

1 Drivers of Early Childhood Vaccination Success in Nepal, Senegal, and Zambia: A
2 Multiple Case Study Analysis Using the Consolidated Framework of Implementation
3 Research

4 Authors: Cam Escoffery^a, Emily Ogutu^a, Zoe Sakas^a, Kyra A. Hester^a, Anna Ellis^a, Katie
5 Rodriguez^a, Chandni Jaishwal^a, Chenmua Yang^a, Sameer Dixit^d, Anindya Bose^e, Moussa
6 Sarr^d, William Kilembe^c, Robert A. Bednarczyk^a, Matthew C. Freeman^a

7 **Affiliations:**

8 ^a Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

9 ^b Center for Molecular Dynamics Nepal, Katmandu, Nepal

10 ^c Center for Family Health Research in Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

11 ^d Institut de Recherche en Santé de Surveillance Epidémiologique et de Formation
12 (IRESSEF), Dakar, Senegal

13 ^e WHO Nepal Immunization Preventable Disease Division

14 * Corresponding author: Matthew C. Freeman; matthew.freeman@emory.edu |
15 www.FreemanResearchGroup.org

16 **Abstract**

17 **Introduction** The fundamental components of a vaccine delivery system are well-
18 documented, but robust evidence is needed on *how* the related processes and
19 implementation strategies - including the facilitators and barriers- contribute to
20 improvements in childhood vaccination coverage. The purpose of this study was to
21 identify critical facilitators and barriers to the implementation of common interventions
22 across three countries that have dramatically increased coverage of early childhood

23 vaccination over the past 20 years, and to qualify common or divergent themes in their
24 success.

25 **Methods** We conducted 277 key informant interviews and focus group discussions with
26 public health leaders at the regional, district, and local levels and community members in
27 Nepal, Senegal, and Zambia to identify intervention activities and the facilitators and
28 barriers to implementation. We used thematic analysis grounded in the Consolidated
29 Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) to identify immunization program key
30 facilitators and barriers.

31 **Results** We found that the common facilitators to program implementation across the
32 countries were the CFIR inner setting constructs of 1) networks and communications, 2)
33 goals and feedback, 3) relative priority, and 4) readiness for implementation; and outer
34 setting constructs of 4) cosmopolitanism and 5) external policies and mandates. The
35 common barriers were incentives and rewards, available resources, access to knowledge
36 and information, and patients needs and resources. Critical to the success of these
37 national immunization programs were prioritization and codification of health as a
38 human right, clear chain of command and shared ownership of immunization,
39 communication of program goals and feedback, offering of incentives at multiple levels,
40 training of staff central to vaccination education, the provision of resources to support the
41 program, key partnerships and guidance on implementation and adoption of vaccination
42 policies.

43 **Conclusion** Adequate organizational commitment, resources, communication, training,
44 and partnerships were the most critical facilitators for these countries to improve
45 childhood vaccination.

46

47

48 Keywords: childhood immunization, exemplars, implementation science, routine

49 immunization, immunization coverage

50 **Introduction**

51 Vaccination averts an estimated 4-5 million deaths annually; children, in particular, have
52 benefited from this protection against communicable diseases [1]. Countries have
53 reported progress in vaccine delivery over the years; however, immunization coverage has
54 varied widely among and within countries [2]. Several countries within Africa and
55 SouthEast Asia regions have outperformed their peers with significant increases in
56 routine immunization coverage since 2000 – including Nepal, Senegal, and Zambia [3-
57 6]. Understanding the factors that contributed to the success of these countries can add
58 to the existing literature and be adopted by other countries to improve their immunization
59 program performance.

60 To disseminate effective strategies to increase childhood immunization, there needs to be
61 understanding of what works (facilitators) to improve immunization performance among
62 different countries. Identification of those factors can reduce childhood mortality,
63 medical expenditures and increase the future productivity of the country through the
64 longevity of their children. Implementation science is the study of methods to promote
65 the adoption and implementation of evidence-based interventions, strategies, or policies
66 to public health and healthcare settings [7]. This provides us with a framework to help
67 understand the context of implementation, assess and improve public health
68 performance, and support and inform intervention scale-up [8]. The use of
69 implementation science frameworks to examine childhood vaccination programs in
70 countries with high immunization coverage rates provides an opportunity to identify and
71 describe factors that may have supported effective programs and childhood vaccination
72 improvements in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). The Consolidated

73 Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) is a widely applied framework that
74 describes the context in which interventions and programs are delivered. CFIR is a meta
75 theory that includes five domains: intervention characteristics, inner setting, outer
76 setting, individual characteristics, and process (Table 1)[9]. It has been widely used since
77 its creation and subsequent publication in 2009 [10], and can explain important factors
78 related to the results of program delivery (e.g., implementation outcomes) [11].

79 A few studies have applied CFIR to examine children immunization programs
80 internationally among LMICs [12-14]. These studies used CFIR to explain facilitators and
81 barriers to implementation that impacted intervention effectiveness for vaccination
82 initiatives. Facilitators in program delivery included intervention flexibility, self-efficacy
83 of health workers, leadership support and resources (vaccine stocking), and cold chain
84 supervision (structural characteristics). Barriers included acceptability of the vaccine,
85 vaccine costs to mothers, vaccine hesitancy, inadequate cold chain infrastructure and lack
86 of incentives for health workers such as community health workers [12, 15]. A quantitative
87 evaluation study of the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (PEI) in Nigeria using CFIR
88 found that successful contributing factors of community engagement for PEI were the
89 external social environment, and political factors [14]. Application of the CFIR framework
90 may guide the design or selection of more appropriate interventions for a particular health
91 facility or community, identify critical factors at the national and subnational levels of
92 government that lead to better public health delivery. This can ultimately lead to greater
93 acceptability and adoption of vaccination protocols by healthcare providers, which can
94 contribute to increased levels of vaccine uptake [10, 16].

95 The purpose of this study was to identify common interventions, and the critical
96 facilitators and barriers to implementation using CFIR framework, that contributed to
97 exemplary growth in routine early childhood vaccine coverage in Nepal, Senegal, and
98 Zambia. Findings from this study may be used to develop actionable recommendations
99 for improving immunization programming globally. We examined the CFIR inner setting
100 (i.e., Ministry of Health) and outer setting (i.e., external partners and stakeholders)
101 constructs that were related to vaccine service delivery and demand generation.

102 **Methods and materials**

103 *Study design.* The Exemplars in Vaccine Delivery research project focused on how Nepal,
104 Senegal, and Zambia succeeded in achieving catalytic growth in childhood routine
105 immunization coverage from 2000-2019. Details about the overall project and
106 methodological approach can be found elsewhere [17, 18]. We used a multi-case study
107 design to explore critical determinants to the implementation of the national
108 immunization programs by applying CFIR, as described in Table 1. Among the five
109 domains of the CFIR framework, we focused on the relevance of the inner and outer
110 settings.

111 Our specific research questions for this paper were: 1) What are the key intervention
112 strategies employed by the national vaccination programs? and 2) What are the
113 facilitators and barriers related to the implementation of the vaccine programs?

114 **Table 1. Inner and Outer Setting Domains of the Consolidated Framework for** 115 **Implementation Research**

| Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research Constructs | | |
|--|---|--|
| Construct | | Description |
| II. INNER SETTING | | |
| A | Networks & Communications | The nature and quality of webs of social networks and the nature and quality of formal and informal communications within an organization. |
| B | Implementation climate | The absorptive capacity for change, shared receptivity of involved individuals to an intervention, and the extent to which use of that intervention will be rewarded, supported, and expected within their organization. |
| | B1. Organizational Incentives & Rewards | Extrinsic incentives such as goal-sharing awards, performance reviews, promotions, and raises in salary, and less tangible incentives such as increased stature or respect. |
| | B2. Goals and Feedback | The degree to which goals are clearly communicated, acted upon, and fed back to staff, and alignment of that feedback with goals. |
| | B3. Relative Priority | Individuals' shared perception of the importance of the implementation within the organization. |
| C | Readiness for implementation | Tangible and immediate indicators of organizational commitment to its decision to implement an intervention. |
| | C1. Available Resources | The level of resources dedicated for implementation and on-going operations, including money, training, education, physical space, and time. |
| | C2. Access to Knowledge & Information | Ease of access to digestible information and knowledge about the intervention and how to incorporate it into work tasks. |

| I. OUTER SETTING | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| A | Patient Needs & Resources | The extent to which patient needs, as well as facilitators and barriers to meet those needs, are accurately known and prioritized by the organization. |
| B | Cosmopolitanism | The degree to which an organization is networked with other external organizations. |
| C | External Policy & Incentives | A broad construct that includes external strategies to spread interventions, including policy and regulations (governmental or other central entity), external mandates, recommendations and guidelines, pay-for-performance, collaboratives, and public or benchmark reporting. |

116

117 *Procedures.* In consultation with national stakeholders and available data, we selected
118 three provinces within Nepal, Senegal, and Zambia, while considering population density,
119 vaccination coverage, and contextual factors [17]. Qualitative data were collected between
120 August 2019 and April 2021. Data were collected by the Center for Family Health
121 Research in Zambia (CFHRZ), Center for Molecular Dynamics Nepal (CMDN) in Nepal,
122 Institute de Recherche en Santé de Surveillance Epidémiologique et de Formation
123 (IRESSEF) in Senegal, and the Emory University research team. The participants
124 included the Ministry of Health (MoH) staff, key partners, public health officers, local
125 organizations, and community members (Table 2).

126 *Measures.* Topic guides asked participants about facilitators and barriers to
127 implementation, immunization activities and interventions, drivers for high routine
128 immunization coverage, and key partners and their roles. Key informant interview (KII)

129 and focus group discussion (FGD) guides were translated into local languages by research
130 assistants. All interview guides were piloted before use and adjusted iteratively
131 throughout data collection. Data was collected by a different team, other than the authors
132 and the names of the participants were not included. Data collection tools can be found
133 on Open Science Framework [19].

134 *Data analysis.* Key informant interviews and focus group discussions were audio-
135 recorded. Recordings were transcribed verbatim into the language of the original audio
136 recording, and then translated into English. When audio recordings were in English, the
137 recordings were transcribed directly. Data were password protected, and reviewed by
138 more than one person in the research team, to ensure accuracy and completeness in
139 deidentification. We created a codebook that was iteratively improved based on the
140 emerging themes [20, 21]. Codes were deductive based on CFIR constructs and open-
141 ended questions. Participants were categorized based their role: 1) Ministry at the
142 national level, 2) Ministry at the subnational level, 3) Partners, 4) Local implementers,
143 and 5) Community members. Transcripts were coded and analyzed using MaxQDA2020
144 software (Berlin, Germany). We used the visual tool in MaxQDA to detect the frequency
145 of codes to select the major CFIR constructs within the inner and outer settings for this
146 analysis. For each theme, we described the valence of the construct to vaccination
147 coverage success: positive influence on implementation, negative, or mixed. At the
148 individual transcript level, valence was determined by interviewees' accounts related to
149 the specific construct (e.g., available resources, external mandates, etc.). At the case level,
150 we considered whether the interviewees agreed with each other in terms of the constructs'
151 influence on vaccination. Finally, we assigned an overall valence across the interviewee
152 categories for constructs using methods recommended by others [22].

153 *Ethics*. The study was considered exempt by the Institutional Review Board committee of
154 Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, USA (IRB00111474) and approved by ethics
155 committees in each country; Nepal Health Research Council in Kathmandu, Nepal
156 (NHRC; Reg. no. 347/2019); the National Ethical Committee for Health Research
157 (CERNS; Comité National d’Ethique pour la Recherche en Santé) in Dakar, Senegal
158 (00000174); and the University of Zambia Biomedical Research Ethics Committee
159 (Federal Assurance No. FWA00000338, REF. No. 166-2019) and the National Health
160 Research Authority in Zambia. All interviewees gave informed consent to participate in
161 the study.

162 **Results**

163 We conducted 277 activities in Nepal, Senegal, and Zambia (Table 2). Table 3 outlines key
164 interventions, programs, and policies across all three countries, organized by level of
165 implementation. At the national level, the most commonly implemented interventions
166 across the three countries were the introduction of new vaccines, presence of a national
167 immunization technical advisory board, expansion of health posts, and media campaigns.
168 At the subnational level, all countries reported use of the Reaching Every District (RED)
169 initiative [23], micro-planning, expansion of the vaccine cold chain, community health
170 worker training, monitoring and evaluation meetings, and vaccination campaigns. At the
171 local level, all employed community health workers, outreach efforts for vaccine
172 promotion, media outreach, micro-planning, defaulter tracing, community and religious
173 leadership engagement, and education of grandparents and/or parents using community
174 groups.

175 **Table 2. Summary of countries, partner organizations, regions, districts and**
 176 **data Collection Activities[24]**

177

| Country | Nepal | | Senegal | | Zambia | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| In Country Research Partner | Center for Molecular Dynamics, Nepal | | Institut de Recherche en Santé de Surveillance, de Surveillance Epidémiologique et de Formation (IRESSEF) | | Center for Family Health Research in Zambia | |
| Data collection period (MM/YYYY) | 8/2019 – 12/2019 | | 12/2020 - 4/2021 | | 10/2019 – 02/2020 | |
| Regions and Districts | | | | | | |
| Region 1 | Madhes* | Dhanusha, Bara, Mahottari | Ziguinchor | Ziguinchor, Oussouye, Diouloulou | Lusaka | Lusaka, Rufunsa, Chongwe |
| Region 2 | Bagmati | Makwanpur, Dolakha, Kathmandu | Dakar | Rufisque, Mbao, Keur Massar | Central | Chibombo, Chitambo, Serenje |
| Region 3 | Gandaki Pradesh | Kaski, Myagdi, Nawalparasi | Tambacounda | Tambacounda, Koumpentoum, Goudiry | Luapula | Chipili, Nchelenge, Samfya |
| Key Informant Interviews | | | | | | |
| <i>Key: Number of KIIs (Participants)</i> | 79 (79) | | 62 (63) | | 66 (85) | |
| National level government staff | 11 (11) | | 5 (5) | | 11 (12) | |
| Partner organization staff | 8 (8) | | 4 (4) | | 11 (15) | |
| Regional health staff | 5 (5) | | 7 (7) | | 6 (8) | |
| District health staff | 15 (15) | | 38 (38) | | 10 (19) | |
| Health facility staff | 23 (23) | | 6 (6) | | 7 (10) | |
| Community leaders | 15 (15) | | 2 (2) | | 10 (10) | |
| Community health workers ** | 2 (2) | | - | | 11 (11) | |
| Focus Group Discussions | | | | | | |
| <i>Key: Number of FGDs (Participants)</i> | 30 (191) | | 19 (128) | | 22 (132) | |
| Community health workers ** | 9 (60) | | 10 (65) | | 10 (60) | |
| Mothers | 9 (60) | | 9 (63) | | 8 (48) | |
| Fathers | 6 (36) | | - | | 1 (6) | |
| Grandparents | 6 (35) | | - | | 3 (18) | |
| Total (per country) | 109 (270) | | 81 (191) | | 88 (217) | |
| Total (across countries) | - | | - | | 278 (678) | |

178 **Includes volunteer community health workers, female community health volunteers (FCHV),*
179 *vaccinators, bajenu gox, and neighborhood health committee members.*

180 **Table 3. Immunization Programming from Key Informants, Organized by**
 181 **Country and Level of Implementation**

| Level of implementation | Policy or intervention | Nepal | Senegal | Zambia |
|--|--|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| National level programming and policies <i>Includes partners and national government</i> | Introduction of new vaccines | X | X | X |
| | Strategic reallocation of targeted funds | X | | X |
| | Health post expansion | X | X | X |
| | Codifying health as a human right | X | X | |
| | Forums for decision making (e.g., ICC) | X | X | X |
| | Media engagement | X | X | X |
| Sub-national programming <i>Regional and district level</i> | RED/REC implementation | X | X | X |
| | Training CHWs and volunteers | X | X | X |
| | Meetings for evidence-based decisions | X | X | X |
| | Data software, health posts | | X | |
| | Data software, district-level | X | X | X |
| | Cold chain expansion | X | X | X |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Community programming <i>Health post and village/community level</i> | Community health worker program | X | X | X |
| | Community-level health committees | X | X | X |
| | Outreach services | X | X | X |
| | Micro-planning in health facilities* | X | X | X |
| | Defaulter tracing** | X | X | X |
| | Engagement of community leaders | X | X | X |
| | Support groups for caregivers | X | X | X |
| | School outreach | X | X | X |
| | Promotion through media (e.g., radio) | X | X | X |

182 *Micro-planning- integrated set of components prepared to support health system.

183 **Defaulter tracing- visiting, calling, messaging mothers to remind them about vaccinating their
 184 children.

185 **Facilitators to implementation of vaccination programs**

186 Several CFIR constructs were integral to the implementation of immunization programs
 187 across the three countries. Of the 14 CFIR Inner Setting constructs, 3 were found to be
 188 facilitators to vaccine delivery: 1) networks and communication, 2) implementation
 189 climate, which includes: relative priority, incentives and rewards, goals and feedback, and

190 3) readiness for implementation, including available resources and access to knowledge.
 191 Two CFIR domains - implementation climate and readiness for implementation - were
 192 central to the facilitating factors. However, incentives and rewards, available resources,
 193 access to knowledge and information, and patients needs and resources constructs were
 194 also barriers to implementation of immunization at the local and community level. Table
 195 4 summarizes findings categorized by CFIR constructs and country.

196 **Table 4. Salient CFIR Inner and Outer Setting Constructs: Facilitators and**
 197 **Barriers to Implementation of Routine Vaccination Programming**

| Construct | Nepal | Senegal | Zambia |
|--|-------|---------|--------|
| Inner Setting (Ministry of Health) | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Networks and communication The nature and quality of webs of social networks and the nature and quality of formal and informal communications within an organization. | + | + | + |
| Implementation climate | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relative priority Individuals' shared perception of the importance of the implementation within the organization. | + | + | + |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incentives and Rewards Extrinsic incentives such as goal-sharing awards, performance reviews, promotions, and raises in salary, | +/- | +/- | +/- |

| | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|
| and less tangible incentives such as increased stature or respect. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals and Feedback <p>The degree to which goals are clearly communicated, acted upon, and fed back to staff, and alignment of that feedback with goals.</p> | + | + | + |
| Readiness for implementation | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Available resources <p>The level of resources dedicated for implementation and on-going operations, including money, training, education, physical space, and time.</p> | +/- | +/- | +/- |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to knowledge and information <p>Ease of access to digestible information and knowledge about the intervention and how to incorporate it into work tasks.</p> | +/- | +/- | +/- |
| Outer Setting | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patient Needs and Resources <p>The extent to which patients' /community members' needs, as well as facilitators and barriers to meet those needs, are accurately known and prioritized by the organization.</p> | +/- | +/- | +/- |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cosmopolitanism | + | + | + |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| The degree to which an organization is networked with other external organizations (external networks, partners) | | | |
| External policies and mandates External strategies to spread interventions, including policy and regulations, external mandates, recommendations and guidelines, pay-for-performance, collaboratives, and public or benchmark reporting. | + | + | + |

198 + = Facilitator to implementation. - = Barrier to implementation. +/- = Both facilitator and barrier

199 **Inner Setting**

200 We found 3 inner setting constructs- 1) network and communications, 2) implementation
 201 climate (relative priority, incentives and rewards, and goals and feedback), and 3)
 202 readiness for implementation (available resources and access to knowledge and
 203 information) as salient facilitators to implementation of vaccination programs in Nepal,
 204 Senegal, and Zambia (Table 4). A few representative quotes related to these themes can
 205 be found below with additional quotes located in Open Science Framework [19].

206 *1. Network and communications*

207 Key informants across all countries viewed communication and coordination between
 208 staff at the national and subnational levels as facilitators to successful implementation of
 209 childhood vaccinations. Interventions to foster communication and coordination in all
 210 three countries included 1) frequent meetings to discuss vaccine data, review and identify
 211 improvements, and improve data quality; 2) communication channels between levels of
 212 government that support shared ownership of immunization activities; 3) micro-planning

213 at district and community levels to align priorities and tailor strategies; and 4) a clear
214 chain of command that facilitated the flow of information.

215 *“On the relationship side, it is always the sharing of information, we receive*
216 *instructions or directives. We try to apply them as much as possible, and in return*
217 *we make our reports, across the medical region, and we always report the*
218 *difficulties we find at the peripheral level, on the ground and elsewhere.*
219 *Whenever we need it, we feedback [from the national level] on everything we had*
220 *expressed as a point for improvement, recommendation. And from time to time,*
221 *we still feel that the central level is very close to the peripheral level.” (National*
222 *Chief Medical Officer, Senegal)*

223 2. Implementation climate

224 Three sub constructs of implementation climate were facilitators of implementation of
225 the immunization programs. These included relative priority, access to knowledge, and
226 incentives and rewards.

227 *Relative Priority.* Relative priority is the shared perception of importance of the public
228 health topic and/or program, and it can lead to adoption and/or implementation of public
229 health interventions by program leaders and staff. Public health professionals perceived
230 that there was strong political will and commitment by the government to conduct
231 childhood immunization programming in all three countries. Informants from Senegal
232 and Nepal reported codification of health as a human right in their constitution, and in
233 Zambia, equitable access to quality healthcare as a national priority as included in the
234 current Vision 2030 Zambia strategic document. In Nepal, an informant mentioned that

235 immunization programming was prioritized by the government through implementation
236 of the existing policies that support immunization. In Zambia, there were discussions of
237 having specific budget line for immunization at the national level, showing the level of
238 commitment by the Ministry of Health to improve immunization.

239 *“I think I may have mentioned this at one point that the government has been*
240 *procuring the vaccines. In fact, we started own procurement [of vaccines] in*
241 *2004. We assumed the total budget for vaccines procurement at that time. A*
242 *dedicated budget line for vaccine procurement for vaccines was even established*
243 *within the yellow book. That helped to make sure we had commodities readily*
244 *available within the facilities. (Former EPI manager, Zambia)*

245 *“It is the commitment of government to conduct the program and commitment*
246 *of policy makers and decision makers, after that commitment of all the health*
247 *workers working in implementation level. Commitment and involvement of the*
248 *social organizations and bodies in vaccination program, along with that*
249 *commitment in the management of vaccines and equipment where it is*
250 *necessary.” (Former Director General, Nepal)*

251 *Incentives and Rewards.* All three countries reported use of incentives to motivate
252 personnel to improve their performance and increase their vaccination coverage. These
253 included motivating both health workers to improve their staff performance and
254 caregivers to increase their demand for vaccination. In Zambia, supervisors provided
255 trophies to high-performing facilities, districts, and provinces and partners offered non-
256 monetary incentives to communities (e.g., certificates). Health professionals were
257 primarily motivated to vaccinate children to reduce disease among children and ensure

258 healthy communities. Nepal offered incentives at multiple levels: a reward system existed
259 at the district level, and local community health workers were sometimes given a stipend
260 during vaccination campaigns, and they attended training and conferences. Villages,
261 districts and provinces were declared fully immunized and celebrated by the national
262 government through the Full Immunization Declaration (FID) Program in a bottom-up
263 approach, and this motivated local government bodies, service providers, community
264 workers, volunteers and parents and facilitated community buy to immunization.
265 Physicians offered postnatal gifts like mirrors, mosquito nets and other incentives to
266 mothers who got their child vaccinated. In Senegal, recognition was common at different
267 levels, including certificates, upward mobility for high performing facility health workers,
268 and awards and recognition for revenue of health posts.

269 *“Staff performance is assessed and there’s even an incentive to reward staff if*
270 *they are performing well at the end of a time. But initially, I think there is every*
271 *once in a month where we do the Labor Day celebrations where they award the*
272 *staff that are deserving. So, they awarded five staff that are doing well and they*
273 *give award just to motivate those staff...” (National Chief Cold Chain Officer,*
274 *Zambia)*

275 *“We organized for Labor Day; we organized a small gathering. Everyone was*
276 *there, the service providers, the ASC (community health worker), the bajenu gox,*
277 *the community actors in general, and there were certificates of recognition that*
278 *were decided beforehand. We identified the recipients, and these names were put*
279 *on the certificates. During these gatherings, the doctor gives the certificates along*

280 *with an envelope of (25,000 francs).” (Sexual and Reproductive Health*
281 *Coordinator, Senegal)*

282 However, a lack of tangible incentives (money and awards to staff), and inconsistent
283 motivation of community health workers were highlighted as barriers in Nepal and
284 Senegal. Tangible incentives, especially those that were planned in advance (monthly
285 Labor Day celebrations, field allowance or training, for instance) were facilitators.

286 *“They are not at all motivated, it's just when there is training that's the source of*
287 *motivation or if there is campaign and others but apart from that they have no*
288 *specific motivation.” (MoH Staff member, Senegal)*

289 *“The health workers are the same who worked previously in health institutions*
290 *so there are not much differences. However, they don't get field allowance now*
291 *that is why motivation level is quite low.” (District Health Officer, Nepal)*

292 *Goals and Feedback.* All three countries had mechanisms for communicating their
293 immunization goals to ensure feedback was shared across all levels. The national level
294 provided instructions, directions, and support for logistics and capacity building. Public
295 health professionals at the subnational level often applied learning from training and
296 logistical support. In all countries, feedback is given from the national to provincial and
297 to the district level at regular intervals (i.e., monthly, annually). In Zambia, Provincial
298 Medical Officers present their program data to the central level on a quarterly basis -
299 including the epidemiology of vaccine preventable diseases - and the national level
300 provides feedback to the provinces. Informants in Nepal stated that feedback is provided
301 to low coverage areas or low performing health facilities, and that their public health staff
302 employ micro-planning and categorization of the health facilities based on that

303 performance. In Senegal, informants indicated that performance was assessed at the start
304 of the month with objectives and targets set for each health post. Feedback on indicators
305 and achievements were provided from the central and provincial levels during monthly
306 meetings.

307 *“The central level calls the Provincial Medical Officers, on a quarterly basis,*
308 *sometimes even more often to come and present their data looking at the*
309 *programs, including EPI, and feedback is given...” (Director of Public Health,*
310 *Zambia)*

311 *“Recently we have done review at provincial level, which is done yearly. In June*
312 *each district level data was observed. What is the status level of every district, is*
313 *everything scheduled? All these were discussed and at the upcoming years what*
314 *decisions should be made, to make vaccination programs more fruitful what*
315 *should be done in entire districts. We worked along with family welfare*
316 *departments and discussion are made. They [family welfare departments] are*
317 *our responsibilities, and they belong to this group and based on that review is*
318 *done.” (Immunization supervisor, Nepal)*

319 3. *Readiness for implementation*

320 Three sub-constructs of readiness for implementation were perceived as being both
321 facilitators and barriers to the implementation of the immunization programs. These
322 included available resources, access to knowledge, and incentives and rewards.

323 *Available Resources.* Available resources was a strong theme, and consistent across the
324 countries; this included budgeting for the national immunization programs, cold chain

325 infrastructure, and a vaccination workforce. In Zambia, key informants at the sub-
326 national and local implementation level mentioned availability of staff and volunteers as
327 an enabler for increases in vaccine coverage and sustainability. In addition, cold chain
328 improvements were essential for increases in vaccine coverage and was prioritized by the
329 MOH, who advocated for funding from the Ministry of Finance and from donors to
330 support the infrastructure. In Nepal and Senegal, the government provides the main
331 startup money for the immunization program and there is substantial support by
332 international donor organizations. At the subnational and community levels in Nepal,
333 the local government allocated funds to train and incentivize health workers, maintain
334 health facilities, and hire cold chain technicians. In Senegal, external partners such as
335 GAVI and USAID are mentioned as working at all levels, and some ministry staff noted
336 that they fill in the gap where the district or health development committee cannot fund
337 activities.

338 *“Basically, the Ministry of Finance decides how much money goes to all the other*
339 *sectors but when it comes to the EPI, at least we have some specific budget lines*
340 *and we actually do contribute towards coming up with those plans and budgets*
341 *but ultimately is the Ministry of Finance that, who determine how much goes to*
342 *what.” (MoH staff member, Zambia)*

343 *“Now ... I cannot say it for sure ... but since last two decades, it [vaccine rate]*
344 *started to show improvement. We can also say after external support started to*
345 *come like GAVI is our partner ... they have played great role, even they help*
346 *community financially to strengthen system they have played major role in it.*
347 *They are globally big donor in field of vaccine. They have contributed much in*

348 *Nepal. Talking about partners in Nepal, UN agencies is UNICEF main*
349 *mandatory, it works mainly for women and children, they also provide technical*
350 *support to us and WHO are also providing technical support as well.” (National*
351 *level stakeholder, Nepal)*

352 However, participants at the sub national level reported a lack of available resources
353 which resulted in consistent barriers across the three countries. These constraints
354 included financing for the immunization program, procurement of vaccines,
355 transportation for vaccine provision, human resources, lack of vaccination facilities, and
356 inadequate vaccine supplies.

357 *“At the district level, there are health posts that are suffering in terms of*
358 *equipment, and health posts that are suffering from the building. Others are*
359 *suffering from the resources of transport for the nurses in charge of vaccination.”*
360 *(MoH staff member, Senegal)*

361 *Access to Knowledge and Information.* Across all countries, training, and quality
362 assurance methods were critical. In Zambia, multiple trainings around the Reaching
363 Every District (RED) were mentioned. RED is a WHO strategy to increase vaccination
364 rates through building capacity to increase vaccine delivery by establishing outreach
365 services, planning and management of resources, monitoring and use of data, and linkage
366 of services with the community [23]. Likewise, Senegal stakeholders discussed that
367 knowledge is passed from the national level to lower levels through training sessions,
368 modules, and manuals. Some district level staff reported organizing and conducting
369 training for community-level workers.

370 *“The first thing you do is train the districts in RED (Reaching Every District and*
371 *Every Child). Then they do all the micro plans, everything in the district and we’ll*
372 *also go and train them. Let me start with, you have to conduct the TOT, the*
373 *training of trainers. So, we identify the trainers within the districts and*
374 *provinces. So, eventually we went to train the districts and the districts are going*
375 *to train the facilities. So, we go and monitor the facilities assuming they are*
376 *implementing RED and developing all the micro plans and everything. And that*
377 *is a continuation in other interventions that are coming on board, RED is also a*
378 *priority. RED is always a training and RED is always a priority.” (Chief Cold*
379 *Chain Officer, Zambia)*

380 Nevertheless, this construct of access to knowledge was discussed across all countries as
381 a common barrier at the levels closer to the community. There was limited, or infrequent,
382 vaccination training and educational community outreach to all staff, organizations, or
383 partners. Education was sometimes provided to only selected staff, or training
384 information was not disseminated to others in the organization or partners.

385 *“The training was for one week only. ...It was just presentations by a member of*
386 *staff from the clinic, ... The selected group then came here at the clinic to be*
387 *trained on what to do and say to the people in the community. Yes madam, that*
388 *is all that they did to train us. (Neighborhood Health Committee member,*
389 *Zambia)*

390 *“Training is not given much nowadays. The municipality organizes training only*
391 *once a year.” (Vaccinator, Nepal)*

392 *“It may not be very frequent, but we are given training every 6 months.”*

393 *(Community health worker, Senegal)*

394 **Outer Setting**

395 According to key informants, cosmopolitanism, and external policies and mandates were
396 the two outer setting factors recognized as facilitators for implementation of the vaccine
397 program. Other representative quotes related to these themes are found at Open Science
398 Framework web page [19].

399 *Cosmopolitanism*

400 Cosmopolitanism, the extent to which an organization (e.g., the Ministry of Health) is
401 connected to external partnership or networks, was instrumental in implementation. At
402 each country’s national level, there were similar organizations that aided in the
403 implementation of the immunization program. These partners included WHO, UNICEF,
404 and GAVI which offered technical support and financial resources across the three
405 countries. In Nepal, WHO and UNICEF fostered a high trust, constant communication,
406 and collaboration and agreed upon division of labor. At the local level, MoH workers
407 collaborated with religious leaders, schools, NGOs, the media, and community health
408 workers (CHWs) to increase vaccination in all the countries. In Nepal and Zambia, school
409 directors and teachers shared information about immunization with children in school,
410 while Nepal focused on strong media partnerships. In Senegal, community-based
411 organizations and neighborhood delegates supported implementation.

412 *“In major vaccination, of Polio campaign to support government technically,*
413 *financially there was WHO and UNICEF. UNICEF majorly supported*

414 *government in capacity development, logistic management, and in few types of*
415 *equipment; and after that the global organization such as GAVI, Lions started to*
416 *support us and inside Nepal Rotary Club, Lions Club started to support us in Polio*
417 *campaign as a sensitizer and mobilize but in government program there was*
418 *major support of WHO and UNICEF, where GAVI has constantly supporting us.”*
419 *(Former Director General, Nepal)*

420 *“Like here at our clinic, letters are written...to different zones to make people*
421 *aware that there will be a vaccination program, again there are letters written*
422 *to churches that are close by and also to all those that come to this clinic. So, most*
423 *women or grandmothers are aware of when to bring children here for*
424 *vaccination. Posters are also stuck for all to know when the vehicle has past,*
425 *maybe some are at work, but when they return and look on the trees, walls, and*
426 *all over the markets, they stick them all over even at the shops...even in schools*
427 *they announce, school children take the message to parents.” (Grandmothers,*
428 *Zambia)*

429 *External Policies and Mandates*

430 External policies and mandates may include political directives, regulations, and external
431 mandates. Many of the immunization efforts are performed within a WHO, GAVI, or
432 UNICEF global policy framework. External agencies gave guidance to country leaders
433 who needed their support and approval to implement policies or adopt new vaccine
434 technologies.

435 *“Nepal hasn’t become capable of making policies on its own but as it has made an*
436 *international commitment, WHO guides us to make necessary changes in the*

437 *policies. Hence, the decisions are made on that basis. Of that, the regulations are*
438 *formulated, and according to this.” (Ministry of Finance personnel, Nepal)*

439 *“The most important is the ACD plan, which has become the ACE plan (aka -*
440 *RED/REC). Through this plan of Reaching Every District, it is the activities of the*
441 *districts and of the health posts that are funded to enable the position to perform.”*
442 *(EPI and PHC focal point, Senegal)*

443 *Patient Needs and Resources*

444 Patient needs and resources was reported as a facilitator and barrier to program delivery.
445 This construct identifies whether program implementers are aware of community needs
446 and how they respond to those needs. In all the countries, participants mentioned that
447 they worked together with the healthcare workers to address their needs, and this
448 included the selection of community health workers. These CHWs came from close by
449 communities and understood the needs of communities better. Participants reported that
450 parents in all countries were aware of diseases that could be prevented through childhood
451 vaccination. Participants discussed the changes in infrastructure including better
452 transportation and roads which facilitated access to healthcare. In Senegal, participants
453 reported a mobile strategy where healthcare providers traveled to rural patients to
454 provide vaccination services. Healthcare workers and community actors raised
455 awareness and creating demand for vaccination. Outreach and transportation initiatives
456 were identified as barriers to community needs that the Ministries of Health.

457 *“By the way, I think there are a lot of people who are aware of different diseases,*
458 *so they have voluntarily gone to vaccinate their children, they know the interest*
459 *of vaccination. Certainly, there are people who until now do not believe in*

460 *vaccination, but there are also us, community actors, who go every day to the*
461 *population to make the population aware of the interests of vaccination. But also,*
462 *there are the opinion leaders, who are at the level of neighborhood delegates and*
463 *the bajenu gox and others who are involved in relation to vaccination.” (Head*
464 *nurse for Health Post, Senegal)*

465 *“The main reason for the existing good immunization coverage is the awareness*
466 *among people regarding vaccination, which is given to prevent different*
467 *diseases. Other reasons are the provision of good quality vaccine, the availability*
468 *of health workers, accessibility of health services, availability of vaccine, road*
469 *accessibility. In the past, people had to walk for a day to reach the immunization*
470 *center, but now due to the transportation facility, people can reach there in an*
471 *hour or even less.” (MoH staff member, Nepal)*

472 Interviewees identified unmet needs as a barrier to implementation of immunization
473 programming. Community barriers included families facing economic hardship, a lack of
474 knowledge about childhood vaccination, reliance on traditional healers or medicine,
475 vaccine hesitancy, low literacy, and language barriers.

476 *“And the next thing is about the language. In the Hilly area they have different*
477 *languages and in the Terai area they have different languages. We make the*
478 *programs in one language, so it does not match with other areas and people do*
479 *not understand the language.” (Former Director General, Nepal)*

480 *“It would be nice to explain to mom the benefits of the vaccine her child just took*
481 *because most moms are illiterate. You have to take the time to talk to them about*
482 *the vaccine and its benefits because otherwise the mother will be discouraged, she*

483 *will never come back.” (Mother, Senegal)*

484 **Discussion**

485 Our findings describe *how* Nepal, Senegal, and Zambia achieved high routine
486 immunization coverage through investigating facilitators and barriers to program
487 implementation and how they relate to CFIR constructs. CFIR constructs were critical to
488 understanding the success of these countries in increasing childhood immunization.
489 Although there is no “silver bullet” intervention to enhance early childhood vaccination,
490 our findings point to critical facilitators that exist at national, sub-national, and local
491 levels of vaccine delivery. The application of the CFIR model enabled a comprehensive
492 assessment of implementation context; the use of this framework to assess vaccination
493 programming could be expanded to support adaptation of successful implementation
494 strategies and factors for other countries.

495 Many facilitators to implementation of the national immunization program were shared
496 by key informants from these exemplar countries. Our findings complement existing
497 literature that supported the use of CFIR to explore factors related to implementation.

498 Support from international partners- GAVI, WHO, USAID, UNICEF and others, and local
499 community partners- religious leaders, traditional leaders, local media stations,
500 community based organizations and others, in service provision and delivery have led to
501 successful rollout of childhood vaccines in low-income countries [25, 26]. Adoption and
502 implementation of policy initiatives or mandates like Reaching Every District is
503 instrumental in enhancing vaccination coverage. Within these countries, districts are
504 required to submit plans annually to reach every child to receive funding from the

505 ministries for their vaccination activities through assessment of data, identification of
506 problems and creation of a work plan. This strategy is endorsed by WHO and has assisted
507 LMIC in achieving high coverage rates of childhood vaccinations [27]. Although all 3
508 countries did report that external policies were facilitators, they also reported that access
509 to knowledge, patient needs, and available resources were mixed, and usually negative at
510 the community levels, thus the need for consideration of local context, priorities, and
511 needs alongside external policies.

512 We identified some common barriers across the countries related to immunization
513 delivery. Some respondents, mostly at regional or local levels, believed that training was
514 missing, not frequent enough, or reached various levels of implementation at national to
515 less local regions. Several studies have demonstrated the impact of training on delivery of
516 immunization programs [15, 28]. Some challenges to vaccination at the community level
517 included language, geography, education or poverty status. In analyzing implementation
518 barriers and strategies in polio eradication initiative in the Democratic Republic of Congo
519 and Ethiopia, Deressa et al. found the common barriers include accessibility issues
520 (population movement, geography); gaps in human resources; supply chain; finance and
521 governance and community hesitancy [29]. The CFIR constructs of available resources,
522 training of healthcare and other staff, and patient needs and resources are commonly
523 identified barriers in vaccination studies [16, 30, 31]. An understanding of the contextual
524 factors may support unearthing the systemic issues around immunization. Further
525 research on optimal interventions to increase vaccine confidence and reduce community
526 level barriers can inform further efforts to sustain public demand for childhood vaccines
527 [32, 33].

528 The findings from this review have various practical implications for how to enhance the
529 implementation of childhood immunization programs. First, prioritization of health or
530 vaccines by ministries or governments, provision of resources for vaccination programs,
531 supplies, and workforce at all levels and facilities are essential to vaccine program
532 implementation [34]. Other qualitative analyses have found insufficient funds and
533 resources and staffing issues as barriers to immunization[35, 36]. Secondly, coordination
534 and engagement of different levels of the country (e.g., ministry, districts/subnational,
535 and local community) and stakeholders was crucial to public education to increase
536 community demand and rollout of the programs [4-6, 37]. Related to this, communication
537 and feedback loops and incentives provided motivation for reaching immunization goals;
538 this has been identified in another study focused on immunization delivery [38]. Third,
539 incentives were helpful in motivating staff and provinces or regions to improve
540 vaccination rates. Finally, partnership engagement at all public health levels and
541 community stakeholder engagement is critical to the success of these programs.

542 **Strengths and limitations**

543 There were several strengths to this study. CFIR informed the qualitative instruments
544 and identified shared factors across countries to fill a gap in the literature related to
545 optimal implementation of vaccine programs globally. It helped examine factors internal
546 to the ministries and public health programs and also external agents that facilitated
547 successful vaccine delivery. Employing CFIR was a strength because it assists in assessing
548 successful determinants of immunization program implementation and barriers to
549 implementation. The stakeholder groups included in this qualitative study were diverse
550 and included the community level to understand their assessment of critical factors that

551 lead to childhood vaccinations. Often, implementation research focuses on program
552 implementers (e.g., public health leaders, implementation staff) and does not include
553 levels of implementation (regional to local) and community members (intervention
554 recipients). Future research could assess other CFIR domains (i.e., process,
555 characteristics of individuals) and their association with implementation success.

556 This study has several limitations. The data collection instruments focused on the factors
557 that drove catalytic change and did not elicit policies or interventions that were
558 unsuccessful. We focused on the CFIR constructs and sub-constructs of inner and outer
559 setting post-implementation for the majority of this analysis; recall of activities may be
560 more valid with data collection occurring during vaccine program implementation. The
561 CFIR framework has been updated; future research could explore how other domains of
562 CFIR (e.g., individual, process) and new constructs (e.g., critical incidents, local
563 conditions, etc.) contributed to successful immunization program and outcomes such as
564 sustainment of effective intervention strategies employed by these countries [39]. Using
565 qualitative methods to understand historical events was challenging; interviewees often
566 spoke about current experiences rather than discussing historical factors. However,
567 research assistants probed respondents to reflect on longitudinal changes in the
568 immunization program.

569 **Conclusion**

570 This multiple case study analysis presents the opportunity to explore implementation
571 science determinants that were critical to the successful implementation of childhood
572 vaccination programming in three countries with high immunization coverage. CFIR's

573 comprehensive and multifaceted domains help capture the complexities of multilevel
574 interventions to increase childhood vaccination. The use of CFIR helps inform why these
575 countries have high vaccination coverage by describing facilitators and barriers to
576 implementing immunization programming at the national, regional, and
577 local/community level. We identified facilitators such as communication of goals and
578 feedback, offering of incentives at multiple levels, training staff central to vaccination
579 education, providing resources to support the program, and maintaining key
580 partnerships. Public health and governmental staff may bolster direct resources to
581 support the immunization infrastructure, communications, collaborations and incentives
582 to improve vaccination. This study identifies a wide range of facilitators and barriers to
583 implementation of vaccine programs across Nepal, Senegal, and Zambia which
584 contributes to the limited literature on implementation research in global vaccination.

585 **Acknowledgements**

586 We thank Center for Molecular Dynamics, Nepal (CMDN), the Institut de Recherche en
587 Santé de Surveillance Epidémiologique et de Formation (IRESSEF) in Dakar, Senegal and
588 the Center for Family Health Research in Zambia for their partnership in this study. We
589 gratefully acknowledge the participants who gave their time and insights to help us better
590 understand Nepal's, Senegal's, and Zambia's vaccine delivery system, along with
591 facilitators from the Ministry of Health and Population, Department of Health Services,
592 and the Family Welfare Division of Nepal, Ministry of Health and Social Action in
593 Senegal, and the Ministry of Health in Zambia for supporting this research. In addition,
594 we thank Sarah Chesemore, Anna Rapp, Tove Ryman, and Ethan Wong from the Bill and
595 Melinda Gates Foundation; Kate Buellesbach, Nancy Fullman, Nathaniel Gerthe, Gloria

596 Ikilezi, Caitlyn Mason, David Phillips, and Oliver Rothschild, Jordan-Tate Thomas, and
597 Angela Wang from Gates Ventures for technical support; and the Vaccine Exemplars
598 Research Advisory Group for their insights, specifically Agnes Binagwaho, Laura Craw,
599 Carolina Danovaro, Anuradha Gupta, Heidi Larson, Penelope Masumbu, Kate O'Brien,
600 Helen Rees, Lora Shimp, and Aaron Wallace.

601 **Data Availability Statement**

602 All relevant data are within the paper and its supporting information files.

603 **Funding**

604 This work was supported by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Seattle, WA
605 (OPP1195041) with a planning grant from Gates Ventures, LLC, Kirkland, WA. Bill and
606 Melinda Gates Foundation and Gates Ventures were engaged in the project process,
607 provided context, when necessary, but all research activities and publications are solely
608 those of the authors.

609

610 **Competing Interests**

611 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal
612 relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

613 **References**

- 614 1. WHO. Immunization 2019 [Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/facts-in-](https://www.who.int/news-room/facts-in-pictures/detail/immunization)
- 615 [pictures/detail/immunization](https://www.who.int/news-room/facts-in-pictures/detail/immunization).
- 616 2. WHO. Immunization Agenda 2030 A global strategy to leave no one behind. 2020.
- 617 3. WHO. WHO-UNICEF estimates of DTP3 coverage 2020 [updated 15-Jul-2020; cited 2021 23
- 618 November]. Available from:
- 619 https://apps.who.int/immunization_monitoring/globalsummary/timeseries/tswucoveredtp3.html.
- 620 4. Micek K, Hester KA, Chanda C, Darwar R, Dounebaine B, Ellis AS, et al. Critical success factors for
- 621 routine immunization performance: A case study of Zambia 2000 to 2018. *Vaccine X*. 2022;11:100166.
- 622 5. Hester KA, Sakas Z, Ellis AS, Bose AS, Darwar R, Gautam J, et al. Critical success factors for high
- 623 routine immunization performance: A case study of Nepal. *Vaccine: X*. 2022;12:100214-.
- 624 6. Sakas Z, Hester KA, Rodriguez K, Diatta SA, Ellis AS, Gueye DM, et al. Critical success factors for
- 625 high routine immunization performance: A case study of Senegal. *medRxiv*. 2022:2022.01.25.22269847.
- 626 7. Eccles MP, Mittman BS. Welcome to Implementation Science. *Implementation Science*.
- 627 2006;1(1):1.
- 628 8. Peters DH, Adam T, Alonge O, Agyepong IA, Tran N. Implementation research: what it is and
- 629 how to do it. *BMJ : British Medical Journal*. 2013;347:f6753.
- 630 9. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation
- 631 of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing
- 632 implementation science. *Implementation Science*. 2009;4(1):50.
- 633 10. Means AR, Kemp CG, Gwayi-Chore M-C, Gimbel S, Soi C, Sherr K, et al. Evaluating and optimizing
- 634 the consolidated framework for implementation research (CFIR) for use in low-and middle-income
- 635 countries: a systematic review. *Implementation Science*. 2020;15(1):1-19.
- 636 11. Nilsen P. Making sense of implementation theories, models, and frameworks. *Implementation*
- 637 *Science* 30: Springer; 2020. p. 53-79.
- 638 12. Adamu AA, Uthman OA, Gadanya MA, Wiysonge CS. Using the consolidated framework for
- 639 implementation research (CFIR) to assess the implementation context of a quality improvement
- 640 program to reduce missed opportunities for vaccination in Kano, Nigeria: a mixed methods study. *Hum*
- 641 *Vaccin Immunother*. 2020;16(2):465-75.
- 642 13. Boisson A, Thompson P, Fried B, Shea CM, Ngimbi P, Lumande F, et al. Determinants of the
- 643 uptake of childhood immunization in Kinshasa Province, the DRC: ordered logit regression analyses to
- 644 assess timely infant vaccines administered at birth and six-weeks of age. 2022.
- 645 14. Akinyemi OO, Adebayo A, Bassey C, Nwaiwu C, Kalbarczyk A, Fatiregun AA, et al. Assessing
- 646 community engagement in Nigeria polio eradication initiative: application of the Consolidated
- 647 Framework for Implementation Research. *BMJ open*. 2021;11(8):e048694.
- 648 15. Boisson A, Morgan CE, Fried B, Shea CM, Yotebieng M, Ngimbi P, et al. Barriers and facilitators
- 649 to timely birth-dose vaccines in Kinshasa Province, the DRC: a qualitative study. *Journal of Global Health*
- 650 *Reports*. 2022;6:e2022028.
- 651 16. Selove R, Foster M, Mack R, Sanderson M, Hull PC. Using an Implementation Research
- 652 Framework to Identify Potential Facilitators and Barriers of an Intervention to Increase HPV Vaccine
- 653 Uptake. *J Public Health Manag Pract*. 2017;23(3):e1-e9.
- 654 17. Bednarczyk RA, Hester KA, Dixit SM, Ellis AS, Escoffery C, Kilembe W, et al. Protocol:
- 655 Identification and evaluation of critical factors in achieving high and sustained childhood immunization
- 656 coverage in selected low- and lower-middle income countries. *medRxiv*. 2021:2021.12.01.21267018.
- 657 18. Health EIG. Making Better Decisions in Global Health: Understand Positive Outliers to Inform
- 658 Policy and Practice. 2023 [Available from: <https://www.exemplars.health/>].
- 659 19. OSF. Exemplars in Vaccine Delivery2022.

- 660 20. Hennink MM. Focus group discussions: Oxford University Press; 2013.
- 661 21. Miles MB, Huberman AM, Saldana J. Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook: SAGE
662 Publications; 2019.
- 663 22. Damschroder LJ, Lowery JC. Evaluation of a large-scale weight management program using the
664 consolidated framework for implementation research (CFIR). *Implementation Science*. 2013;8(1):51.
- 665 23. WHO. Essential Programme on Immunization: Reaching Every District (RED) 2023 [Available
666 from: [https://www.who.int/teams/immunization-vaccines-and-biologicals/essential-programme-on-](https://www.who.int/teams/immunization-vaccines-and-biologicals/essential-programme-on-immunization/implementation/reaching-every-district-red)
667 [immunization/implementation/reaching-every-district-red](https://www.who.int/teams/immunization-vaccines-and-biologicals/essential-programme-on-immunization/implementation/reaching-every-district-red)].
- 668 24. Sakas Z, Hester KA, Ellis AS, Ogutu EA, Rodriguez K, Bednarczyk RA, et al. Critical success factors
669 for high routine immunization performance: A multiple case study analysis of Nepal, Senegal, and
670 Zambia. *medRxiv*. 2022:2022.11.08.22282076.
- 671 25. Gatera M, Bhatt S, Ngabo F, Utumuliza M, Sibomana H, Karema C, et al. Successive introduction
672 of four new vaccines in Rwanda: High coverage and rapid scale up of Rwanda's expanded immunization
673 program from 2009 to 2013. *Vaccine*. 2016;34(29):3420-6.
- 674 26. Ahonkhai AA, Odusanya OO, Meurice FP, Pierce LJ, Durojaiye TO, Alufohai EF, et al. Lessons for
675 strengthening childhood immunization in low-and middle-income countries from a successful public-
676 private partnership in rural Nigeria. *International Health*. 2022;14(6):632-8.
- 677 27. WHO. Microplanning for immunization service delivery using the Reaching Every District (RED)
678 strategy. World Health Organization; 2009.
- 679 28. Mpabalwani E, Menon J, Phiri G, Malambo A, Mbozi E, Kalesha P, et al. Assessing the delivery
680 and effectiveness of a new immunisation training initiative at district level in Zambia. *Medical Journal of*
681 *Zambia*. 2011;38(1):8-12.
- 682 29. Deressa W, Kayembe P, Neel AH, Mafuta E, Seme A, Alonge O. Lessons learned from the polio
683 eradication initiative in the Democratic Republic of Congo and Ethiopia: analysis of implementation
684 barriers and strategies. *BMC Public Health*. 2020;20(4):1807.
- 685 30. Escoffery C, Riehman K, Watson L, Priess AS, Borne MF, Halpin SN, et al. Facilitators and Barriers
686 to the Implementation of the HPV VACs (Vaccinate Adolescents Against Cancers) Program: A
687 Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research Analysis. *Prev Chronic Dis*. 2019;16:E85.
- 688 31. Soi C, Gimbel S, Chilundo B, Muchanga V, Matsinhe L, Sherr K. Human papillomavirus vaccine
689 delivery in Mozambique: identification of implementation performance drivers using the Consolidated
690 Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR). *Implementation Science*. 2018;13(1):151.
- 691 32. Lane S, MacDonald NE, Marti M, Dumolard L. Vaccine hesitancy around the globe: Analysis of
692 three years of WHO/UNICEF Joint Reporting Form data-2015-2017. *Vaccine*. 2018;36(26):3861-7.
- 693 33. Cooper S, Betsch C, Sambala EZ, Mchiza N, Wiysonge CS. Vaccine hesitancy – a potential threat
694 to the achievements of vaccination programmes in Africa. *null*. 2018;14(10):2355-7.
- 695 34. LaFond A, Kanagat N, Steinglass R, Fields R, Sequeira J, Mookherji S. Drivers of routine
696 immunization coverage improvement in Africa: findings from district-level case studies. *Health Policy*
697 *Plan*. 2015;30(3):298-308.
- 698 35. Ezezika O, Mengistu M, Opoku E, Farheen A, Chauhan A, Barrett K. What are the barriers and
699 facilitators to polio vaccination and eradication programs? A systematic review. *PLOS Global Public*
700 *Health*. 2022;2(11):e0001283.
- 701 36. Nkwenkeu SF, Jalloh MF, Walldorf JA, Zoma RL, Tarbangdo F, Fall S, et al. Health workers'
702 perceptions and challenges in implementing meningococcal serogroup a conjugate vaccine in the
703 routine childhood immunization schedule in Burkina Faso. *BMC public health* [Internet]. 2020
704 2020/02//; 20(1):[254 p.]. Available from: <http://europepmc.org/abstract/MED/32075630>
705 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-8347-z>

706 <https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC7031928>

707 <https://europepmc.org/articles/PMC7031928?pdf=render>.

708 37. Sakas Z, Hester K, Ellis A, Ogutu EA, Rodriguez K, Bednarczyk R, et al. Critical success factors for
709 high routine immunization performance: A multiple case study analysis of Nepal, Senegal, and Zambia.
710 medRxiv; 2022.

711 38. Guan TH, Htut HN, Davison CM, Sebastian S, Bartels SA, Aung SM, et al. Implementation of a
712 neonatal hepatitis B immunization program in rural Karenni State, Myanmar: A mixed-methods study.
713 PLoS One. 2021;16(12):e0261470.

714 39. Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Opra Widerquist MA, Lowery J. Conceptualizing outcomes for use
715 with the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR): the CFIR Outcomes Addendum.
716 Implementation Science. 2022;17(1):7.

717