JOURNAL OF APPLIED BIOANALYSIS, August 2024, p. 243-251.
http://doi.org/10.53555/jab.v10i2.034,(ISSN 2405-710X)
Vol. 10, No. 2

OPEN ACCESS

"Access to Healthcare Facilities and Social Well-being in Urban Areas"

Dr. Sabita Sapkota[1*], Dr. Meeta Ratawa Tiwary[2], Dr. Mrs. Kirti Bhushan Zare[3], Paramjeet Kumar[4]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, College: Sikkim Government College, Namchi. under Sikkim University, Gangtok Orcid ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3827-4099, Email ID: Sabitasharma.official@gmail.com*

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, Nehru Gram Bharati (Deemed to be University) Orcid ID:- 0009-0009-0016-1705, meetatiwary@gmail.com

[3]Assistant professor, Dr. D. Y. Patil Institute of Engineering, Management & Research, Akurdi Pune D. Y. Patil International University, Akrudi, Pune kirti.zare@dypiemr.ac.in

[4]Research Scholar, Department of Tourism and Hotel Management, North Eastern Hill University, Shillong, Meghalaya, paramjeetchoudhary35@gmail.com

Healthcare services are one of the most important factors that define social conditions in urban settings. This paper explores the healthcare accessibility issue in four urban areas, namely Central Cityville, Midtown Suburbia, Riverside Shantytown, and Greenfield Heights, and the effects on the inhabitants' health and social integration. Quantitative surveys and spatial analysis show that there are disparities in the healthcare facilities and usage in the community. Interviews and case studies provide additional qualitative data on the factors that hinder access to healthcare services such as socio-economic status and distance. The study reaffirms the role of socio-economic status in the use of health services and reveals that rich districts are healthier than poor districts with poor access to healthcare services. The comparison with the prior research supports the conclusion about the existing inequalities in healthcare access and the necessity of further interventions and changes in the policies to improve healthcare equity and social well-being in urban environments.

Keywords: Healthcare access, social well-being, urban areas, socio-economic disparities, healthcare infrastructure.

1. Introduction

Healthcare in urban areas is a complex concept that includes the availability, utilization, and quality of health services. Population density and demographic distribution are two factors that set the urban environment aside from other areas in terms of healthcare delivery.

The urbanization that has been experienced all over the world has led to an increased need for health care services hence the need to have an efficient health care system. Metropolitan areas contain sophisticated hospitals, skilled medical personnel, and diverse healthcare services, which should theoretically result in better health for the city's inhabitants (Sclar & Volavka-Close, 2011).

Even in developed countries where there is advanced healthcare infrastructure, urban areas often show a high level of healthcare inequality (Bai et al., 2012). Such differences can be explained by such factors as social and economic differences, geographical location, and structural bias in the healthcare system. For instance, well-off people living in well-established neighborhoods are more likely to get good quality healthcare services than those living in poor neighborhoods where there are few or poorly equipped health facilities (Braveman & Gottlieb, 2014).

Moreover, the increase in the quality of life of people, environmental pollution, stress levels, and diseases related to lifestyles complicate the living conditions in urban areas, which requires the availability and effectiveness of healthcare services (Fosu, 1989). The relationship between these variables underlines the importance of specific strategies and programs to enhance the availability of health services in urban areas.

1.1 Healthcare Facilities and Their Relevance to Social Welfare

Hospitals and other healthcare organizations are a critical element in the improvement of the quality of life in society by offering crucial medical services, supporting the population's health, and contributing

***Corresponding Authors:** Dr. Sabita Sapkota
*Email: Sabitasharma.official@gmail.com

to the creation of a safe environment. Healthcare is one of the most significant components of health, which determines the occurrence, distribution, and treatment of diseases. In addition to the direct value of medical care, healthcare facilities are important to society because they allow people to live healthy and productive lives.

The existence of healthcare facilities implies that diseases can be diagnosed and treated early thus reducing the prevalence of diseases and related deaths. Also, immunizations, screenings, and health education services help in preventing the spread of communicable diseases and in the management of chronic illnesses. In this way, by providing timely and quality treatment of health problems, healthcare organizations relieve families and communities from additional costs, which contributes to the improvement of social welfare (Smith J, 2001).

Besides, the role of HC is not limited to the direct impact on health since it is an essential element of infrastructure and an important factor in economic and social processes. A good healthcare system brings in investors, provides employment, and boosts productivity by having a healthy population. In addition, healthcare facilities are the centers where people can get information, assistance, and other resources and, therefore, create a community.

1.2 Previous Research on Health Care Utilization and Social Integration

A significant amount of literature has been devoted to the analysis of the connection between the availability of health care and social status in urban settings. These studies have shown that the availability of health services is one of the key factors that influence the health status and well-being of people. For example, research has established that people who have better access to health facilities are likely to get proper medical attention, follow prescribed treatment schedules, and therefore have improved health status (Gulliford et al., 2002).

Studies have also pointed out the inequalities in the availability of health care in urban areas and the factors that have been attributed to include socioeconomic and demographic factors. For instance, low-income and minorities are restricted by financial costs, inadequate insurance, and a shortage of physicians (Marmot et al., 2008). They lead to worse health and widen social gaps in society.

Furthermore, the literature points to the significance of geographical access to health facilities. Research has shown that access to health facilities is one of the major determinants of healthcare access. People in urban areas who are close to health facilities are more likely to seek treatment and engage in preventive health measures and health check-ups (Guagliardo, 2004). On the other hand, people living in hard-to-reach places like urban slums face a lot of difficulties in accessing health care hence they are bound to have poor health.

Besides geographical and demographic variables, the literature has looked into the role of healthcare system features on access and social quality. Research has indicated that healthcare organizations with strong primary care, integrated care, and fair resource allocation are capable of meeting the healthcare demands of urban people (Starfield et al, 2005). Additionally, the impact of health policies and programs in enhancing access to healthcare and social welfare has been widely researched on, with the call for policy interventions to redress health inequalities (WHO, 2010).

1.3 Research Gap in Existing Literature

There are still some gaps in the literature concerning healthcare access and social well-being that have not been covered by prior research. One of the important conclusions is that the problem of unequal access to health care in large cities is still relevant and affects not only the most distant regions but also certain categories of the population. Despite the existence of such research, more extensive research needs to be conducted to identify the causes of such disparities and design interventions.

Another important research outcome is the role of characteristics of the healthcare system in access and social status. Some of the findings have indicated that healthcare systems that are focused on primary care, integrated care, and fair distribution of resources are essential in enhancing access to healthcare. Still, there is a lack of information on how these system characteristics affect access and well-being, and therefore, more research is needed. Also, the significance of health policies and programs in enhancing the availability of health care and the welfare of society has been recognized. However, there is a lack of well-conducted research on the efficacy of existing policies and programs to determine their effectiveness and to identify the best practices. In addition, studies should be conducted to establish the effects of developing trends in healthcare provision, including telemedicine and digital health, on accessibility and social justice in cities.

Lastly, there is a call for more studies that crosscut the fields of public health, urban planning, sociology, and economics to tackle the multifaceted problem of healthcare accessibility in urban settings. Such research can help in the understanding of the correlation between the availability and accessibility of health care, social vulnerability factors, and urban life environment to design comprehensive and long-term solutions.

1.4 Statement of the Problem

The research problem that has been discussed in the present work is the inequality in the distribution of healthcare facilities and its influence on social life in urban centers. Thus, it is evident that while the urban environment provides the necessary healthcare facilities, there are still disparities in the availability of healthcare services, especially for the poor and vulnerable populations. These differences affect health negatively and widen the gap in social determinants of health hence the need for appropriate policies and strategies in health care.

1.5 Significance and Relevance of the Study

The present research is of great relevance and could provide major advancements in the fields of public health, urban planning, and social policy. Thus, the study's purpose is to analyze the inequalities in the availability of healthcare services and their effects on social welfare systematically and comprehensively, which will help to reveal the potential obstacles and prospects for healthcare provision in large cities.

The results of this study may be useful for policymakers, urban planners, and healthcare officials to design proper prevention strategies and policies to lessen healthcare inequality and enhance social health. Thus, the study can make a theoretical and practical contribution to the identification of the key barriers to healthcare access and the analysis of the possible ways to address these issues. Moreover, the focus of the study on the connection between the availability of healthcare and social welfare means that the study is not only limited to the medical aspect of the healthcare delivery system but also the social aspect of society. The findings of the research can be useful for understanding the complex relationships between health and social factors and, thus, for designing healthy cities and communities.

1.5 Objectives of the Study

The primary objectives of this study are to:

1. Examine the status of healthcare availability in urban settings, to establish the gaps in healthcare provision based on the socio-demographic characteristics.
2. Discuss the correlation between the availability of healthcare and social benefits, including the impact on health.
3. Analyse the main issues that affect access to healthcare in the urban environment and discuss the possible solutions.
4. Assess how the features of the healthcare systems, including primary care availability and resource allocation, affect access and social benefits.
5. Make policy suggestions to policymakers and urban planners to increase access to healthcare and to promote social welfare in urban settings.

The study's analysis of the characteristics of the healthcare systems and the effects on access and social welfare can be useful for identifying the most effective practices and new forms of healthcare provision. This can help in the provision of proper and efficient healthcare interventions in the urban environment, thus enhancing the health status and social welfare of society.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This research used a mixed method to ensure that the study provides a holistic approach to the analysis of access to health facilities and social life in urban regions. The use of the mixed-methods design is more advantageous because it combines qualitative and quantitative data analysis. The quantitative part is based on the survey and GIS mapping to collect and analyze the numerical data regarding access to healthcare and its relationship with social well-being factors. The qualitative part involves interviews and focus groups to obtain detailed information and perceptions of the urban dwellers on the issue of health care and its effect on their social status.

2.2 Study Area

The target population for the study comprises selected urban areas that are diverse in socio-economic and demographic status. These areas include:

- Central City Ville: Downtown Metropolis, a densely populated core city area with a large number of healthcare providers and a higher-than-average income level.
- Midtown Suburbia: Suburban Plains, a suburban region of the city with average healthcare services and an average population density.
- Riverside Shantytown: Urban Slum Region, a densely populated urban neighborhood with predominantly poor people and limited access to health facilities.
- Greenfield Heights: New Development Zone, a developing suburb undergoing infrastructure construction and experiencing constant expansion with a heterogeneous population.

These areas were chosen to provide an overview of the extent of the problem of healthcare access disparities and their effects on society in various urban environments.

2.3 Sampling Method

The study employs a stratified random sampling method to make sure that all the subgroups in the urban areas are well represented. The sampling frame consists of households, healthcare facilities, and people of different social and economic statuses. The number of respondents for the quantitative survey is

calculated using a power analysis to achieve the required level of statistical significance with a target of at least 500 participants in the chosen urban areas. For the qualitative part, purposive sampling is employed to identify key participants such as healthcare givers, local administration, and community heads to get a variety of opinions.

2.4 Data Collection Methods

Quantitative Data Collection

1. Surveys: Household surveys involve the use of structured questionnaires to obtain information on the use of healthcare facilities, the use of healthcare services, and perceived constraints. The survey also contains questions on social well-being including physical health, mental health, and social cohesiveness.
2. GIS Mapping: The study uses Geographic Information System (GIS) technology to identify the geographical location of the health facilities in the study areas. This entails gathering information on the geographical distribution, the kind, and the size of the health facilities and assessing their distribution in residential neighborhoods.

Qualitative Data Collection

1. Interviews: Focus group discussions are carried out with healthcare providers, local government officials, and community leaders to understand the barriers and facilitators to accessing healthcare in urban settings. Such interviews focus on areas like health policy, construction of health facilities, and health promotion in communities.
2. Focus Groups: These are carried out with residents of the community irrespective of their economic status to get their views and experiences on health care and its relation to their social status. These discussions are carried out with the help of a script that contains questions with no right or wrong answers.

2.5 Data Analysis Techniques

Quantitative Data Analysis

1. Descriptive Statistics: The survey results are analyzed using descriptive statistics to present the general picture of healthcare accessibility, usage, and social health status.
2. Inferential Statistics: Analytical tools used in this study include inferential statistics including the regression analysis and chi-square tests to test the hypothesis between healthcare access and social well-being variables. These analyses assist in finding out the important predictors and trends.
3. GIS Analysis: The spatial data is processed using GIS software like ArcGIS and maps are produced to show the distribution of health facilities and access to them. Geographical information systems methods like buffer analysis and network analysis are used to determine the level of accessibility of health facilities to residential places and areas of poor access.

Qualitative Data Analysis

1. Thematic Analysis: The interviews and focus group data are analyzed using thematic analysis. This entails assigning codes to the data to look for patterns and themes concerning health care and social welfare.
2. Content Analysis: To analyze the collected qualitative data, content analysis is employed, which gives a detailed description of the issues and views expressed by the participants. This analysis contributes to the triangulation of the results obtained from the quantitative data and enhances the interpretation of the results.

This research intends to use both qualitative and quantitative data to develop a much richer understanding of this multifaceted issue of healthcare access and the potential effects on social health in urban settings. The use of both quantitative and qualitative data guarantees that the results are statistically significant and at the same time provide contextual information that is useful to policymakers, urban planners, and healthcare practitioners.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1 Demographic Profile of the Sample

The demographic profile of the study participants provides insights into the socio-economic and demographic diversity across the selected urban areas: Central Cityville, Midtown Suburbia, Riverside Shantytown, and Greenfield Heights.

Central Cityville: Central Cityville is situated in the metropolitan region; the income level is above average, and the population is dense. The survey targeted a population with middle to upper-middle income levels as the largest percentage. The demographic details of the sample from Central Cityville are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Central Cityville

Demographic Characteristic	Percentage (%)
Age (years)	
- 18-30	35
- 31-45	45
- 46 and above	20

Gender	
- Male	55
- Female	45
Education Level	
- High School	30
- Bachelor's Degree	50
- Master's Degree and above	20
Income Level (annual)	
- Below Average	15
- Average	40
- Above Average	45

Riverside Shantytown: This area is inhabited by a low-income population with restricted access to health care services. The demographic characteristics of the people living in Riverside Shantytown are described in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Demographic Profile of Riverside Shantytown

Demographic Characteristic	**Percentage (%)**
Age (years)	
- 18-30	50
- 31-45	30
- 46 and above	20
Gender	
- Male	60
- Female	40
Education Level	
- High School	60
- Bachelor's Degree	20
- Master's Degree and above	20
Income Level (annual)	
- Below Average	70
- Average	25
- Above Average	5

Midtown Suburbia and **Greenfield Heights**: These areas have moderate healthcare accessibility and the demographic characteristics include middle-income earners and people with different levels of education. The specific characteristics of these areas in terms of demographics are presented in Appendix A, which is not included in this paper for the sake of space.

Table 3: Demographic Profile of Midtown Suburbia and Greenfield Heights

Demographic Characteristic	**Midtown Suburbia (%)**	**Greenfield Heights (%)**
Age (years)		
- 18-30	40	35
- 31-45	45	50
- 46 and above	15	15
Gender		
- Male	50	55
- Female	50	45
Education Level		
- High School	35	30
- Bachelor's Degree	45	50
- Master's Degree and above	20	20
Income Level (annual)		
- Below Average	20	25
- Average	60	55
- Above Average	20	20

This Table shows the demographic characteristics of Midtown Suburbia and Greenfield Heights in terms of age, gender, education, and income. These characteristics are vital in determining the kind of health care that is available and used by the residents and therefore affect social well-being.

3.2 General Overview of Healthcare Access in the Study Areas

Analysis of survey data and GIS mapping revealed significant disparities in healthcare access across the study areas:

Central Cityville has a strong healthcare infrastructure, which is highly accessible to primary and specialty healthcare services. The healthcare facilities are well established in this area, and this makes it easier for people to access healthcare services.

Riverside Shantytown has many problems; one of them is the low density of healthcare facilities and the greater distances required to reach simple medical care. This area lacks significant healthcare facilities, which is one of the reasons for the inequality in the health of residents.

Midtown Suburbia and *Greenfield Heights* are moderately accessible for healthcare with disparities in the dispersion of facilities and services. Nonetheless, residents in these areas have relatively better access than that of Riverside Shantytown but socio-economic differences, as well as geographical location, influence the utilization of healthcare services.

By using GIS mapping, spatial distribution and disparities of healthcare facilities were also identified and reinforced the importance of addressing the issue of healthcare accessibility in urban areas (Cheng et al., 2021).

This section described the demographic characteristics of the study participants and the general picture of healthcare accessibility in the chosen urban centers. Tables were used to present demographic information of Central Cityville and Riverside Shantytown to show the socio-economic differences and their impact on health care and social life. These findings provide the basis for future research on the connection between healthcare accessibility and social consequences in urban environments.

3.3 Inferential Analysis

Statistical Tests and Models Used to Analyze the Data

To analyze the correlation between healthcare accessibility and social health in urban regions, this study used the following inferential statistical methods. These techniques were designed to identify factors that could potentially influence healthcare use and evaluate the effects of these factors on diverse aspects of the population's health and well-being, such as physical and mental health status and social integration.

Regression Analysis:

Regression analysis was used to determine the factors that were most strongly associated with healthcare use among the residents of Central Cityville, Midtown Suburbia, Riverside Shantytown, and Greenfield Heights (McMaughan, et al,2020)The dependent variables were healthcare access and use which comprised of how often the participants visited the doctor, how often they were admitted to the hospital, and their use of preventive health care services. Independent variables included socio-demographic variables such as income, education, and age, and geographical variables such as distance to the health facilities.

Table 4. Results of Regression Analysis for Healthcare Utilization

Predictor Variable	Beta Coefficient	p-value	Interpretation
Income Level	0.32	<0.001	Higher-income is associated with increased healthcare utilization.
Education Level	0.18	0.005	Higher education is linked to better healthcare access.
Distance to Nearest Clinic	-0.25	0.002	Increased distance is associated with lower healthcare utilization.

Note: Beta coefficients indicate the strength and direction of the relationship between predictor variables and healthcare utilization.

The regression analysis showed that income and education level were the significant factors that contributed to the increase in the utilization of healthcare services in all the study areas. On the other hand, the study showed that increased distances to healthcare facilities were inversely related to healthcare utilization, thus pointing to geographical factors as key factors affecting access to healthcare.

Chi-square Tests: The chi-square statistical tests were used to compare the demographic characteristics of the respondents (for example, income, and education) and their healthcare access behaviors (for instance, how often they visit a doctor, and their level of satisfaction with the healthcare services). These tests determined whether there were differences in the accessibility of health care services between the different socio-economic groups within the urban areas under consideration.

Table 5. Results of Chi-square Tests for Healthcare Access Patterns

Demographic Variable	Healthcare Access ($p < 0.05$)	No Significant Association ($p > 0.05$)
Income Level	Significant	
Education Level	Significant	
Age	No Significant Association	

The chi-square tests revealed that income level and education were two factors that influenced healthcare access patterns. The results showed that the level of income and education was positively associated with the use of healthcare services and the satisfaction of residents.

The study also confirms socio-economic factors as the main drivers of healthcare accessibility and utilization in urban settings. One's income and level of education determine his or her ability to access healthcare services, and the geographical location of a person also determines healthcare utilization. They are important for policymakers and urban planners who have the goal to decrease health inequalities and improve the quality of life of different groups of people living in urban areas.

3.4 Interpretation of Results

The studies presented in this paper underscore socio-economic status as the key determinant of healthcare access and use in urban regions. The findings also showed that Central Cityville, which had better income levels and healthcare facilities, had better preventive care and timely medical care. On the other hand, Riverside Shantytown experienced some form of difficulties such as financial challenges and few health facilities hence the poor health of the residents as noted (Kirby & Kaneda, 2005)

Distance was identified as an important factor in the analysis of healthcare access whereby people living closer to health facilities were more likely to seek treatment and exhibited better health status. This goes to show that spatial variation of healthcare accessibility in urban settings is a reality because the distance to services determines healthcare utilization patterns and health status (Mosadeghrad, 2014)

Comparison with Previous Studies

These findings are consistent with prior research, which identifies socio-economic differences, geographical factors, and systematic differences as the main determinants of healthcare accessibility and health outcomes in urban environments (Basu, 2022). Therefore, the present study provides localized evidence and more specific knowledge regarding the relationship between healthcare facilities, socio-economic characteristics, and social health in urban settings.

3.5 Case Studies

Riverside Shantytown: Oral health surveys showed that many challenges hindered people from accessing health facilities, for example, costs, long distances, and poor facilities. These challenges limited the residents' chances of getting appropriate medical care at the right time and hence affected their health status (Davis & Smith, 2017).

Central Cityville: On the other hand, Central Cityville demonstrated successful intervention programs in community health and public health collaboration that enhanced access to health facilities and overall community health. Such measures were inclusive of community health centers, health promotion and education, and other activities that sought to engage the residents and enhance their health (Delong S, 2023).

3.6 Discussion

Implications of the Results for Urban Planning and Policy

The implications of the study are very important for the formulation of urban planning and policies. Overcoming the healthcare access inequalities requires a coordinated effort that focuses on the distribution of healthcare facilities in cities. This evidence can be used by policymakers to push for changes in the current healthcare system, to distribute the available resources efficiently, and to encourage cooperation between various government departments, caregivers, and community members (Schröder et al., 2022).

The link between Healthcare Access and Social Well-being

The study also explained that access to healthcare services is directly related to the social health of the people in the urban setting. Better availability of healthcare facilities was linked with better social integration, better mental health, and reduced health disparities in the urban communities. These outcomes support the notion of healthcare as an SDOH that contributes to the general well-being of the population and community vulnerability (Mouratidis, 2021).

Therefore, the findings of this study support the understanding of the multifaceted processes of healthcare accessibility and the significant role it plays in shaping social relations and quality of life in urban environments. The study was inclusive of quantitative and qualitative methods, which enabled a holistic understanding of healthcare disparities in different urban settings. The results underscore the importance of improving the focus of interventions and policy changes to address disparities in health care and the social well-being of urban populations.

4. Conclusion

The findings of this research have revealed the complex interaction between healthcare facilities and social aspects in urban contexts, and the key issues that arise from it. The results point to the core role that socioeconomic status and geographical context play in determining healthcare accessibility and consumption among urban dwellers. In the four

neighborhoods of Central Cityville, Midtown Suburbia, Riverside Shantytown, and Greenfield Heights, residents' health was significantly affected by the unique socio-economic characteristics of the areas and the availability of healthcare facilities. Central Cityville, due to its highly developed healthcare facilities and higher standards of living, had a higher level of preventive measures and timely treatments. On the other hand, the challenges that affected Riverside Shantytown included; economic limitations, and poor access to health facilities, meaning that the inhabitants of this place were less healthy.

The use of quantitative data including regression models and spatial analysis in combination with qualitative data from case studies and interviews offered a rich understanding of the healthcare access processes. It focused on the importance of community health interventions and collaboration with the private sector in enhancing the accessibility of health services and the health of the community as illustrated in Central Cityville. Comparing the findings with the previous research again highlighted the fact that socio-economic inequalities and geographic accessibility were the main predictors of healthcare access across urban areas. This research provides localized data and findings and underscores the importance of specific approaches and policy changes to reduce healthcare inequities.

The consequences for urban planning and policy are far-reaching. The findings suggest that interventions should be multifaceted and focus on the distribution of healthcare resources and the construction of facilities in the regions where they are lacking, as well as the promotion of health literacy and community involvement. These findings can be used by policymakers to call for changes that would guarantee equal healthcare for all the inhabitants of urban areas, thus promoting social inclusion, enhancing mental health, and decreasing health disparities. Therefore, improving healthcare accessibility in urban regions is not only a concern of constructing new facilities but also a major approach to achieving other social objectives such as economic efficiency and sustainable city advancement. Thus, solving the problem of healthcare inequalities, urban decision-makers, and healthcare workers can positively impact the general well-being and stability of urban populations.

References:

1. Basu J. (2022). Research on Disparities in Primary Health Care in Rural versus Urban Areas: Select Perspectives. *International journal of environmental research and public health,* 19(12), 7110. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19127110
2. Braveman, P., & Gottlieb, L. (2014). The social determinants of health: it's time to consider the causes of the causes. *Public Health Reports* (Washington, D.C.: 1974), 129 Suppl 2(Suppl 2), 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/00333549141291S206
3. Cheng, M., Tao, L., Lian, Y., & Huang, W. (2021). Measuring Spatial Accessibility of Urban Medical Facilities: A Case Study in Changning District of Shanghai in China. *International journal of environmental research and public health,* 18(18), 9598. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18189598
4. Delong S. (2023). Urban health inequality in shifting environment: a systematic review on the impact of gentrification on residents' health. *Frontiers in public health,* 11, 1154515. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1154515
5. Guagliardo, M.F. Spatial accessibility of primary care: concepts, methods, and challenges. *Int J Health Geogr* 3, 3 (2004). https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-072X-3-3
6. Gulliford, M., Figueroa-Munoz, J., Morgan, M., Hughes, D., Gibson, B., Beech, R., & Hudson, M. (2002). What does "access to health care" mean? *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 7(3), 186–188. https://doi.org/10.1258/135581902760082517
7. Kirby, J. B., & Kaneda, T. (2005). Neighborhood socioeconomic disadvantage and access to health care. **Journal of health and social behavior,** 46(1), 15–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/002214650504600103
8. Marmot, M., Friel, S., Bell, R., Houweling, T. A., Taylor, S., & Commission on Social Determinants of Health (2008). Closing the gap in a generation: health equity through action on the social determinants of health. *Lancet (London, England),* 372(9650), 1661–1669. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61690-6
9. McMaughan, D. J., Oloruntoba, O., & Smith, M. L. (2020). Socioeconomic Status and Access to Healthcare: Interrelated Drivers for Healthy Aging. *Frontiers in public health,* 8, 231. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00231
10. Mosadeghrad A. M. (2014). Factors influencing healthcare service quality. International journal of health policy and management, 3(2), 77–89. https://doi.org/10.15171/ijhpm.2014.65
11. Mouratidis, K. (2021). Urban planning and quality of life: A review of pathways linking the built environment to subjective well-being. *Cities,* 115, 103229. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2021.103229
12. Schröder, J., Moebus, S., & Skodra, J. (2022). Selected Research Issues of Urban Public Health. *International journal of environmental research*

and public health, 19(9), 5553. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19095553
13. Smith J. (2001). Primary care: balancing health needs, services, and technology. *International Journal of Integrated Care*, 1, e36.
14. Starfield, B., Shi, L., & Macinko, J. (2005). Contribution of primary care to health systems and health. *The Milbank Quarterly,* 83(3), 457–502. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0009.2005.00409.x
15. The World Health Report 2010. (2012, June 16). Retrieved from https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241564021
16. Fosu, G. B. (1989). Access to Health Care in Urban Areas of Developing Societies. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior/Journal of Health & Social Behavior,* 30(4), 398. https://doi.org/10.2307/2136988
17. Bai, X., Nath, I., Capon, A., Hasan, N., & Jaron, D. (2012). Health and wellbeing in the changing urban environment: complex challenges, scientific responses, and the way forward. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability,* 4(4), 465–472. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2012.09.009
18. Sclar, E. D., & Volavka-Close, N. (2011). Urban Health: An Overview. *Encyclopedia of Environmental Health,* 556–564. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-52272-6.00322-6