patterns, language needs, and affordability constraints. Participation in needs assessment, service design, governance, and feedback can improve uptake and make the enterprise more accountable. In health work, community participation does not replace professional expertise, but it helps ensure that professional services are delivered in ways people can access and respect.

2.2 ENTERPRISE MODELS, INNOVATION, AND HEALTH-SYSTEM LINKAGES

Affordable-care enterprises often seek to reduce costs through standardized protocols, task-sharing under appropriate supervision,

pooled purchasing, efficient use of space, and cross-subsidy between paying and low-income users. Mobile and outreach models reduce geographic barriers by bringing screening, counselling, diagnostics, or health education closer to villages, workplaces, schools, and community centres. Digital platforms can support appointment scheduling, health reminders, consultation facilitation, record management, and referral tracking, although their value depends on connectivity, data protection, usability, and access to trained personnel.

Community health enterprises may also address upstream determinants. Nutrition-focused enterprises can improve access to safe foods and local information; sanitation enterprises can support household toilets, waste management, or safe water practices; and enterprises led by persons with disabilities can improve the availability of assistive devices and inclusive services. These models are not clinical care in the narrow sense, yet they can contribute substantially to health protection and dignity when they are implemented with technical guidance and local accountability.

Health-system linkage is a critical condition for impact. Social enterprises should know when to provide basic support, when to refer, and how to follow up. A screening service without a referral pathway may identify needs but leave people without treatment. A telehealth platform without local facilitation may exclude people with low digital literacy. A community pharmacy without safeguards may encourage unsafe medicine use. The literature therefore supports models that are connected to qualified professionals, accredited facilities, public programmes, emergency care, and disease-surveillance systems where appropriate.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary object of this study is to examine how social entrepreneurship can contribute to community health improvement through accessible, ethical, and sustainable service models. The study treats community health improvement as a process that includes prevention, early identification of health risks, access to primary care, continuity of support, health literacy, social inclusion, and fair treatment of groups that experience barriers to care. It does not assume that enterprise activity alone can solve structural health inequities.

Instead, it investigates how mission-driven organizations can work with communities and public institutions to improve health opportunities in practical ways.

The study specifically considers the relationship between social-enterprise design and the conditions that shape health access. This includes local disease patterns, health literacy, income levels, transport and communication barriers, gender relations, disability inclusion, trust in providers, regulatory requirements, workforce availability, and the capacity of public health facilities. It also considers whether enterprise models can remain accountable when they receive income from users, donors, investors, or public contracts.

A key aspect of the research is the identification of approaches that support health access without creating financial or ethical risks. The analysis compares social enterprises that deliver direct services with those that facilitate navigation, preventive education, community outreach, low-cost products, or technology-enabled support. It also considers how enterprises can measure both operational sustainability and their contribution to health equity.

In addition, the study examines health improvement at multiple levels. Household-level interventions can strengthen knowledge and care-seeking; community-level activities can improve trust, outreach, and local monitoring; enterprise-level systems can improve service organization; and health-system partnerships can ensure continuity, quality, and referral support. These levels must be connected if social entrepreneurship is to make a durable contribution to community health.

3.1 COMMUNITY HEALTH NEEDS AND SOCIAL-ENTERPRISE ECOSYSTEMS

This subsection focuses on the social, economic, and service-delivery conditions that influence the relevance of community-health social enterprises.

- Assessment of common health concerns, preventive-care gaps, and patterns of delayed treatment.
- Evaluation of distance, transport, cost, waiting time, language, stigma, and disability-related barriers to care.

- Identification of existing providers, public schemes, community groups, pharmacies, schools, and referral facilities.
- Analysis of health-literacy needs related to nutrition, maternal and child health, chronic diseases, mental health, sanitation, and safe medicine use.
- Examination of local trust, gender norms, privacy needs, and culturally appropriate communication practices.
- Assessment of who is excluded from available services and why, including low-income households, migrants, older persons, and persons with disabilities.

3.2 SERVICE ACCESS, AFFORDABILITY, AND CONTINUITY OF CARE

This section examines the way service design can influence the ability of different groups to obtain and continue appropriate health support.

- Analysis of user costs, travel expenses, lost work time, and payment barriers associated with seeking care.
- Study of community outreach, mobile services, telehealth facilitation, and appointment systems that reduce access barriers.
- Evaluation of health-worker capacity, supervision, clinical quality, confidentiality, and patient-safety requirements.
- Assessment of referral arrangements, follow-up support, medicine availability, and record continuity.
- Identification of pricing, cross-subsidy, insurance, voucher, or public-partnership approaches that protect low-income users.

3.3 MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION SCOPE

This subsection considers the practical actions through which social enterprises can build responsible and sustainable community-health programmes.

- Development of community-based health education, screening, navigation, and referral-support services.
- Use of mobile units, local service points, digital tools, and trained facilitators where these are appropriate and safe.
- Establishment of formal referral links with qualified providers, public facilities, laboratories, and emergency services.

- Application of transparent pricing, cross-subsidy, financial assistance, and grievance mechanisms.
- Training of local staff in communication, privacy, safeguarding, record keeping, health promotion, and escalation of urgent cases.
- Use of social-impact indicators that track access, quality, inclusion, patient experience, and health outcomes alongside revenue.
- Consideration of regulatory compliance, data protection, quality assurance, and ethical marketing in all service activities.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a descriptive, analytical, and comparative methodology to examine social entrepreneurship for community health improvement. The methodology is designed to connect community health needs, enterprise models, service-access barriers, and institutional relationships. It focuses on the practical contribution of social enterprises to health access and prevention rather than treating entrepreneurship as an end in itself. Secondary information is drawn from

academic literature, health-policy reports, social-enterprise publications, and documented examples of community-oriented service delivery.

The study uses a structured analytical framework to compare health-related social-enterprise models according to their social mission, target population, accessibility, affordability, operational feasibility, quality safeguards, health-system linkages, governance, and sustainability. Particular attention is given to whether a model can reach groups who are commonly excluded from care and whether financial arrangements support, rather than undermine, the health mission. The framework recognizes that positive social impact requires more than innovation: it also requires reliable service design, ethical practice, accountability, and appropriate professional oversight.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research follows a descriptive and comparative design to analyze community-health needs and the potential contribution of different social-enterprise approaches.

Component	Description
Research Type	Descriptive, Analytical, Comparative
Approach	Community health and social-enterprise analysis
Data Source	Journal articles, policy reports, programme documents
Analysis Method	Comparative assessment of enterprise models and health outcomes
Focus Area	Community health improvement, access, equity, and sustainability

4.2 STUDY DIMENSIONS AND ENTERPRISE-MODEL SELECTION

The study considers the following dimensions for examining social entrepreneurship in community-health improvement:

- Affordable primary-care, diagnostic, pharmacy, and referral-support models.
- Community health education, prevention, screening, and health-navigation initiatives.
- Digital and mobile approaches that reduce distance, waiting time, and information barriers.
- Social-enterprise models addressing nutrition, sanitation, disability inclusion, and safe community environments.

- Governance, financing, accountability, and partnership arrangements that protect the social mission.

Each enterprise model is assessed on the basis of:

- Potential to improve access to timely and appropriate health support.
- Ability to reduce financial, geographic, social, and informational barriers.
- Suitability for local health needs, workforce capacity, infrastructure, and regulatory conditions.
- Cost, technical requirements, operating risks, and realistic sources of revenue or support.

- Equity of access for low-income households and other underserved groups.
- Quality, privacy, referral safety, and accountability to users and public institutions.

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis presents a qualitative assessment of social entrepreneurship for community health improvement. The analysis is organized around five connected dimensions: health-service access, affordability, quality and continuity of care, community participation, and enterprise sustainability. These dimensions help explain why certain communities remain underserved and which enterprise features are more likely to create durable health value.

The first finding is that social enterprises can be especially useful when they address a clear access gap rather than introducing a generic service. Communities may have a formal health facility but still face long travel, uncertain opening hours, unaffordable diagnostics, poor communication, or lack of support after a first consultation. Enterprises that map these barriers and design a specific response - for example, a mobile screening programme linked to referral facilities or a local health-navigation service - are more likely to complement the existing system and gain community trust.

The second finding concerns affordability. Fee-based services can support continuity, but user charges may exclude the people with the greatest health needs. The analysis therefore supports transparent pricing and mixed financing arrangements. Cross-subsidy, community insurance support, public reimbursement, vouchers, charitable support for specified groups, or partnerships with employers and local bodies can help maintain access. The appropriate model depends on local incomes and on whether a service is essential, preventive, or discretionary. Financial sustainability should be assessed together with the proportion of vulnerable users who actually receive care.

Quality and safety emerge as central dimensions. Community-oriented enterprises may reduce barriers, yet their health value is limited if services are poorly supervised, marketing claims are exaggerated, medicines are used inappropriately, or referrals are delayed. Responsible models define the limits of the service, use qualified personnel for

clinical tasks, protect confidentiality, maintain reliable records, and establish referral and escalation procedures. These safeguards are necessary for public confidence as well as patient protection.

Community participation also influences performance. Enterprises that work with local organizations, women's groups, schools, self-help groups, community health workers, and local government can learn more quickly about access barriers and service quality. Participation supports feedback, but it should be meaningful rather than symbolic. Communities should have ways to report concerns, understand pricing, influence priorities, and assess whether services are reaching people fairly. This strengthens accountability and reduces the risk that enterprise decisions are guided only by financial convenience.

Finally, the analysis shows that partnerships determine scalability and resilience. Social enterprises can pilot innovations, but they may struggle to maintain service quality as they expand without a stable workforce, procurement arrangements, referral networks, data systems, or regulatory guidance. Partnerships with public health departments, professional associations, hospitals, laboratories, universities, and community-based organizations can provide these supports. Effective collaboration should include clear roles, quality standards, information-sharing safeguards, and mutual accountability.

6. DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that social entrepreneurship should be understood as a method for building community-health capability rather than merely as a way to sell low-cost services. Its strongest contribution is often the creation of reliable bridges between households and health systems. These bridges may involve awareness, screening, navigation, transport coordination, follow-up, local supply chains, or community feedback. A service becomes socially valuable when it improves the practical ability of people to protect and manage their health, especially when existing systems are difficult to access.

An important observation is that enterprise innovation and public-health responsibility must work together. Social enterprises can experiment with delivery methods and respond

quickly to local gaps, while public institutions retain responsibility for standards, regulation, financing of essential services, surveillance, and health equity. Where collaboration is weak, an enterprise may create parallel services that fragment care or compete for scarce health workers. Where collaboration is constructive, enterprises can support outreach, strengthen referrals, and improve the usability of public programmes without displacing public responsibility.

The discussion also highlights the importance of context-sensitive design. A health enterprise that succeeds in an urban setting may not transfer directly to a rural or remote community. Technology-based models may work well where connectivity, digital literacy, and local facilitation exist, but they can widen inequality where these conditions are absent. Likewise, a clinic-based model may not serve seasonal workers or households facing mobility restrictions. Social entrepreneurs should therefore begin with detailed community assessment, pilot carefully, and adapt services through continuous feedback rather than assuming that a single model fits all settings.

Equity is a decisive consideration. Community health initiatives can unintentionally favour users who are easier to reach, more able to pay, or more comfortable engaging with formal services. A mission-driven enterprise should monitor who uses the service, who is left out, and whether different groups experience different costs or outcomes. Inclusive staffing, accessible locations, culturally appropriate communication, flexible service hours, and targeted financial support can reduce exclusion. Measuring only revenue, patient volumes, or app downloads is insufficient; enterprises should also assess whether they are reducing barriers for people who face the greatest disadvantage.

The role of governance is equally important. A clear social mission, representative advisory structures, independent clinical oversight where relevant, transparent financial reporting, and grievance mechanisms can help an enterprise manage tension between impact and income. Social-impact measurement should be practical and honest. It should distinguish outputs, such as consultations or screenings, from outcomes, such as improved follow-up, reduced delay, increased preventive behaviour, or better access

for low-income users. Claims about health improvement should remain proportionate to available evidence and should not overstate the effect of a single programme.

Local government, donors, investors, and universities can strengthen responsible social entrepreneurship through patient financing, technical support, capacity building, evaluation, and fair procurement practices. Such support should not force enterprises to pursue rapid expansion at the cost of quality. The most useful forms of support help organizations develop skilled teams, evidence-based service protocols, secure data practices, and long-term partnerships with community and public-health stakeholders.

7. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that social entrepreneurship can make a meaningful contribution to community health improvement when it is grounded in local needs, guided by an explicit social mission, and connected to accountable health systems. Community health challenges are shaped by more than the absence of facilities; they also arise from cost, distance, information gaps, stigma, weak referral pathways, limited trust, and unequal power. Social enterprises can help reduce some of these barriers by offering accessible services, health education, navigation, outreach, affordable products, and innovative delivery models.

The analysis demonstrates that effective models combine practical enterprise discipline with safeguards for affordability, quality, equity, and continuity of care. Affordable pricing alone is not sufficient. Enterprises should establish qualified supervision, transparent service boundaries, referral arrangements, confidentiality protections, and mechanisms for community feedback. Their financing structures should be designed so that low-income and marginalized users are not excluded as the organization seeks operational sustainability.

The study further concludes that community participation is a condition for relevance and trust. People who use health services should have a meaningful role in identifying barriers, shaping delivery, and assessing whether a social enterprise is meeting its stated mission. Partnerships with public institutions and local organizations are essential because social

enterprises are most effective when they strengthen, rather than fragment, existing health systems.

Finally, social entrepreneurship should be evaluated through both social and operational indicators. Measures of reach, affordability, service quality, referral completion, inclusion, patient experience, and health-related outcomes should be considered alongside revenue and

growth. Future community-health strategies can benefit from supporting ethical social enterprises that are locally responsive, professionally accountable, and committed to reducing avoidable health inequities. Through such an integrated approach, social entrepreneurship can become a durable contributor to healthier, more informed, and more resilient communities.

8. REFERENCES

1. Dees, J. G. (1998). *The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship*. Stanford University: Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership. https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/03/Article_Deess_MeaningofSocialEntrepreneurship_2001.pdf
2. Mair, J., & Marti, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business*, 41(1), 36-44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2005.09.002>
3. Austin, J., Stevenson, H., & Wei-Skillern, J. (2006). Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2006.00107.x>
4. Seelos, C., & Mair, J. (2005). Social entrepreneurship: Creating new business models to serve the poor. *Business Horizons*, 48(3), 241-246. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2004.11.006>
5. Nicholls, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Oxford University Press.
6. Bornstein, D. (2004). *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. Oxford University Press.
7. Yunus, M. (2007). *Creating a World Without Poverty: Social Business and the Future of Capitalism*. PublicAffairs.
8. Defourny, J., & Nyssens, M. (2010). Conceptions of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship in Europe and the United States: Convergences and divergences. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 32-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420670903442053>
9. Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1203-1213. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0620>
10. Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519-532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007>
11. Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3(2), 161-194. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.69>
12. Haugh, H. (2007). Community-led social venture creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(2), 161-182. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2007.00170.x>
13. Di Domenico, M. L., Haugh, H., & Tracey, P. (2010). Social bricolage: Theorizing social value creation in social enterprises. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 681-703. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00370.x>
14. Ebrahim, A., Battilana, J., & Mair, J. (2014). The governance of social enterprises: Mission drift and accountability challenges. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 34, 81-100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2014.09.001>
15. Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing: Insights from the study of social enterprises. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 397-441. <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2014.893615>
16. World Health Organization. (2008). *Closing the Gap in a Generation: Health Equity Through Action on the Social Determinants of Health*. Geneva: WHO. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-IER-CSDH-08.1>
17. World Health Organization. (2016). *Framework on Integrated, People-Centred Health Services*. Geneva: WHO. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-HIS-SDS-2016.3>

18. World Health Organization. (2019). *Primary Health Care on the Road to Universal Health Coverage: 2019 Monitoring Report*. Geneva: WHO. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240029040>
19. World Health Organization. (2021). *Social Determinants of Health*. Geneva: WHO. <https://www.who.int/health-topics/social-determinants-of-health>
20. World Health Organization. (2021). *Global Strategy on Digital Health 2020-2025*. Geneva: WHO. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240020924>
21. World Health Organization. (2023). *World Health Statistics 2023: Monitoring Health for the SDGs*. Geneva: WHO. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240074323>
22. United Nations. (2015). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York: United Nations. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
23. United Nations Development Programme. (2015). *Sustainable Development Goals*. New York: UNDP. <https://www.undp.org/sustainable-development-goals>
24. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2020). *Social Economy and the COVID-19 Crisis: Current and Future Roles*. Paris: OECD. <https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/social-economy-and-the-covid-19-crisis.htm>
25. World Bank. (2017). *Delivering Quality Health Services: A Global Imperative for Universal Health Coverage*. Washington, DC: World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/health/publication/delivering-quality-health-services-a-global-imperative-for-universal-health-coverage>
26. Kruk, M. E., Gage, A. D., Arsenault, C., et al. (2018). High-quality health systems in the Sustainable Development Goals era: Time for a revolution. *The Lancet Global Health*, 6(11), e1196-e1252. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X\(18\)30386-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(18)30386-3)
27. Peters, D. H., Garg, A., Bloom, G., Walker, D. G., Brieger, W. R., & Rahman, M. H. (2008). Poverty and access to health care in developing countries. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1136, 161-171. <https://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1425.011>
28. Levesque, J.-F., Harris, M. F., & Russell, G. (2013). Patient-centred access to health care: Conceptualising access at the interface of health systems and populations. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, 12, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-9276-12-18>
29. Marmot, M. (2005). Social determinants of health inequalities. *The Lancet*, 365(9464), 1099-1104. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)71146-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71146-6)
30. World Health Organization. (2010). *Monitoring the Building Blocks of Health Systems: A Handbook of Indicators and Their Measurement Strategies*. Geneva: WHO. <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/258734>