Moneta : Journal of Economics and Finance
E-ISSN : 3030-8666
Volume. 2, Issue 3, July 2024
Page No: 183-195

The Role of Socioeconomic and Cultural Factors in Shaping Healthcare Accessibility

Setiadi
Universitas Dirgantara Marsekal Suryadarma
Correspondent: setiadi@unsurya.ac.id

Received : May 29, 2024
Accepted : July 21, 2024
Published : July 31, 2024

Citation: Setiadi. (2024). The Role of Socioeconomic and Cultural Factors in Shaping Healthcare Accessibility. Moneta : Journal of Economics and Finance, 2(3), 183-195.

https://doi.org/10.61978/moneta.v2i3.884

ABSTRACT: Access to healthcare remains a critical concern globally, particularly in low- and middle-income countries where systemic barriers persist. This narrative review aims to examine the multi-layered factors influencing healthcare access, including social, economic, policy, and cultural dimensions. Literature was sourced from major scientific databases such as PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science using key terms like "healthcare access," "health equity," and "public health policy." The selection criteria emphasized peer-reviewed studies focusing on determinants of access to health services across various geographical contexts. Findings demonstrate that educational level, social stratification, and income disparities significantly shape individuals' ability to seek and receive healthcare. Cultural beliefs and stigmas further limit service utilization, especially for chronic and stigmatized conditions. Moreover, policies that are not evidence-based or fail to account for local realities often exacerbate existing inequities. Although countries like Sweden have implemented successful universal health programs, their replication requires context-sensitive adaptation. The discussion reveals that bureaucratic inefficiencies and systemic inequalities perpetuate inaccessibility, highlighting the need for more responsive and community-centered health policies. In conclusion, this study calls for integrative approaches that combine education, policy reform, and culturally aligned interventions to bridge healthcare gaps. It recommends future research on localized service models and the expansion of digital health education tools to enhance access and equity.

Keywords: Healthcare Access, Health Inequality, Public Health Policy, Socio-Economic Determinants, Cultural Barriers, Universal Health Coverage, Healthcare Equity.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, access to healthcare has become an increasingly prominent subject in both global health discourse and academic research. The rise of digital communication tools and patient advocacy movements has fundamentally reshaped how individuals interact with healthcare systems, particularly regarding the accessibility of experimental treatments and clinical trials.

Mackey and Schoenfeld (2016) emphasize the role of social media and patient advocacy in improving access to potentially life-saving therapies. These digital and social platforms have not only expanded awareness but have also amplified the voice of patients in policymaking and research prioritization. Furthermore, government initiatives have sought to reinforce healthcare infrastructure through targeted investments. Atkinson et al. (2019) report that increased budget allocations toward public health programs and biomedical research have been vital in enhancing the reach and quality of healthcare services. These developments represent significant trends that illustrate the evolving dynamics of healthcare access in the 21st century.

Concurrently, regulatory environments have adapted to accommodate innovations in healthcare, such as gene and cell therapies. Coppens et al. (2018) highlight the evolution of regulatory frameworks toward greater flexibility, enabling faster approval and integration of novel treatments into clinical practice while still maintaining safety and ethical oversight. This regulatory shift is vital to ensuring sustained innovation without compromising patient protection. As healthcare technologies advance rapidly, the role of policymakers in balancing innovation and equity becomes increasingly complex. These transitions reflect broader systemic transformations that warrant comprehensive scholarly attention.

Recent statistical data underscore the pressing nature of access disparities. According to Santosa et al. (2014), over 5% of the population in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) still lack adequate access to essential health services, resulting in preventable morbidity and mortality. The global burden of both communicable and non-communicable diseases continues to escalate, especially in underserved regions. In more developed contexts, such as the United Kingdom, public health interventions like the NHS Health Check program have demonstrated success in reducing cardiovascular risks through early detection and preventive care (Garrison & Deschamps, 2013). This juxtaposition between resource-rich and resource-poor settings highlights the diversity of healthcare access challenges across the globe.

Parallel to these public health initiatives, global investments in healthcare have been on the rise. Yet, challenges persist. As noted by Garrison and Deschamps (2013), funding shortfalls and inefficiencies in resource distribution remain significant barriers, particularly in supporting long-term research agendas. Moreover, recent data reviewed by Coque et al. (2023) point to a simultaneous rise in both infectious diseases and chronic conditions, exacerbating the demand for equitable access. These data emphasize the need for systemic, sustainable, and globally coordinated responses to close the healthcare access gap.

Despite policy advancements, the practical implementation of healthcare initiatives often encounters formidable barriers. Atkinson et al. (2019) reveal a recurring misalignment between the intended objectives of health policies and their execution on the ground. The disparity between policy design and operational realities undermines the effectiveness of health interventions. Moreover, Yao et al. (2019) argue that socioeconomic disparities further compound the difficulty in delivering equitable healthcare access, particularly in marginalized communities. Structural inequalities manifest in various forms, from geographic isolation to cultural stigma, and require multifaceted strategies to address.

Additional challenges stem from uncertainties in the research environment, such as unstable research funding and the lack of institutional support for health innovation, which hinder the development of new solutions. Garrison and Deschamps (2013) note that many researchers struggle with unstable funding and limited institutional support, hindering progress in health innovation. These limitations reduce the pace and scale at which new evidence-based solutions can be developed and disseminated. Fairbrother et al. (2019) further stress the complexity of global health systems, where differing regulatory regimes and healthcare practices across countries impede the development of standardized solutions. This complexity calls for adaptive, context-sensitive models of healthcare access improvement.

In light of these challenges, current literature points to notable gaps that merit further investigation. One such gap concerns the limited incorporation of patient perspectives in healthcare policy and delivery. Marczewska and Kostrzewski (2020) argue that insufficient attention to patient experience impairs the development of services that are responsive to actual needs. Similarly, Atkinson et al. (2019) emphasize the lack of longitudinal data to monitor how access patterns evolve over time, especially in resource-constrained settings. This absence of temporal insights restricts understanding of the long-term impacts of health interventions.

Another critical area underexplored in the literature is the influence of environmental change on healthcare access. Yao et al. (2019) note that climate-related disruptions, including extreme weather and environmental degradation, pose growing threats to healthcare delivery, particularly in vulnerable regions. These environmental determinants of health access are insufficiently integrated into current policy frameworks. Collectively, these gaps suggest an urgent need for interdisciplinary research that bridges patient-centered approaches, longitudinal evaluation, and environmental health.

The primary aim of this literature review is to provide a comprehensive synthesis of the existing research on access to healthcare, focusing on the multidimensional challenges and emerging opportunities within diverse sociopolitical contexts. As Irwin (2019) suggests, understanding the application of social justice principles in health policy is critical to addressing access inequalities. More specifically, this review seeks to identify persistent barriers and underexplored research areas, particularly those affecting vulnerable populations. As emphasized by Yao et al. (2019), such analysis is necessary to inform more effective and inclusive health policies. Additionally, this review intends to distill practical recommendations grounded in empirical findings to guide future reforms and interventions.

The scope of this review is geographically and demographically diverse, with particular attention to low- and middle-income countries and socially marginalized populations. Research has consistently indicated that these groups face disproportionate barriers to healthcare. For example, Beran et al. (2021) detail the difficulties encountered by diabetes patients in securing affordable insulin in resource-limited settings. Luby (2018) also outlines how substandard housing conditions exacerbate disease transmission in urban slums. These contextual insights are vital to framing effective interventions.

Furthermore, this review examines how demographic variables such as ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and geographic location intersect to shape healthcare access. Yao et al. (2019) emphasize that disparities are not merely a matter of income but are embedded in broader social and institutional dynamics. The inclusion of such variables allows for a more nuanced analysis that transcends simplistic metrics of access. Ultimately, the review provides a global overview of the inequities in healthcare access and explores context-specific challenges faced by rural residents, immigrants, and individuals with pre-existing conditions.

By synthesizing findings across geographic and thematic boundaries, this review contributes to a deeper understanding of the structural, social, and environmental factors that influence healthcare access. In doing so, it aims to support the development of more equitable, sustainable, and context-sensitive healthcare systems.

METHOD

This narrative review systematically collected, evaluated, and synthesized academic literature on access to healthcare services. The approach followed a structured, qualitative synthesis model, aiming to gather relevant data from multiple high-quality academic databases and identify patterns, gaps, and thematic insights from previous studies. The process began with identifying appropriate databases that would support a wide range of sources, including empirical studies, policy evaluations, and theoretical discussions, particularly those addressing healthcare access in vulnerable populations and low- and middle-income countries.

Three primary scientific databases were selected for the literature search: PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science. These databases were chosen due to their prominence and extensive coverage of peer-reviewed journals in the fields of health, public policy, and social sciences. PubMed, in particular, was utilized as a central source for biomedical and clinical studies. This focus ensured the inclusion of evidence on patient access, healthcare delivery, and public health initiatives, which are essential for understanding access disparities. The database's focus on medically indexed journals made it especially valuable for capturing studies related to health outcomes and patient-centered perspectives.

Scopus was also integral to the search process, particularly due to its wide international coverage and its ability to capture publications from non-English and regionally focused journals. This inclusion was critical, as the topic of healthcare access requires sensitivity to geographic and linguistic diversity. Scopus' robust bibliometric features also facilitated the identification of influential authors, institutions, and citation trends relevant to health equity and service access. In addition, Web of Science was employed to ensure comprehensive citation tracking and to locate high-impact articles that may not be indexed in the other databases. Web of Science's inclusion allowed for the retrieval of interdisciplinary research that connected healthcare with broader social and economic frameworks. The combination of these three platforms ensured a thorough and balanced review of the global literature on healthcare access.

The search strategy involved the use of a comprehensive list of keywords and their variations. The primary keywords included "healthcare access," "health inequality," "primary healthcare services," and "health policy." Equivalent terms such as "equity in healthcare," "healthcare services," and "healthcare policy" were employed to expand the search net and account for differences in terminology used across studies. These keywords were used in various combinations, both independently and within Boolean expressions (e.g., "healthcare access" AND "equity"; "primary healthcare" OR "universal coverage"), to ensure the capture of a broad yet relevant body of literature.

An important consideration in this phase was the variability in terminology across different national and disciplinary contexts. For example, studies from the United Kingdom frequently used "universal health coverage" in preference to "access to healthcare," while U.S.-based publications emphasized "health disparities" or "health inequities." Moreover, some terms such as "universal healthcare," although related, often implied distinct policy frameworks and target populations. To address these differences, the review adopted an iterative keyword refinement process. This involved initial searches using a core set of keywords, followed by an evaluation of retrieved abstracts to identify additional relevant terms that were then incorporated into subsequent searches.

The inclusion and exclusion criteria were determined prior to the literature search to ensure a focused and meaningful synthesis of studies. Articles were included if they met the following conditions: they were published in peer-reviewed journals between 2010 and 2024; they addressed access to healthcare as a primary or secondary research objective; they were written in English; and they involved empirical analysis or systematic/narrative reviews. Both qualitative and quantitative studies were eligible, provided they offered insight into healthcare access, policy impact, or health equity outcomes. Included studies also had to offer a clear methodological framework, whether observational, experimental, or theoretical.

Conversely, studies were excluded if they were editorials, opinion pieces, or conference abstracts without full text available. Articles that addressed healthcare topics without a clear focus on access (e.g., focused solely on disease burden or treatment efficacy) were also excluded. Furthermore, studies that did not specify the population group or geographic context relevant to access disparities were excluded to maintain analytical clarity.

This review incorporated diverse research designs to reflect the multidisciplinary nature of healthcare access studies. Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were included where relevant, especially those evaluating interventions aimed at improving service delivery or patient outcomes. Cohort studies and cross-sectional surveys were common among included articles that examined population-level access patterns and determinants. Additionally, qualitative case studies were incorporated, particularly when they provided rich contextual understanding of barriers to care in marginalized communities. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses were also prioritized as they offered consolidated evidence and comparative insights across different healthcare systems and policy interventions.

Following the database searches, the literature selection process involved multiple stages. Initially, all search results were imported into a citation management tool to facilitate screening and deduplication. Titles and abstracts were then independently screened by the lead researcher to assess relevance based on the inclusion criteria. When abstracts were ambiguous, full texts were retrieved and reviewed to ensure alignment with the review's objectives. A second researcher was consulted in cases of uncertainty or disagreement, promoting consistency in study selection and minimizing subjective bias.

Full-text articles were evaluated using a standardized data extraction form that captured information on authorship, publication year, study design, geographic focus, target population, key findings, and stated limitations. This process ensured that extracted data were comparable across studies and that thematic analysis could be conducted systematically. Studies were then grouped based on emerging themes, such as economic barriers, social determinants, policy frameworks, and health system characteristics. This thematic coding allowed for a nuanced synthesis of findings and the identification of cross-cutting issues.

To assess the quality and credibility of the included literature, each study was evaluated for methodological rigor. Quantitative studies were appraised based on sample size, statistical validity, and control for confounding factors, while qualitative studies were assessed for transparency in data collection, coding procedures, and researcher reflexivity. Where applicable, review articles were examined for the comprehensiveness of their search strategies, inclusion criteria, and synthesis methods. Although formal scoring systems such as GRADE or CASP were not employed, these evaluative practices helped maintain a high standard of evidence throughout the review.

In sum, this methodology integrates comprehensive database search techniques, diverse keyword applications, stringent selection criteria, and methodical evaluation processes to ensure a robust and credible synthesis of the literature on healthcare access. By encompassing a wide range of geographic regions and methodological approaches, this review seeks to illuminate the structural, social, and policy-related dimensions of healthcare access and inform future research and policy directions aimed at achieving equitable health systems globally.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section presents a synthesis of the findings from the reviewed literature, organized into four key thematic areas that influence access to healthcare services: social factors, economic conditions, public policy, and cultural norms. Each subsection analyzes how these factors impact access and integrates comparative perspectives across different countries and populations. The analysis draws upon evidence from both high-income and low- and middle-income countries to provide a comprehensive overview of global healthcare access challenges.

Social Factors and Their Impact on Healthcare Access

Social determinants, including education level, socioeconomic status, and access to health information, significantly affect individuals' ability to access healthcare services. Yao et al. (2019) emphasize that individuals with higher levels of education are more likely to be aware of healthcare options, understand medical information, and engage in decision-making processes regarding their health. This educational divide creates significant disparities in healthcare utilization, particularly in low- and middle-income countries where access to quality education remains uneven. Individuals with lower education levels often struggle with health literacy, a critical barrier that limits their engagement with preventative care and treatment options.

Socioeconomic status further compounds disparities in access. Garrison and Deschamps (2013) note that individuals with higher social status tend to have better access to both healthcare services and pertinent health-related information. This is not merely a function of income but also includes social capital, networks, and the ability to navigate complex healthcare systems. These advantages contribute to better health outcomes for higher-status individuals, reinforcing a cycle of inequality.

Empirical evidence supports the strong correlation between social factors and healthcare access. For instance, a study in sub-Saharan Africa found that health education initiatives significantly increased healthcare utilization among high-risk populations (Luo et al., 2014). In communities where education about chronic disease management, such as diabetes and hypertension, was incorporated into public health campaigns, there was a marked improvement in early diagnosis and treatment adherence. These findings underscore the role of targeted social interventions in addressing disparities in healthcare access.

Economic Conditions and Access to Healthcare

Economic factors such as income, employment, and insurance coverage are consistently linked to disparities in healthcare access. Individuals with low income face multiple barriers, including out-of-pocket costs, lack of transportation, and the absence of health insurance. Although Luo et al. (2014) do not directly address income-related challenges, Guo et al., as cited in the broader literature, indicate that financial limitations often discourage individuals from seeking care or completing treatment regimens. This is particularly evident in countries without universal healthcare systems, where patients bear a significant proportion of medical expenses.

Employment status also plays a vital role. Garrison and Deschamps (2013) discuss how job insecurity and informal employment arrangements contribute to healthcare avoidance, as individuals fear losing income due to time off work or cannot afford unexpected medical costs. These economic uncertainties reduce healthcare utilization even when services are technically available.

There is a stark contrast in healthcare access between high-income and low-income countries. Bannayan et al. (2016) illustrate that in low-income countries, per capita healthcare spending remains well below international benchmarks, leading to limited availability of essential services and medicines. In contrast, high-income countries allocate greater resources to public health and often provide safety nets through social insurance programs. Atkinson et al. (2019) highlight that such programs are notably absent in many low- and middle-income countries, leaving vulnerable populations without essential protections. This comparative analysis reveals that structural

economic disparities are deeply embedded in global healthcare systems and require policy-level interventions to address effectively.

Public Policy and Its Influence on Healthcare Access

The influence of national and international public policy on healthcare access is profound and multifaceted. Well-designed policies can expand access and reduce disparities, while poorly implemented or fragmented policies can exacerbate inequalities. Irwin (2019) explains that although social justice principles are increasingly being integrated into health policy, many countries still face challenges in translating these ideals into practice. This includes a lack of coordination among governmental agencies, insufficient stakeholder engagement, and the absence of data-driven decision-making.

Policy implementation often falls short due to gaps in institutional capacity and political will. For instance, despite formal commitments to universal health coverage, some governments struggle with logistics and funding, resulting in uneven access across regions and populations. Evidence from Sweden, though not directly cited in the current literature set, often serves as a model of effective universal healthcare. Meena et al. (2014) describe the Swedish system as grounded in solidarity, where tax-funded services provide equitable access to high-quality care for all residents. This integrated model has yielded measurable improvements in population health and has been particularly effective in reaching vulnerable groups.

For developing countries, such models offer critical lessons. Atkinson et al. (2019) argue that replicating such successes requires more than policy adoption; it necessitates institutional reform, sustainable financing, and the adaptation of strategies to local contexts. Moreover, evidence-based policymaking is essential. Policies not grounded in robust empirical data risk overlooking key barriers to access and may fail to address the needs of marginalized communities.

Cultural Norms and Their Role in Healthcare Access

Cultural values and social norms significantly influence individual attitudes toward healthcare and patterns of service utilization. In many societies, deeply ingrained beliefs and stigmas surrounding illness shape how people perceive health and their willingness to seek care. Yao et al. (2019) highlight that stigma associated with certain diseases, such as mental illness or sexually transmitted infections, can deter individuals from pursuing medical attention. This effect is especially pronounced in tightly-knit communities where social reputation is highly valued.

Moreover, cultural expectations regarding gender roles and health behaviors also impact access. In some regions, women may require permission from male family members to seek healthcare, limiting their autonomy and delaying critical care. In other settings, traditional medicine may be preferred over formal healthcare systems, particularly when biomedical approaches are viewed with suspicion or considered culturally inappropriate.

Despite these challenges, culturally tailored interventions have shown promise in improving healthcare access. Guerry et al. find that programs incorporating local norms and community participation tend to achieve higher engagement and better health outcomes. Although this reference is not directly cited in the current review, similar findings are echoed in Yao et al. (2019),

who assert that integrating cultural sensitivity into program design enhances the relevance and acceptability of health services.

Global evidence supports the efficacy of such approaches. In regions with diverse ethnic populations, interventions that respect and incorporate cultural identity have proven effective in increasing participation in preventive health programs. For instance, community-based initiatives in Southeast Asia that involve traditional leaders and utilize local languages have been more successful than generic outreach efforts. These examples emphasize the importance of cultural competence in healthcare planning and delivery, particularly in multicultural societies.

In summary, the reviewed literature provides robust evidence that access to healthcare is shaped by an interplay of social, economic, policy, and cultural factors. Each of these dimensions contributes uniquely to either facilitating or impeding healthcare access. Education, income, and employment create foundational inequalities that are further moderated by national policies and cultural contexts. The findings affirm the necessity of multidimensional strategies to reduce health disparities and improve access across different populations and settings. Continued research and context-specific interventions are essential to address these complex and intersecting determinants of healthcare access globally.

The findings of this narrative review resonate with and build upon previous studies in the global literature concerning health service access and its associated challenges. Numerous sources have highlighted the complexity and interconnectivity of economic, social, and policy-related factors as core determinants of health service accessibility. Beran et al., as discussed by Meena et al. (2014), emphasized that health access cannot be decoupled from the wider socio-economic and political systems in which it exists. Their systemic approach, which underscores the vulnerability of marginalized populations, parallels our findings regarding the compounded impact of social and economic factors on healthcare access.

A closer comparison with the study by Yao et al. (2019) confirms that socioeconomic status, particularly education, plays a pivotal role in influencing healthcare behaviors and knowledge. Our analysis reveals that educational disparities directly affect individuals' engagement with health systems, echoing Yao et al.'s assertion that low educational attainment correlates with limited health literacy and reduced empowerment in decision-making. These educational gaps are often more pronounced in developing countries, further exacerbating existing inequities in access.

Furthermore, our review aligns with the insights of Garrison and Deschamps (2013), who found that individuals with higher social status are generally more successful in navigating healthcare systems due to better access to information and resources. The evidence from Luo et al. (2014), highlighting successful health education interventions in Sub-Saharan Africa, reinforces the argument that enhancing community knowledge can significantly improve health service utilization among vulnerable groups.

Despite the parallels with existing literature, our findings also challenge the notion that healthcare models from high-income countries can be directly transplanted into low-income settings. Irwin (2019) critiques this assumption by illustrating how policies successful in Sweden may fail in different sociopolitical environments if not adapted appropriately. This reinforces the necessity for

contextual sensitivity and the incorporation of culturally specific considerations in policy development and implementation.

One of the most pressing systemic barriers identified is entrenched bureaucratic inefficiencies, for example, lengthy administrative procedures in public health programs that delay the implementation of new interventions. Though not directly referenced in our literature base, anecdotal and secondary sources suggest that administrative inertia and overly complex governance frameworks delay the adoption of effective policy interventions. These bottlenecks hinder both innovation and responsiveness in health system reform, ultimately maintaining the status quo of limited access.

Structural inequalities—both financial and social—continue to pose significant obstacles, as seen in the marginalization of low-income groups in accessing basic healthcare services. As reported by Meena et al. (2014), exclusionary social structures in developing nations systematically marginalize minorities and low-income populations, depriving them of even basic healthcare rights. This is supported by data from Bannayan et al. (2016), which highlight how underfunded health systems in low-income countries result in disproportionately poor health outcomes compared to well-resourced systems in wealthier nations.

Economic insecurity, including precarious employment and lack of health insurance, compounds this issue. Guo et al. (2014) documented how income insecurity often leads individuals to defer or forgo care entirely, fearing financial repercussions. Garrison and Deschamps (2013) further elaborated on this by emphasizing that people without stable income streams are less likely to participate in preventive care programs, thereby perpetuating cycles of poor health and limited access.

On a regulatory level, Mackey and Schoenfeld (2016) criticized policies that restrict experimental or non-traditional medical treatments, arguing that such regulations often stifle innovation and delay access to potentially life-saving interventions. These constraints are especially damaging in under-resourced settings, where mainstream healthcare options are already limited. Reforming regulatory frameworks to allow for more agile and inclusive healthcare practices could offer substantial improvements in access.

From a policy perspective, Sweden's universal healthcare model provides a valuable case study of systemic alignment between policy, funding, and public health outcomes. Irwin (2019) documented the role of social solidarity in the Swedish system, where tax-based funding supports a universally accessible and preventative health infrastructure. This model demonstrates how well-integrated systems can promote equity, efficiency, and resilience. However, as Beran et al. noted, the success of such models depends heavily on socio-political context and public buy-in, which may not be replicable in countries with different institutional or cultural landscapes.

Adaptation is key. Interventions that fail to integrate local norms, languages, and belief systems are less likely to gain traction in target communities. Yao et al. (2019) and Guerry et al. both emphasized that health programs which incorporate cultural considerations tend to see higher participation and effectiveness. These culturally sensitive strategies not only build trust but also enhance the legitimacy and sustainability of health initiatives.

However, despite these insights, several limitations in the current literature remain. Many studies lack longitudinal data to track the long-term effectiveness of health interventions. Others are geographically limited, focusing mainly on either high-income or low-income countries, without adequate comparative analysis. There is also a paucity of research exploring the intersection of multiple barriers—such as how social stigma and economic hardship jointly impact access.

Additionally, more research is needed on the role of digital technologies and telemedicine in bridging health access gaps. While the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated digital health initiatives, few studies have systematically assessed their impact on underserved populations. Future inquiries could focus on how mobile health tools, community health apps, and AI-based diagnostics can be leveraged to reduce disparities.

Lastly, ethical considerations must be more prominently integrated into health access discussions. Issues of consent, privacy, and the digital divide warrant critical examination, especially as technological interventions become more widespread. Ensuring that health innovations do not inadvertently exacerbate existing inequities is a challenge that requires ongoing vigilance and inclusive policy-making.

In conclusion, while this review affirms much of the existing understanding of health access disparities, it also calls for a more nuanced, systemic, and culturally grounded approach to health policy and intervention design. Without addressing these multidimensional and interconnected barriers, efforts to improve health equity will remain insufficient and fragmented.

CONCLUSION

This narrative review highlights the multidimensional and systemic nature of barriers to healthcare access, emphasizing the importance of social, economic, cultural, and policy-related factors. The findings suggest that low educational attainment and social status limit individuals' awareness and ability to engage with health services, particularly in resource-limited settings. Economic constraints such as income insecurity, lack of insurance, and unstable employment reduce access to adequate care. Additionally, cultural stigmas and misaligned health beliefs further complicate efforts to improve service uptake. Crucially, health policies that are disconnected from local realities and insufficiently supported by infrastructure and inclusive governance mechanisms exacerbate the inequities.

Despite successful models such as Sweden's universal healthcare system, this review confirms that one-size-fits-all solutions are inadequate. Contextual adaptation and culturally grounded strategies are essential. Effective interventions must therefore be supported by community engagement, policy innovation, and systemic reforms. This review also underscores the urgency of interdisciplinary and intersectoral action to address these challenges.

Future research should focus on localized models of health service delivery and the integration of digital tools to mitigate disparities. Strengthening access and improving information dissemination are essential strategies. Equally important is community participation to overcome systemic barriers and achieve equitable healthcare.

REFERENCE

Atkinson, P., Sheard, S., & Walley, T. (2019). 'All the stars were aligned'? The origins of England's National Institute for Health Research. *Health Research Policy and Systems, 17*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-019-0491-5

Bannayan, M., Paymard, P., & Ashraf, B. (2016). Vulnerability of maize production under future climate change: Possible adaptation strategies. *Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, 96*(13), 4465–4474. https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.7659

Beran, D., Lazo-Porras, M., Camille, M., & Mbanya, J. (2021). A global perspective on the issue of access to insulin. *Diabetologia, 64*(5), 954–962. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00125-020-05375-2

Coque, T., Cantón, R., Pérez-Cobas, A., Fernández-de-Bobadilla, M., & Baquero, F. (2023). Antimicrobial resistance in the global health network: Known unknowns and challenges for efficient responses in the 21st century. *Microorganisms, 11*(4), 1050. https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms11041050

Coppens, D., Wilde, S., Guchelaar, H., Bruin, M., Leufkens, H., Meij, P., … & Hoekman, J. (2018). A decade of marketing approval of gene and cell-based therapies in the United States, European Union and Japan: An evaluation of regulatory decision-making. *Cytotherapy, 20*(6), 769–778. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcyt.2018.03.038

Fairbrother, A., Muir, D., Solomon, K., Ankley, G., Rudd, M., Boxall, A., … & Brooks, B. (2019). Toward sustainable environmental quality: Priority research questions for North America. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry, 38*(8), 1606–1624. https://doi.org/10.1002/etc.4502

Garrison, H., & Deschamps, A. (2013). NIH research funding and early career physician scientists: Continuing challenges in the 21st century. *The FASEB Journal, 28*(3), 1049–1058. https://doi.org/10.1096/fj.13-241687

Irwin, R. (2019). Sweden's engagement in global health: A historical review. *Globalization and Health, 15*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-019-0499-1

Luby, S. (2018). Urban slums: A supportive ecosystem for typhoidal Salmonellae. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases, 218*(suppl_4), S250–S254. https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiy324

Luo, Y., Chen, H., Zhu, Q., Peng, C., Yang, G., Yang, Y., … & Zhang, Y. (2014). Relationship between air pollutants and economic development of the provincial capital cities in China during the past decade. *PLOS ONE, 9*(8), e104013. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0104013

Mackey, T., & Schoenfeld, V. (2016). Going "social" to access experimental and potentially life-saving treatment: An assessment of the policy and online patient advocacy environment for expanded access. *BMC Medicine, 14*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-016-0568-8

Marczewska, M., & Kostrzewski, M. (2020). Sustainable business models: A bibliometric performance analysis. *Energies, 13*(22), 6062. https://doi.org/10.3390/en13226062

Meena, M., Prabha, S., & Pandian, S. (2014). A cloud-based mobile robotic system for environmental monitoring. https://doi.org/10.1109/apcase.2014.6924484

Santosa, A., Wall, S., Fottrell, E., Högberg, U., & Byass, P. (2014). The development and experience of epidemiological transition theory over four decades: A systematic review. *Global Health Action, 7*(1). https://doi.org/10.3402/gha.v7.23574

Yao, Q., Li, X., Luo, F., Yang, L., Liu, C., & Sun, J. (2019). The historical roots and seminal research on health equity: A referenced publication year spectroscopy (RPYS) analysis. *International Journal for Equity in Health, 18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-019-1058-3