

1 **Title: Individual and organisational interactions, learning and information sharing in a multi-**
2 **country implementation-focused quality of care network for maternal, newborn and child health:**
3 **a social network analysis**

4

5 **Short title: Quality of care network for maternal, newborn and child health: a social network**
6 **analysis**

7

8 Fidele Kanyimbu Mukinda^{1*}, Nehla Djellouli², Kohenour Akter³, Mithun Sarker³, Asebe Amenu Tufa⁴,
9 Kondwani Mwandira⁵, Gloria Seruwagi⁶, Agnes Kyamulabi⁶, Kasonde Mwaba², Tanya Marchant⁷,
10 Yusra R. Shawar^{8,9}, Mike English¹⁰, Hilda Namakula⁶, Geremew Gonfa¹¹, QCN Evaluation Group, Tim
11 Colbourn², Mary V. Kinney^{1*}

12 ¹School of Public Health, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa.

13 ² Institute for Global Health, University College London, London, UK.

14 ³Perinatal Care Project, Diabetic Association of Bangladesh, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

15 ⁴Ethiopian Public Health Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

16 ⁵Parent And Child Health Initiative PACHI, Lilongwe, Malawi.

17 ⁶ School of Public Health, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.

18 ⁷ Department of Disease Control, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK.

19 ⁸ Department of International Health, School of Public Health, John Hopkins University, Baltimore,
20 USA.

21 ⁹ School of Advanced International Studies, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, USA.

22 ¹⁰ Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

23 ¹¹ Ethiopian Public Health Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

24

25 *Corresponding authors: School of Public Health, University of the Western Cape, Robert Sobukwe
26 Road, Private Bag X17 - Bellville, Cape Town 7535, South Africa. E-mail: mvkinney@gmail.com -
27 fidelekmukinda@gmail.com

28

29

30 Abstract (292/300)

31 The Network for Improving Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health (QCN) was
32 established to build a cross-country platform for joint-learning around quality improvement
33 implementation approaches to reduce mortality. This paper describes and explores the structure of
34 the QCN in four countries and at global level.

35 Using Social Network Analysis (SNA), this cross-sectional study maps the QCN networks at global level
36 and in four countries (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda) and assesses the interactions among
37 actors involved. A pre-tested closed-ended structured questionnaire was completed by 302 key actors
38 in early 2022 following purposeful and snowballing sampling. Data were entered into an online survey
39 tool, and exported into Microsoft Excel for data management and analysis. This study received ethical
40 approval as part of a broader evaluation.

41 The SNA identified 566 actors across the four countries and at global level. Bangladesh, Malawi and
42 Uganda had multiple-hub networks signifying multiple clusters of actors reflecting facility or district
43 networks, whereas the network in Ethiopia and at global level had more centralized networks. There
44 were some common features across the country networks, such as low overall density of the network,
45 engagement of actors at all levels of the system, membership of related committees identified as the
46 primary role of actors, and interactions spanning all types (learning, action and information sharing).
47 The most connected actors were facility level actors in all countries except Ethiopia, which had mostly
48 national level actors.

49 The results reveal the uniqueness and complexity of each network assessed in the evaluation. They
50 also affirm the broader qualitative evaluation assessing the nature of these networks, including
51 composition and leadership. Gaps in communication between members of the network and limited
52 interactions of actors between countries and with global level actors signal opportunities to
53 strengthen QCN.

54

55

56

57

58 Keywords: Quality of care network; Maternal, newborn and child health;

60 Introduction

61 In 2017, a ‘global network’ approach was established to address the high burden of maternal and
62 perinatal mortality and morbidity in low- and middle-income countries, called ‘The Network for
63 Improving Quality of Care for Maternal, Newborn and Child Health’ (QCN) [1]. Originally established
64 by nine countries (Bangladesh, Côte d’Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Malawi, Nigeria, Tanzania and
65 Uganda - later joined by Sierra Leone and Kenya), and supported by the World Health Organization
66 (WHO), the H6 partnership and partners from all stakeholder groups, the network aimed to build a
67 cross-country platform for joint-learning around quality improvement (QI) implementation
68 approaches and shared health outcome goals [1]. QI networks facilitate the diffusion of information
69 between groups of people and offer an opportunity for health professionals across boundaries to learn
70 and apply QI methods. As more countries are initiating or strengthening QI collaboratives or networks
71 to improve healthcare services and outcomes [2, 3] , such as the QCN, there is need to systematically
72 understand their composition including the actors engaged and their level of engagement.

73

74 Global health networks are “webs of individuals and organizations” which emerge either as formal or
75 informal entities that have the potential to evolve and influence policy and practice for health
76 conditions or focus areas,[4] in this case maternal, perinatal, and newborn health [5]. Social Network
77 Analysis (SNA) is one method that allows for the examination of these networks by considering how
78 individual actors interact to form social structures [6]. Box 1 presents details about the methodology,
79 key terms and measures for SNA [7, 8]. Two structural types of networks can be observed using SNA:
80 dense networks with a higher degree of interconnectedness, and less dense networks with less
81 connections between actors displaying structural holes [8]; the latter is characteristic of most health
82 professional organisations where groups are working in silos [9]. In QI collaborative networks, there
83 is focus on building the relationships and interactions between network actors, given that not all
84 actors in the network are connected to each other (lower density) [10]. Collaborative relationships
85 can, however, be hampered by actors’ professional or organisational culture, differences in
86 professional power or knowledge that can affect effectiveness and efficiency of the services provided
87 [11].

88

Box 1. Stakeholder Network Analysis overview

Using mathematical tools and specialized software packages, SNA analyses can map entities, people or events (nodes) and their relationships (paths). The method involves asking respondents (egos) to identify key members (alters) in their network in relation to a question of interest, where responses to the questions may be binary, indicating the presence of a relationship, or on a continuum, reflecting the strength of the relationship [9]. SNA systematically maps the connections across individuals to show the patterns of relationships (ties) between actors (nodes), and explores their interactions and social structures.

Key terms include:

- Node: Actors that make up the network (e.g. a single actor)
- Edges: Lines (or ties) that connect the nodes together
- Bridges: Actors that facilitate information to reach those that are isolated in the network
- Brokers: Actors that facilitate the transfer of specialized knowledge between groups
- Density: The extent to which all possible relations are actually present. It measures how the network is close to completeness or the level of connectedness in a network [12].
- Centrality: Number of connections (or ties) one node has to other nodes. If a node has many ties compared with actors, this indicates that this node has a central position in the network.
- Degree centrality (In-degree): The number of immediate contacts (alters**) an actor (ego*) has in a network. It is measured by counting the number of alters adjacent to the ego. Central connectors will have higher degree centrality, while the peripheral actor will have the lowest degree centrality.
 - In-degree refers to the number of edges which are coming into a node, it indicates the more popular actors as receivers of ties [12].
 - Weighted in-degree refers to the number of in-coming edges, weighted by the weight of each edge.
- Ego* and Alters**: Ego in SNA is the focal node, the respondent. The nodes to whom ego is directly connected to are named 'alters.

89

90 Building QI networks is a continuous process and thus, it can go through the following four stages
91 described by Valdis and Holley (13) that provide a typology of four distinct network structures: (i)
92 *Scattered Fragments network*, (ii) *Single Hub-and-Spoke network*, (iii) *Multi-Hub Small-World Network*,
93 *and (iv) Core/Periphery network*. In scattered fragment network, no connections exist or spontaneous
94 connections are emerging between actors because no one takes the lead to build a network. In a single
95 hub-and-spoke network, one central actor (hub) connects diverse individuals or groups based on

96 his/her vision, social skills and links outside the network. Multiple hubs can work together in the same
97 network (*Multi-Hub Small-World Network*). A well-developed or mature network (core/periphery) is
98 dense with high concentration of connections. SNA can facilitate to identify the need for shifting some
99 connections to avoid network overload and rigidity in case of higher density [13].

100

101 This paper is part of a collection evaluating the emergence, legitimacy and effectiveness of the QCN
102 (supplement 1 – 2-page summary of series of papers). In this paper, we explore and describe the
103 structure of the QCN and map actors involved at different levels in the four QCN countries involved in
104 the broader study (Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda) by examining the quality of interactions
105 between actors. We focus specifically on the following domains - information sharing, collective
106 learning and taking collective action to improve the quality of care; these are related to the QCN
107 strategic objectives of Learning, Action, Leadership and Accountability [14].

108

109 **Methods**

110 **Study Design**

111 A cross-sectional survey study was conducted using SNA to assess interactions among actors involved
112 in the QCN at global level and in four countries at national and local levels: Bangladesh, Ethiopia,
113 Malawi and Uganda. In this paper, we focus on data from the SNA to estimate the density of the
114 network as well as the (weighted – determined by the frequency of interaction) indegree centrality
115 (Box 1) as two main measures of the network properties related to the level of connectedness and the
116 actors' role and position within the network.

117 **Study setting**

118 The setting of each network is different with respect to political engagement, and on-going and
119 planned activities related to maternal, newborn and child health that could be leveraged or be a
120 barrier to successful emergence, legitimacy and effectiveness of QCN [4, 15, 16]. Other papers in this
121 collection, focused on QCN emergence [4] and QCN effectiveness [16] found the conditions to be most
122 favourable for the network in Bangladesh, followed by Ethiopia, Uganda and Malawi. Supplementary
123 file 1 - Country Context - summarizes the situations for each setting to add context to our work and
124 explain the relevance of this study.

125 Study population and sampling

126 Specific to the SNA analysis, 302 respondents were selected among those involved in the QCN, as
 127 identified through the evaluation, [4, 15, 16] using purposeful and snowballing sampling approaches
 128 based on respondents' expertise and membership in the network. They were from national and local
 129 levels in Bangladesh (n=47), Ethiopia (n=45), Malawi (n=85), and Uganda (n=113), as well as global
 130 level actors (n=12). Characteristics of respondents varied by network; for instance, there were less
 131 females in Ethiopia as compared to more in Malawi and Uganda (Table 1). In each country network,
 132 different units were considered to ensure a well-stratified sample including facility, sub-national and
 133 national level. Within these units, the sampling also took into consideration the primary role of actors
 134 in the network as well as their professional backgrounds. [Details on country sampling approach
 135 including snowballing which led to ~200% response rates in Malawi and Uganda]

136 **Table 1: Characteristics of respondents**

		Bangladesh	Ethiopia	Malawi	Uganda	Global	Total
Survey sample size (n)		55	50	43	56	36	240
Responded (Response rate %)		47 (85.5)	45 (90)	85 (197.7)	113 (201.8)	12 (33.3)	302 (125.8)
<i>Characteristics of respondents</i>							
Gender							
		n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	
	Male	28 (58.3)	39 (86.7)	27 (31.8)	22 (19.5)	3 (25.0)	119 (39.3)
	Female	20 (41.7)	6 (13.3)	58 (68.2)	91 (80.5)	9 (75.0)	184 (60.7)
Professional background							
	Doctors	26 (54.2)	11 (24.4)	1 (1.2)	15 (13.3)	9 (75.0)	62 (20.5)
	Nurses	8 (16.7)	9 (20.0)	74 (87.1)	93 (82.3)	1 (8.3)	185 (61.1)
	Other	14 (29.2)	25 (55.6)	10 (11.8)	5 (4.4)	2 (16.7)	56 (18.5)
Level of involvement in network (n=291)							
	Facility	31 (64.6)	29 (64.4)	78 (91.8)	101 (89.4)	-	239 (82.1)
	Sub-national	3 (6.3)	7 (8.9)	6 (7.1)	8 (7.1)	-	24 (8.2)
	National	13 (27.1)	9 (20.0)	1 (1.2)	4 (3.4)	-	27 (9.3)
	Global	1				-	1 (0.3)

Role in the network							
	Frontline health worker	11 (22.9)	29 (64.4)	80 (94.1)	92 (81.4)		212 (70.0)
	Implementing partner	13 (27.1)	4 (8.9)	-	2 (1.8)	5 (41.7)	24 (7.9)
	Member of any related committee	20 (41.7)	10 (22.2)	4 (4.7)	16 (14.2)	1 (8.3)	51 (16.8)
	Technical partner	1(2.1)	2 (4.4)	1 (1.2)	3 (2.7)	6 (50.0)	13 (4.3)
	Other	3 (6.3)			-		3 (1.0)

138 Data collection and analysis

139 Data collection and analysis was done following the steps described by Blanchet and James (17). First,
140 a closed-ended structured questionnaire (Supplementary file 2) was developed, pre-tested in
141 collaboration with co-authors familiar with the local context. The first part of the questionnaire
142 included questions on respondents' basic characteristics such as sex, current job (cadre) and their role
143 in the network specific to each country. The second part explored the domains of interaction networks
144 within the QCN, starting by establishing the existence of interaction between actors, to include the
145 frequency and the quality of interaction (Box 2).

Box 2: Components of data collection tool

Domains and related questions

- Establishing interactions (Yes/No): Have you interacted with this individual on the Quality of Care Network?
- Frequency of interactions: Please indicate how often you interact with this individual on matters related to the Quality of Care Network (never=1, annually=2, bi-annually=3, quarterly=4, monthly=5, weekly=6, daily=7)
- Quality of interactions (yes/no):
 - Collective learning: Have you undertaken some learning activities related to Quality of Care Network with this individual?
 - Taking actions: Have you taken forward actions related to Quality of Care Network with this individual?

- Information-sharing: Have you shared information related to the Quality of Care Network with this individual?

146

147 A list of names (roster) was collated by co-authors involved in the evaluation from other aspects of
 148 the QCN evaluation. Each survey included a list of between 20-30 names of stakeholders by global,
 149 national, and subnational/facility level. Individuals completing the survey were asked a set of
 150 questions for each stakeholder on the list (Box 2) and could add names of other individuals who they
 151 interacted with around the QCN network. For each question, a list was presented to the respondents
 152 (egos) from which they had to select with whom they interacted with (alters) [18]. Respondents were
 153 allowed to add any names not included in the list. For the ‘frequency of interaction’, egos had to
 154 indicate with the corresponding number, how often they interacted with each alter. For the other
 155 questions, respondents were requested to indicate with a tick the people relevant to each question.
 156 To ensure high turnout of participation in the survey, in settings where internet connectivity was
 157 available, a web-based survey was used; where internet connection was reported as a problem, a
 158 paper-based approach was followed. Specific contextual adaption to the data collection approach was
 159 done for each country (Table 2). Dissemination of the survey included face-to-face questionnaires,
 160 email, announcements during meetings, and paper-based questionnaires disseminated to key
 161 stakeholders.

162 **Table 2: Data collection process**

Network	Time frame of data collection	Dissemination of survey	Details on data entry into online platform
Bangladesh	January –March 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Face-to-face interview using paper-based questionnaire with national level MOH stakeholders (by KA, MS) ▪ Remote interviews (by phone) to key stakeholders at local level; ▪ Online survey emailed individually to key implementing national partners with follow up after 1 week if no response. If there were gaps, email or phone was used to communicate and address issues. ▪ Online survey shared to broader national level QCN stakeholders through a Zoom meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Manual entry of data from paper-based questionnaire to online survey after most interviews completed.

		Local level data collected over phone by MS.	
Ethiopia	February-March 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Face-to-face interview using paper-based questionnaire with stakeholders at national, subnational and facility level involved in QCN. 	Manual entry of data from paper-based questionnaire to online survey after all interviews were completed.
Malawi	March 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Online survey shared to broader national level QCN stakeholders through email or WhatsApp including MOH, donors, and implementing partners. ▪ Paper-based questionnaires shared by study team; completed by participants on their own time; and collected by study team at local and facility level 	Manual entry of data from paper-based questionnaire to online survey after all interviews were completed and questionnaires collected.
Uganda	February – April 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Online survey emailed to QCN mailing lists via MOH to national level stakeholders ▪ Face-to-face interview using paper-based questionnaire of frontline health workers 	Manual entry of data from paper-based questionnaire to online survey during data collection period when internet connectivity allowed.
Global	February 28 – April 15 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Online survey emailed to key global stakeholders (including individuals involved in other country QCN teams). ▪ Reminder email sent after 2 weeks for those who did not complete. 	All participants completed the online survey directly.

163

164 Data were entered into the online survey, using the UCL-based online survey tool Opinio, by the
 165 participants who completed the online survey or country specific co-authors who entered in the
 166 data on this platform from paper-based questionnaires (AAT, MS, CN, AK, HN, LC). The data were
 167 exported into Microsoft Excel® 2019 (Microsoft, USA) for data management and analysis. Two
 168 authors (FKM, MK) continuously crosschecked the data to correct inconsistencies and errors in
 169 consultation with other co-authors. The Excel matrices were saved as comma-delimited value (.csv)
 170 sheets and imported into Gephi V0.9.4 that was used for network visualisation and to generate
 171 directed sociographs that is, ties are indicated with a headed arrow. The direction of the arrow
 172 (edge) goes from the ego (arrow tail) point to the alter (arrowhead). Reciprocal relationships are
 173 displayed by a double-headed arrow. The graphs were generated by level of involvement and by the

174 primary role of actors' engagement in the QCN. An actor in the network was represented by a coded
175 circle (node). The size of the node relates to the number of respondents who identified the node.

176 Positionality, rigour, reflexivity data validation

177 Two authors external to the QCN analysed the data (FKM, MK). Several meetings were held with the
178 study team to discuss the findings after data analysis. Country data leads received a summary of the
179 findings and three questions for reflection and interpretation for these meetings (See Supplement 3 –
180 Data validation questions).

181 Ethical considerations

182 Ethical approval was obtained from University College London Research Ethics Committee (3433/003),
183 BADAS Ethical Review Committee (ref: BADAS-ERC/EC/19/00274), Ethiopian Public Health Institute
184 Institutional Review Board (ref: EPHI-IRB-240-2020), National Health Sciences Research Committee in
185 Malawi (ref: 19/03/2264) and Makerere University Institutional Review Board (ref: Protocol 869). An
186 information sheet detailing the survey was provided to all respondents; the survey questionnaire was
187 completed after obtaining informed consent. All data is confidential and anonymised.

188 Results

189 Characteristics of respondents and composition of networks

190 Across the five surveys, respondents identified 566 actors (or nodes) engaged with the QCN, ranging
191 from 89 actors in Ethiopia to 211 actors in Uganda. The actors identified in these networks worked at
192 various levels and had a range of roles related to the network (Fig 1), including frontline health
193 workers, member of QCN related committees, technical or implementing partner.

194 Figure 1: Characteristics of actors identified in the network

195 Figure 1a: Level of actors identified in the networks

196 Figure 1b: Primary role of actors in the network

197

198 Respondents in Malawi and Uganda identified mostly facility level actors in their networks (81% and
199 64%, respectively); whereas respondents in Bangladesh and Ethiopia identified more national and
200 global level actors. The global level respondents revealed about half of the actors identified were at
201 global level (48%) and the other half among national actors across the four countries we included (15%
202 Bangladesh, 14% Ethiopia, 12% Malawi, and 14% Uganda). Country level respondents mostly
203 identified actors whose primary role in the network was frontline health workers (42% across all

204 countries) or a member of a related QCN committee (30% across all countries). Ethiopia's QCN
205 network included more technical partners (29%). For the global level, technical partner was the
206 primary role of actors in the network (50%) with most of these actors operating at national level.
207 Among the country actors identified in the global network, the majority were either members of
208 committees or implementing partners (46% and 36%, respectively) (Supplementary file 4 – More
209 details).

210

211 Network structure, density, and key actors

212 The analyses revealed different types of networks (Table 3, Figure 2). The networks in Bangladesh,
213 Malawi and Uganda were multiple-hub networks signifying multiple clusters of actors, reflected by
214 the facility or district networks. The networks in Ethiopia and at global level were more centralized
215 core/periphery structures with central actors at the core and other actors in the periphery. Table 3
216 provides further description of each network and the interactions among actors. All networks
217 reflected the national hierarchies and the organization of the health system to some extent, with
218 national actors often more central and serving as bridges or connectors to subnational actors, who
219 served as connectors to facility level actors. These actors facilitate the transfer of specialised
220 knowledge. However, national and subnational actors engaged facility actors more directly in some
221 networks, such as Ethiopia and Malawi.

222 Figure 2: Network map – interactions by frequency

223 Figure 2a: Bangladesh QCN Network Map

224 Figure 2b: Ethiopia QCN Network Map

225 Figure 2c: Malawi QCN Network Map

226 Figure 2d: Uganda QCN Network Map

227 Figure 2e: Global QCN Network Map

228

229 The network density was very low for all networks. Less than 10% of all potential connections were
230 present demonstrating a low level of interactions between and across levels in the QCN (Table 3,
231 Appendix). The networks in Bangladesh (5% density) and Ethiopia (5% density) had higher density than
232 the other three networks (Malawi: 2% density, Uganda: 2% density, Global: 3% density; Table 3).

233 The central actors in each network varied (Table 3, Appendix). Actors with the highest weighted in-
234 degree scores ranged from national level actors in Ethiopia, to subnational level actors in Bangladesh
235 and Uganda, and facility level actors in Malawi. However, among the top 10 actors in each country
236 network, facility level actors were dominant in all except Ethiopia, which had mostly national level
237 actors. The primary role of these top actors across all countries was membership of a related
238 committee. Implementing partner comprised the primary role for 23 actors (22%, Figure 1b) in the

239 Bangladesh network. For the global network, the central actors identified worked primarily for the
 240 World Health Organization. The global actors identified by country networks were primarily global
 241 technical or implementation partners, including WHO, other UN agencies, academic organizations,
 242 and bilateral programs. Only a few respondents from the country surveys identified other country
 243 actors. For example, a Ugandan respondent added someone from the Tanzania Ministry of Health as
 244 part of their network.

245 **Table 3: Network structures, density, central actors and interactions**

246

Network	Structure uniqueness	Network Density (% of actual connections)	Primary actors identified (based on weighted indegree)	Nature of Interactions
Bangladesh	Multiple-hub network including a hub of national actors interacting with each other and global level actors and multiple clusters of facility level actors connected by national and subnational actors. Global actors identified as part of network linked to national level actors.	4.6%	Top central actor: subnational level Majority of top 10 actors: facility level Main roles of top 10 actors: implementing partner or member of committee Majority of actors: facility level	Most actors indicated that they interact across all three domains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning – 91% • Action – 91% • Information sharing – 93%
Ethiopia	Core/ periphery network with the majority of central actors at national level interacting with other national actors with some connections to subnational, facility and global actors. Both national and subnational actors interact with facility level actors. The structure of the network shows lots of reciprocal relationships between actors displayed by the doubled-arrowed ties. Global actors identified as part of network linked to national level actors.	5%	Top central actor: national level Majority of top 10 actors: national level Main roles of top 10 actors: member of committee and implementing partner Majority of actors: facility level	Most actors indicated that they interact across all three domains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning – 87% • Action – 86% • Information sharing – 87%
Malawi	Multiple-hub network with four hubs displayed. While the majority of central actors to the network are	1.7%	Top central actor: facility level Majority of top 10 actors: facility level	Most actors indicated that they interact across all three domains:

	at facility level, national actors are central connectors. Global actors rarely identified by actors as part of the network.		Main roles of top 10 actors: member of committee Majority of actors: facility level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning – 85% • Action – 85% • Information sharing – 84%
Uganda	Multiple-hub network with five hubs displayed – four facility clusters and national level cluster. The central actors involved are primarily subnational actors, although one national actor is also central. Global actors rarely identified by actors as part of the network.	1.6%	Top central actor: subnational level Majority of top 10 actors: facility level Main roles of top 10 actors: member of committee Majority of actors: facility level	Most actors indicated that they interact across all three domains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning – 99% • Action – 99% • Information sharing – 99%
Global	Core/ periphery network with the majority of central actors global actors who interact mostly among themselves. One global actor is the primary connector with country level actors but other global actors also have direct interactions.	3.1%	Top central actor: global level (World Health Organization) Majority of top 10 actors: global level (World Health Organization) Main roles of top 10 actors: technical partner Majority of actors: global level	Most actors indicated that they interact across all three domains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning – 73% • Action – 60% • Information sharing – 80%

247
248 Regarding the nature of interactions, the majority actors in the country networks (~90% in total)
249 indicated that they interacted across all three domains (Table 3). There was also little variation across
250 the different domains of interactions within each country network (learning, action, information
251 sharing). For the global network, more actors interacted with information sharing (80%) as opposed
252 to learning (73%) and taking forward actions (60%). The frequency of interactions varied by network
253 (Figure 3).

254 **Figure 3: Frequency of interactions by network**

255
256 Depending on the nature of the respondents, three quarters (77%) of the actors in the Bangladesh
257 network interacted on a regular basis (daily, weekly or monthly); whereas three-quarters of the actors
258 in the Ethiopian network interacted less regularly (quarterly, biannually, or annually). The networks in
259 Malawi and Uganda had a more equal spread on frequency of interactions.

260

261 Discussion

262 This study reveals the uniqueness and complexity of the five networks assessed for the QCN - four
263 countries and global partners. There are some common features across the country networks, such as
264 low overall density, engagement of actors at all levels of the system, similar roles of actors, and
265 interactions spanning all types (learning, action and information sharing). The low network density
266 indicates low levels of connection and interactions among QCN actors at various health system levels.
267 Interactions were centralised around a few actors, but with little engagement and interactions among
268 the majority of actors. Important distinctions between the networks include the varying frequency of
269 interactions and structure nature, with three countries—Bangladesh, Uganda and Malawi—
270 demonstrating multiple-hub networks.

271 Overall, the results display the level of interactions between network members and substantiate the
272 qualitative findings of the QCN evaluation, especially those pertaining to political and normative
273 interactions between stakeholder organisations [15], and the pathways through which the network
274 emerged from the global level, through national and sub-national levels [4]. While the four country
275 networks report to have decentralized health systems, there are some variances when it comes to
276 implementation, as reflected by Shawar and colleagues [4], and confirmed by this study. For instance,
277 in Ethiopia where central network position was played by the national actors, qualitative findings
278 showed that actors from the national level were the initiators and were perceived as owners of the
279 network; by their position, they were responsible for connecting with local levels [15]. Similarly in
280 Malawi, central actors were identified at facility level with some connection with sub-national and
281 national level [15]. These facility actors played a central role in the identification of quality
282 improvement issues, development and implementation of projects. The national level was found to
283 be less prominent in Malawi than the other three countries despite the initial strong leadership of the
284 Quality Management Directorate in the Malawi Ministry of Health and the launch of the QCN in
285 Lilongwe, Malawi in Feb 2017 [4]. This variation could be because the Malawi sample was mainly
286 comprised of facility level actors, or because the actors changed over time in Malawi. The Malawi
287 results may have differed slightly if implementing partners who were described as playing significant
288 roles in the provision of resources for activities, technical assistance and coordination were involved
289 [15]. In Uganda, we also see a multi-hub network but with central actors from the national level
290 bridging the sub-district and facility level actors facilitating, therefore, the flow of information within
291 the network. This may reflect, not only the role national actors have had in driving the previous QI
292 initiatives in Uganda, but also an active policy of decentralisation in the country [15].

293 In Bangladesh, the majority of actors identified in the SNA were from the facility and national level
294 with national and sub-national level actors playing crucial roles to connect to facility actors, each other
295 and global actors. This network emerged more quickly than the other countries since QCN was able
296 to build into an existing platform demonstrated by the higher network density. Only one focal person
297 from the national level linked with the global level [15].

298 At global level, the identified network through the SNA matched the observations of global meetings
299 and interview data [14]. Much of the work of the network was coordinated by global level actors from
300 the WHO, and technical and donor partner organisations, with national level actors in each country
301 generally being recipients of information. National level actors also disseminated information to the
302 global level and other partners during QCN webinars and during international meetings [19].

303 Despite the agreement between SNA findings and observations from the field, the results came with
304 some surprises that could be linked, in part, to the way data was collected (e.g. not surveying enough
305 actors at national level in Malawi). Globally, it was interesting to observe that the participants across
306 countries did not report interaction with each other even among the national level stakeholders. Even
307 though there was no specific question in this regard, names of other national actors were included on
308 the survey under the “global actors” category. In Ethiopia, national level respondents mentioned the
309 influence of COVID-19 on global interactions and reported limited online interactions as well. In
310 Bangladesh, the presence of a lay counsellor among the Top 10 with highest in-degree centrality did
311 not align with the other qualitative research findings [4, 15]

312 The QCN intervention took place at multiple scales and that to some extent can explain variations in
313 the patterns of interactions between countries. Pre-existing initiatives of implementing partners
314 across these countries had a large influence on which facilities were chosen given prior work [15].
315 While this undoubtedly shaped the structure of the networks, the SNA results did not identify many
316 implementation partners in the networks, with the exception of Bangladesh, though they are
317 identified as key actors by the qualitative research [4, 15]. Additionally, the network patterns observed
318 might, to some degree, reflect the political or administrative structures where there might be more
319 decentralisation in some countries or a more centralised (command and control) form of
320 administration in others. However, institutional and professional homophilies were reported as
321 explanatory factors for networks formation among health professionals sharing similar interests or
322 belonging to same organisation [20]. While respondents were asked about their professional
323 backgrounds, there was inconsistent reporting about health cadres preventing further exploration.
324 For example, we found many participants would identify as a specific health cadre (e.g. nurse or

325 doctor) but their role was not clinical (e.g. Director in the Ministry of Health or Program Manager for
326 an implementing partner).

327

328 Our study found that the primary role of top actors across all countries was ‘member of a related
329 committee’ and, overall, 30% of respondents reported this as their primary role in the network. This
330 finding aligns with the broader study which found that quality improvement committees were a core
331 output of the QCN at facility, subnational and national level [16] (common methods document –
332 supplement 1). For example, in Bangladesh, there were seven committees: the Upazilla Health
333 Complex Quality Improvement Committee (UHC-QIC), National QI Steering committee (N-QISC),
334 National QI technical Committee (N-QITC), National Task Force Committee (N-TFC), District Quality
335 Improvement Committee (D-QIC), District Hospital Quality Improvement Committee (DH-QIC), and
336 the Upazilla Quality Improvement Committee (Uz-QIC). These committees were generally perceived
337 to have multi-disciplinary representation, to be well supported by management and aligned with
338 government plans, though some thought coordination needed improvement [16]. In Malawi, there
339 were four committees: The Executive and Steering Committee, the Quality of Care Coordination Team,
340 the Quality Improvement Support Team (QIST), and the Work Improvement Team (WIT). The work of
341 the committees in Malawi was perceived less positively overall than in Bangladesh.

342 The SNA provides a valuable tool to identify key actors and analyse their interactions in QI initiatives,
343 such as the QCN; it can show the level of connectedness and the level of network fragmentation [21].
344 Applying the SNA to this study helps to identify which actors may be central to ensuring the QCN
345 remains well-connected. There is a call for increased use of SNA for improvement by both the World
346 Bank’s Independent Evaluation Group and the USAID’s Learning Lab [22-24]. This study is one of the
347 few studies using SNA methodology to explore the structure and interactions of a quality of care
348 network and is unique in its coverage of global, national and local levels of the network. Johnson and
349 Chew (24) recently argued that “the use of SNA to improve program design, program implementation,
350 and program evaluation and learning is quite limited” particularly in the field of international
351 development.

352 There are several limitations to this study. First, not everyone involved in the network participated in
353 the survey. The snowballing approach used for including respondents yielded not only different
354 sample sizes, but also an over-representation of people from similar organisational structures or level
355 of care, and this may have skewed our findings on the composition of the country networks.
356 Conducting the SNA after the qualitative studies in each country allowed teams to identify the key
357 actors involved and approach them for inclusion, although not all were able to participate. The SNA

358 results only reflect information from those who responded to survey; however, the
359 representativeness of the findings from the five networks were validated via the country teams and
360 the qualitative data. The wide variation between the five networks also signifies the uniqueness of
361 each context. This limits the generalisability of the findings to other countries or QI networks, and
362 emphasises the importance of context-specific case study research.

363

364 Recommendations

365 SNA can be of value to aid in planning for system improvement by identifying actors that can sustain
366 the network beyond external support and facilitation. Interactions between countries could have
367 happened more in QCN, and in general moving towards a denser core/periphery mature network in
368 each country as well as global-national-local would be good for quality of care networks like QCN. Our
369 broader work evaluating QCN found national level QCN structures were typically stronger than local
370 structures – the periphery of the network was far weaker [15, 16]. Further work is required to
371 strengthen the periphery of the network. This will require greater investment of time and resources
372 at the local level and creating and strengthening bi-directional links from the centre to the periphery
373 of the network. Furthermore, this requires increasing the frequency of interactions between and
374 within global, national and local levels that may result in a denser/more mature network better able
375 to facilitate improvement of quality of care.

376 Future study should explore how to better do SNA in complex, multilevel, multi-country collaborative
377 networks. As alluded to by McGlashan, de la Haye (25), in such complex networks, collaborations are
378 often centralised on a few central committee members who receive the bulk of incoming ties
379 compared to others. Therefore, support systems should be in place to allow frequent interactions
380 among actors within and between countries.

381 Conclusion

382 Collaboration and interactions between cadres involved in a complex network, such as the QCN, are
383 key ingredients for the success of such a network aiming to improve the quality of care. Our results
384 reveal the uniqueness and complexity of each network assessed in the evaluation. They also affirm
385 the broader qualitative evaluation assessing the nature of these networks, including composition and
386 leadership. This study found gaps in communication between members of the network as well as
387 limited interactions of actors between countries and with global level actors. To be effective,
388 interactions should be strengthened between actors at all levels, particularly at the periphery that is
389 the point of direct contact between the health system and the community receiving the services. Once

390 established, interactive networks reduce systemic fragmentation, facilitate information sharing,
391 learning, collective action and decision making [21]. International partners (such as WHO) can play a
392 crucial role in strengthening individual and organisational interactions and building cohesion across
393 levels and between countries.

394

395 Acknowledgements

396 We thank all respondents and stakeholders for their time and contributions toward making this work
397 possible. The QCN Evaluation Group is: Nehla Djellouli, Kasonde Mwaba, Callie Daniels-Howell, Tim
398 Colbourn (UCL Institute for Global Health, UK), Kohenour Akter, Fatama Khatun, Mithun Sarker, Abdul
399 Kuddus, Kishwar Azad (BADAS-PCP Bangladesh), Kondwani Mwandira, Albert Dube, Gladson Monjeza,
400 Rachel Magaletta, Zabvuta Moffolo, Charles Makwenda (Parent and Child Health Initiative, Malawi),
401 Mary Kinney, Fidele Mukinda (independent researchers, South Africa), Mike English (Oxford
402 University), Yusra Shawar, Will Payne, Jeremy Shiffman (Johns Hopkins University, USA), Kathy
403 Lubowa, Agnes Kyamulabi, Hilda Namakula, Gloria Seruwagi (Makerere University, Uganda), Anene
404 Tesfa, Asebe Amenu, Theodros Getachew, Geremew Gonfa (Ethiopia Public Health Institute, Ethiopia),
405 Seblewengel Lemma, Tanya Marchant (LSHTM, UK).

406

407 REFERENCES

- 408 1. WHO, UNICEF, UNFPA. Quality, equity, dignity: the network to improve quality of care for
409 maternal, newborn and child health – strategic objectives. Geneva: World Health Organization 2018.
- 410 2. ØVretveit J, Bate P, Cleary P, Cretin S, Gustafson D, McInnes K, et al. Quality collaboratives:
411 lessons from research. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2002;11(4):345-51. doi: 10.1136/qhc.11.4.345.
- 412 3. Carmone AE, Kalaris K, Leydon N, Sirivansanti N, Smith JM, Storey A, et al. Developing a
413 Common Understanding of Networks of Care through a Scoping Study. *Health Syst Reform*.
414 2020;6(2):1-13. doi: 10.1080/23288604.2020.1810921.
- 415 4. Shawar YR, Djellouli N, Payne W, Shiffman J, Colbourn T. Factors Shaping Network Emergence:
416 A Cross-Country Comparison of Quality of Care Networks in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Uganda and Malawi
417 Unpublished. 2023.
- 418 5. Shiffman J, Schmitz HP, Berlan D, Smith SL, Quissell K, Gneiting U, et al. The emergence and
419 effectiveness of global health networks: findings and future research. *Health Policy Plan*. 2016;31
420 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):i110-23. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czw012.

- 421 6. Dempwolf CS, Lyles LW. The Uses of Social Network Analysis in Planning: A Review of the
422 Literature. *Journal of Planning Literature*. 2012;27(1):3-21. doi: 10.1177/0885412211411092.
- 423 7. Cunningham FC, Ranmuthugala G, Plumb J, Georgiou A, Westbrook JI, Braithwaite J. Health
424 professional networks as a vector for improving healthcare quality and safety: a systematic review.
425 *BMJ Quality & Safety*. 2012;21(3):239. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000187.
- 426 8. Siriwardena AN. Understanding quality improvement through social network analysis. *Qual
427 Prim Care*. 2014;22(3):121-3.
- 428 9. Braithwaite J. Between-group behaviour in health care: gaps, edges, boundaries,
429 disconnections, weak ties, spaces and holes. A systematic review. *BMC Health Services Research*.
430 2010;10(1):1-11. doi: 10.1186/1472-6963-10-330.
- 431 10. Long JC, Cunningham FC, Braithwaite J. Bridges, brokers and boundary spanners in
432 collaborative network: a systematic review. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2013;13(158):1-13.
- 433 11. Steihaug S, Johannessen AK, Adnanes M, Paulsen B, Mannion R. Challenges in Achieving
434 Collaboration in Clinical Practice: The Case of Norwegian Health Care. *Int J Integr Care*. 2016;16(3):1-
435 13. PubMed PMID: 28435416.
- 436 12. De Brún A, McAuliffe E. Social Network Analysis as a Methodological Approach to Explore
437 Health Systems: A Case Study Exploring Support among Senior Managers/Executives in a Hospital
438 Network. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(3):1-11. Epub 2018/03/14. doi:
439 10.3390/ijerph15030511. PubMed PMID: 29534038; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5877056.
- 440 13. Valdis K, Holley J. Building smart communities through network weaving. Appalachian Center
441 for Economic Networks. Available at: <http://www.orgnet.com/BuildingNetworks.pdf> Accessed on 8
442 August 2022; 2006.
- 443 14. World Health Organization. Quality, equity, dignity: the network to improve quality of care for
444 maternal, newborn and child health – strategic objectives. Geneva: WHO; 2018.
- 445 15. Akter K, Shawar Y, Tesfa A, Daniels-Howell C, Seruwagi G, Kyamulabi A, et al. Influences on
446 policy-formulation, decision-making, organisation and management for maternal, newborn and child
447 health in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi and Uganda: the roles and legitimacy of a multi-country
448 network Unpublished. 2023.
- 449 16. Djellouli N, Shawar YR, Mwaba K, Akter K, Seruwagi G, Tufa AA, et al. Effectiveness of a multi-
450 country implementation-focused network on quality of care: delivery of interventions and processes
451 for improved maternal, newborn and child health outcomes. Unpublished. 2023.
- 452 17. Blanchet K, James P. How to do (or not to do) ... a social network analysis in health systems
453 research. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2012;27(5):438-46. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czr055.
- 454 18. Scott J, Carrington PJ. *The SAGE Handbook of Social Network Analysis*. London: SAGE; 2011.

- 455 19. Mwandira K, Lemma S, Akter K, Amenu Tufa A, Kyamulabi A, Nakidde C, et al. Do Networks
456 facilitate innovation, learning and sharing? An evaluation Case studies fromof the Quality-of-Care
457 Network (QCN) in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Malawi, and Uganda. Unpublished. 2023.
- 458 20. Mascia D, Di Vincenzo F, Iacopino V, Fantini MP, Cicchetti A. Unfolding similarity in
459 interphysician networks: the impact of institutional and professional homophily. BMC Health Serv Res.
460 2015;15:1-8. doi: 10.1186/s12913-015-0748-9. PubMed PMID: 25890319.
- 461 21. Mukinda FK, Van Belle S, Schneider H. Local Dynamics of Collaboration for Maternal, Newborn
462 and Child Health: A Social Network Analysis of Healthcare Providers and Their Managers in Gert
463 Sibande District, South Africa. Int J Health Policy Manag. 2021:1-11. doi: 10.34172/ijhpm.2021.106.
- 464 22. Vaessen J, Hamaguchi K. Group WB, editor.
465 <https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/blog/understanding-world-bank-groups-role>: World Bank
466 Independent Evaluation Group. 2017 8 October 2022. [cited 2022]. Available from:
467 <https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/blog/understanding-world-bank-groups-role>.
- 468 23. Baker M. USAID Learning Lab [Internet]. USAID, editor.
469 [https://usaidlearninglab.org/community/blog/demystifying-social-network-analysis-development-](https://usaidlearninglab.org/community/blog/demystifying-social-network-analysis-development-five-key-design-considerations)
470 [five-key-design-considerations](https://usaidlearninglab.org/community/blog/demystifying-social-network-analysis-development-five-key-design-considerations): USAID. 2019. [cited 2022].
- 471 24. Johnson EM, Chew R. Social Network Analysis Methods for International Development. RTI
472 Press Publication. 2021:1-10. doi: 10.3768/rtipress.2021.rb.0026.2105.
- 473 25. McGlashan J, de la Haye K, Wang P, Allender S. Collaboration in Complex Systems: Multilevel
474 Network Analysis for Community-Based Obesity Prevention Interventions. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):1-10.
475 doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-47759-4.
- 476
- 477




Figure 1a




Figure 1b




Figure 2a




Figure 2b




Figure 2d




Figure 2e




Figure 3