

1 **The implementation and effectiveness of multi-tasked, paid**
2 **community health workers on maternal and child health: A**
3 **cluster-randomized pragmatic trial and qualitative process**
4 **evaluation in Tanzania.**

5 **Short title:** How do community health workers affect maternal and child health in Tanzania?

6 Colin Baynes^{1*}, Almany Malick Kanté², Amon Exavery³, Tani Kassimu⁴, Gloria Sikustahili⁴,
7 Hildegalda Mushi⁴, Jitihada Baraka⁴, Kate Ramsey⁵, Kenneth Sherr¹, Bryan Weiner¹, James F.
8 Phillips⁶

9
10 ¹Department of Global Health, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA

11 ²Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA

12 ³Pact International, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

13 ⁴Ifakara Health Institute, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

14 ⁵Scope Impact, Brooklyn, NY, USA

15 ⁶Department of Population and Family Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

16

17 *Corresponding author

18 Email: colin.baynes@gmail.com

19

20 CB conceptualized the study, had management and coordination responsibility for the data
21 collection, developed the analytic methodology, led the analysis of data, and wrote the original
22 and final draft of the paper. AMK and KR had oversight and leadership responsibility for the
23 research activity, reviewed and edited the paper. AE and TK curated the data used for this
24 analysis, participated in data collection, and reviewed and edited the paper. GS, HM and JB
25 participated in data collection, and reviewed and edited the paper. KS and BW validated the
26 reproducibility of the results of the analysis, reviewed and edited the paper. JFP acquired
27 financial support for this study, validated the reproducibility of the results of the analysis,
28 reviewed and edited the paper.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35 **Abstract**

36 Community health worker programs have proliferated worldwide based on evidence that they help
37 prevent mortality, particularly among children. However, there is limited evidence from
38 randomized studies on the processes and effectiveness of implementing community health worker
39 programs through public health systems. This paper describes the results of a cluster-randomized
40 pragmatic implementation trial (registration number ISRCTN96819844) and qualitative process
41 evaluation of a community health worker program in Tanzania that was implemented from 2011-
42 2015. Program effects on maternal, newborn and child health service utilization, childhood
43 morbidity and sick childcare seeking were evaluated using difference-in-difference regression
44 analysis with outcomes measured through pre- and post-intervention household surveys in
45 intervention and comparison trial arms. A qualitative process evaluation was conducted between
46 2012 and 2014 and comprised of in-depth interviews and focus group discussions with community
47 health workers, community members, facility-based health workers and staff of district health
48 management teams. The community health worker program reduced incidence of childhood illness
49 and improved access to timely and appropriate sick childcare; however, there was no effect on
50 maternal, newborn and child health service utilization. The positive outcomes occurred because of
51 high levels of acceptability of community health workers within communities, as well as the
52 durability of community health workers' motivation and confidence. Implementation factors that
53 generated these effects were the engagement of communities in program startup; the training,
54 remuneration and supervision of the community health workers from the local health system and
55 community. The lack of program effects on maternal, newborn and child health service utilization
56 were attributed to lapses in the availability of needed care at facilities and of working materials
57 among community health workers. Strategies that strengthen and align communities' and health

58 systems core capacities, and their ability to learn, adapt and integrate evidence-based interventions,
59 are needed to maximize the health impact of community health workers.

60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84

85 **Introduction**

86 The evidence that community-based primary health care (PHC) interventions can improve
87 maternal, neonatal and child health (MNCH) has increased over the past few decades (1). This
88 owes, in large part, to studies that focus on specific tasks of community health workers (CHW),
89 such as activities related to safe motherhood (2–4); child health (5–8); family planning (9,10);
90 infectious and non-communicable diseases (11–15); neglected tropical diseases (16) and mental
91 health (17,18). In recognition of their effectiveness, there have been numerous publications
92 collating and comparing CHW experiences across countries (19–22), reporting the costs and cost-
93 effectiveness of CHW models (23,24), synthesizing evidence on the design and effects of CHW
94 programs (25–28) and developing conceptual understandings of how to scale up and integrate them
95 into health systems (29–35). With this, opinions converged in favor of deploying CHW, with
96 increasing numbers of proponents citing evidence that access to essential, low-cost interventions
97 from these cadres can help end preventable mortality, particularly among children in low- and
98 middle-income countries (LMIC) (36).

99 Accordingly, in recent decades there has been a rapid expansion of CHW deployment in many
100 countries. Despite this, respected observers have argued that the use of CHW remains an
101 underdeveloped component of health systems in LMIC (1). Indeed, studies on the implementation
102 of CHW programs have noted that support for CHW, their performance and integration into
103 communities and health systems is uneven across and within countries (37,38). Frequently,
104 evidence-based recommendations are not effectively applied as CHW programs are designed and
105 implemented (30,35,39), and many CHW programs are fraught with challenges including poor
106 planning; unclear or fragmented roles; inadequate training; weak supervision; lapses in logistical

107 processes; tenuous accountability linkages; ineffective incentive structures; poor selection
108 processes and dissatisfaction of communities (40–43).

109 The impact of CHW can be maximized if implementers and policymakers understand the reasons
110 for these problems well and adapt implementation strategies for deploying CHW accordingly.
111 However, most research has focused on the effects of CHW on service utilization and population
112 health with less attention to implementation process (44), and the contextual factors that influence
113 success (45,46). Studies of CHW program implementation are often detached from rigorous
114 evaluations of programs' impact (47). To date there is limited evidence on CHW effectiveness
115 from randomized studies delivered through routine health systems (48,49), and, furthermore, there
116 is a lack of pragmatic evidence on CHW programs that achieved mixed results even though
117 analyses of barriers to implementation success are needed to help programs (25). In this paper, we
118 share results from a cluster-randomized pragmatic implementation trial of a CHW program in
119 Tanzania that was conducted from 2011-2015. This trial, called *Connect*, evaluated the impact of
120 a CHW program on child survival, the primary outcome; and on MNCH behaviors, childhood
121 morbidity and care seeking for sick children, the secondary outcomes. Since previous publications
122 on *Connect* have reported that WAJA implementation had no statistically significant effect on
123 childhood mortality (50), we report here the impact of the intervention on secondary outcomes and
124 findings from an embedded qualitative process evaluation conducted from 2012-2014.

125 **Materials and Methods**

126 **Study setting**

127 *Connect* was situated in the sentinel areas of the Ifakara and Rufiji Health and Demographic
128 Surveillance Systems (HDSS) managed by the Ifakara Health Institute (IHI). The Ifakara HDSS

129 is in Morogoro, a landlocked region in southwestern Tanzania, and traverses two districts,
130 Kilombero and Ulanga, that are approximately 500 km by road from Dar es Salaam, Tanzania's
131 largest city. The Rufiji HDSS is in Rufiji district on the Indian Ocean coast approximately 150 km
132 south of Dar es Salaam by road. The population under surveillance in 2015 was approximately
133 380,000 (280,073 in Ifakara and 99,206 in Rufiji) (51,52). See Figure 1.

134 **INSERT FIGURE 1**

135 **Fig 1. The Connect Project Study Areas**

136 **Intervention background and design**

137 The use of CHW has precedent in Tanzania (53). Since their introduction in the 1970s, the
138 deployment of volunteer CHW proved fraught with implementation and maintenance problems
139 and failed to provide evidence that unpaid workers could provide effective and sustainable means
140 to extend PHC to communities (54).

141 In 2007, the Government of Tanzania promulgated the Primary Health Care Services Development
142 Plan, known in Swahili as *Mpango wa Maendeleo wa Afya ya Msingi* (MMAM), which called for
143 the revitalization community PHC by way of establishing a national cadre of paid, multi-tasked
144 CHW (55). In 2010, UNICEF and the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare of Tanzania
145 (MOHSW) carried out a situation analysis of existing CHW programs in the country to inform
146 recommendations on strategy for operationalizing the MMAM vision. Their report recommended
147 that the national CHW, which they named *Wawezashaji wa Afya ya Jamii* (“community health
148 enablers” or “WAJA”), be selected by their communities, formally trained and enrolled in national
149 health sector scheme of service, accorded a salary and government recognition and tasked with

150 performing an integrated package of MNCH services (56). Yet, at this time, there was no
151 experience of operationalizing such a program, nor systematic evidence on whether the proposed
152 CHW model would be acceptable, feasible and cost-effective or have an incremental impact on
153 MNCH. In 2010, the IHI, MOHSW, the Tanzania Training Center for International Health and
154 Mailman School for Public Health at Columbia University launched *Connect* to address that
155 knowledge gap.

156 **CHW recruitment, selection and training.**

157 The design of the *Connect* intervention is described in depth elsewhere (57,58). In 2010, IHI staff
158 and Council Health Management Teams (CHMT) in Kilombero, Ulanga and Rufiji oriented
159 community leaders to the intervention and recruited community members to stand for election to
160 become WAJA. Community members could become a WAJA if they had received form four level
161 education attainment (US grade 10) and passing grades in science, as per requirements for
162 government employment, and longstanding residency in their current home village. Candidates
163 whose eligibility was confirmed by local authorities were given two-three weeks to make their
164 case to the community as candidates, and after that villages held elections to select their WAJA.

165 In October 2010, candidates chosen by their communities went to Ifakara to undertake training of
166 nine months, the minimum duration required for government employment. The curricula received
167 national accreditation and comprised of two semesters of didactic and practical, clinic-based
168 training in human biology; basic clinical skills; health promotion and disease prevention in the
169 community; sexual and reproductive health; integrated management of childhood illness (IMCI);
170 management of basic pharmaceuticals; stakeholder mapping and networking and community
171 mobilization; and a community-based practicum. The WAJA service package was developed as a

172 strategy to expand access to education on MNCH, mobilize villages to collectively promote
173 community health, enhance referrals and utilization of antenatal care (ANC), facility-delivery by
174 skilled birth attendants, postnatal care (PNC), and make IMCI available in communities. WAJA
175 also distributed oral contraceptives and condoms and performed basic curative care for gut
176 infections caused by worms, fever, and non-complicated cases respiratory infection, diarrhea, and
177 malaria. See Figure 2 (59).

178 **INSERT FIGURE 2**

179 **Fig 2. The *Connect* WAJA Service Delivery Package**

180 **CHW deployment and implementation management.**

181 WAJA received employment contracts from local government authorities upon their graduation
182 from training. This accorded them a salary of approximately \$112 (United States dollar) per
183 month. *Connect* developed a two-tiered system for supervising WAJA to promote the clinical
184 quality of care, and to ensure that WAJA were accountable to communities. During training the
185 CHMT appointed nurses or clinical officers to be ‘facility supervisors’ of WAJA that were
186 deployed to communities in their facilities’ catchment areas. Village Health Committees from
187 intervention communities appointed a ‘village supervisor’. Both supervisors participated in
188 practical sessions of the WAJA training and participated in workshops with IHI staff on the WAJA
189 role and work package, supervision and mentoring and community engagement.

190 Implementation arrangements of *Connect* balanced the overriding goal of understanding the effects
191 of WAJA deployment through the routine health system with the reality that to deliver the program,
192 the health systems required support from development partners (60). To provide this support, the

193 IHI issued a financial subaward to Tanzania Training Center for International Health to develop
194 and implement the training program. The IHI also issued subawards to the respective CHMTs to
195 cover expenses associated with WAJA recruitment and selection; field practicum; the orientation
196 of WAJA supervisors and their performance of timely supervision; health information system
197 staffs' compilation of routine service delivery data recorded by WAJA; procurement and
198 distribution of WAJA equipment, supplies, and medicines; and payment of WAJA salaries. In
199 addition, the IHI seconded Implementation Coordinators to the CHMT to help manage the
200 deployment of WAJA and the launch of their activities in communities and establish processes for
201 routinizing the provision of management and health system supports to the new cadre.

202 The provision of this assistance lasted for the first two years of the trial (2011-12) after which, the
203 IHI withdrew direct support for implementation. At this point, CHMT were to obtain resources for
204 maintaining the WAJA in their posts through the routine comprehensive council health planning
205 process. From 2013 onward, the IHI led the evaluation of the WAJA intervention only, setting
206 aside resources to ensure availability of remuneration, supervision, and essential supplies to WAJA
207 if CHMTs failed to secure resources through the health system. *Connect* never intervened to
208 influence the readiness or ability of facilities to provide referral level care. WAJA, 142 in total,
209 were recruited, selected, and trained in two cohorts, the first deployed to 25 intervention villages
210 in August 2011 and the second to the remaining 25 intervention villages in August of 2012.

211 **Outcome evaluation**

212 **Study design**

213 The detailed protocol for the *Connect* trial (registration number ISRCTN96819844) has been
214 published elsewhere, including CONSORT checklist for pragmatic trials (Supplemental File 1)

215 (57). *Connect* was a cluster-randomized pragmatic trial in the 101 villages within the areas of the
216 Ifakara and Rufiji HDSS (63 in Ifakara, 38 in Rufiji). Stratified randomization was used to allocate
217 50 villages to the intervention arm and 51 to the comparison arm. The unit of randomization was
218 the village. In 2010, a public drawing was organized to randomly assign villages to the two arms.
219 Villages were block-randomized within the strata defined by village population size. Stratification
220 was segmented by four categories to achieve a 1:1 match of communities in each arm that had
221 <1000 population, 1000-2999, 3000-4999, and ≥ 5000 . Local government and village leaders
222 attended the drawing, selecting representatives to draw pieces of paper with the name of each
223 village written on them from containers numbered for each stratum. The villages chosen by the
224 representatives were to be randomized to the intervention and comparison arms, and which
225 representative represented which arm and the villages that they picked were concealed until after
226 the drawing. Within the intervention arm, villages received between one and four WAJA
227 depending on their strata. Villages allocated to the comparison received the ‘standard of care’
228 which comprised of routine activities coordinated by village governments to promote community
229 health and households’ recourse to facility-based care for preventive or curative care. Because of
230 the nature of the intervention, it was not possible to mask participants to their treatment status.

231 **Data sources and sampling**

232 The HDSS provided the platform to ascertain *Connect’s* primary outcome, childhood mortality.
233 As this has been published elsewhere, we report here the effect of WAJA on secondary outcomes,
234 MNCH behaviors and incidence of childhood disease. To obtain data for the evaluation of
235 secondary outcomes, the IHI conducted household surveys in villages in the 101 villages before
236 deployment of WAJA in April-August 2011 and after four years of implementation, April-August
237 2015.

238 HDSS censuses conducted in 2010 and 2014 provided the sampling frame for the pre- and post-
239 intervention surveys. Calculations of data from a survey conducted in the same districts the year
240 before indicated that to detect a minimum of 12% difference in the prevalence of secondary
241 outcomes, the surveys needed to enroll per village a minimum of eight women that had had a live
242 birth in the previous two years, and that to detect a minimum of 5% difference between arms in
243 the incidence of childhood diarrheal or febrile/respiratory illness, the surveys would have enroll
244 per community primary caregivers of at least 15 under-five year-old children (assuming $\alpha=0.05$,
245 $\beta=0.80$, $k=0.25$ and two-tailed test).

246 *Connect* researchers employed ‘probability proportional to size’ techniques and used census data
247 to randomly select households for recruiting survey participants (61). Participants were eligible if
248 they were a female between the ages of 18-49 or the primary caregiver of an under-five year-old
249 child and resident in the household that was randomly selected. In the end, both baseline and
250 endline household surveys met the minimum sampling requirements, enrolling 3,267 and 3,048
251 women aged 18-49, respectively, including 882 and 778 mothers that had delivered a live birth in
252 the previous two years. The participants reported on 2,104 under-five year-old children at baseline
253 and 1,565 at endline. Over time, no adverse events were reported in either trial arm. See Figures
254 3a and 3b, the participant flow diagrams.

255 **INSERT FIGURE 3A AND 3B**

256 **Figs 3. Organizational-level Causal Pathway Model**
257

258 **Data collection and management**

259 The data collection team comprised of Tanzanian research assistants with degrees in public health,
260 sociology, or other relevant disciplines. They underwent a one-week training, which was followed

261 by two days of pre-testing during which all data collectors administered the full survey at least
262 twice. *Connect* staff divided the data collection team into groups and assigned each group to
263 clusters of communities. Data collectors recruited all women of reproductive age that were resident
264 in each of the selected households no matter their childbearing history. Those that agreed to
265 participate were read aloud an informed consent form (ICF). Individuals that agreed to participate
266 either signed the ICF or provided an inked thumbprint to confirm their agreement to participate.
267 Data collection was paper based. *Connect* embedded staff members in each data collection group
268 to review completed surveys to assure their quality and pass them on for data entry into an Epi-
269 Info database where they were cleaned and prepared for analysis. Information that could identify
270 individual participants during and after data collection was available on the ICF which contained
271 participant names and unique identifiers. ICF were stored in a secure, locked environment at the
272 IHI office and not accessed by the authors during data analysis.

273 **Outcome measures**

274 This study reports on the effect of WAJA deployment on secondary outcomes listed in Table 1.
275 All outcomes were self-reported by household survey participants and were specified before the
276 trial. Outcomes one to five in Table 1 refer to service utilization and health behaviors practiced by
277 mothers with respect to their most recently born child if the child was born within two years prior
278 to the survey. Outcomes six and seven refer to the incidence of childhood morbidities in the two
279 weeks prior to the survey among all children under five years of age whose mothers or other
280 primary care givers participated in the survey. Outcomes eight to 10 refer to the timeliness and
281 appropriateness of care received by all under-five children if their mother or caregiver reported
282 that they had become ill with diarrheal, febrile, or respiratory sickness during the two weeks before
283 the survey.

284 **Table 1: Secondary outcomes measured through *Connect* household surveys (2011 and 2015)**

1	First trimester antenatal care (ANC) initiation
2	4+ ANC sessions
3	Facility delivery
4	Exclusive breastfeeding
5	Postnatal care (newborn)
6	U5 diarrhea incidence
7	U5 cough/fever/difficulty breathing incidence
8	Oral rehydration therapy (ORT) for children with diarrhea
9	Malaria test for febrile children
10	Appropriate care ¹ for children with febrile or respiratory symptoms

285

286 **Data analysis**

287 For each outcome, we estimated the effect of the intervention using an intent-to-treat approach and
288 logistic difference-in-difference (DiD) regression analysis with fixed effects for time and trial arm
289 and random-intercepts to account for clustering of observations within villages. See Equation 1:

$$290 \quad \text{logit}(y_{ijk}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{time}_k + \beta_2 \text{int}_{jk} + \beta_3 (\text{time}_k \times \text{int}_{jk}) + u_{ij} \quad (1)$$

291 where y_{ijk} is the log of the odds that the k th individual in the j th cluster in the i th treatment arm
292 experienced the outcome (Table 1), time is an indicator of data source of observation k whereby
293 time equals zero for baseline and one for endline, int is the intervention group dummy for
294 individual k in cluster j , and $\text{time} \times \text{int}$ is the DiD indicator of the time by intervention interaction.
295 β_3 is the DiD estimator for the effect of WAJA deployment on outcomes above and beyond
296 changes associated with the passage of time.

297 Given the balance of the sample before the intervention (Supplemental File 2), we did not adjust
298 for individual-level characteristics of participants. In the model, u_{ij} is the random effect
299 corresponding to the j th cluster in the i th trial arm and is normally distributed. Because the

¹ Artemisinin Combined Therapy (ACT) for malaria or antibiotics for respiratory illness.

300 combination of binomial variation within clusters and normal variation between clusters,
301 quadrature methods were used to maximize the likelihood and obtain parameter estimates, cluster
302 robust standard errors and confidence intervals and conduct the significance test for this model.
303 The DiD approach relies on the ‘parallel trends’ assumption. While we could not formally test this
304 assumption, we used data from the HDSS to verify that child mortality trends in the two arms were
305 similar during the 10 years prior to the trial.

306 **Process evaluation**

307 **Qualitative study design**

308 In July and August 2012, 2013, and 2014, respectively, we carried out a qualitative process
309 evaluation. The goal of this was to understand the changes that arose in the local health system
310 and communities as a result introducing WAJA, whether those changes led to proximal outcomes
311 associated with desired health and behavioral changes, and how contextual factors shaped that
312 process. We situated the qualitative process evaluation within the same ‘nodes’ in each year, which
313 we defined as intervention villages, their aligned PHC facilities which received WAJA referrals
314 and provided WAJA supervision, and their respective CHMT.

315 We purposively sampled four nodes in Ifakara and two in Rufiji. We sampled two urban nodes in
316 Ifakara and Rufiji, respectively, and four rural nodes. Participants from the community-level were
317 parents of under-five year-old children, WAJA, village supervisors of WAJA, Village Executive
318 Officers and Village Chairpersons. Participants from the health system included WAJA health
319 facility supervisors, District Medical Officers, District Reproductive and Child Health
320 Coordinators and District *Connect* focal persons. We analyzed transcriptions of 75 focus group
321 discussions (FGD) and in-depth interviews (IDI). See Table 2.

322 **Table 2: Qualitative data collection methods and participants**

Informant Type	Year and data collection method					
	2012		2013		2014	
	IDI	FGD	IDI	FGD	IDI	FGD
WAJA	5	2	4	4	8	0
Other community stakeholder	3	4	5	0	6	0
Health facility staff	4	2	4	2	5	0
District-level health management staff	5	0	6	0	6	0

323

324 **Qualitative data collection and management**

325 Qualitative data collectors comprised of a team of experienced Tanzanian researchers with degrees
326 in public health, sociology or another relevant discipline who received a three day training. After
327 this, they pre-tested the instruments in an intervention setting that were not situated in the process
328 evaluation nodes. These steps were conducted in all three years of the process evaluation. Each
329 IDI and FGD was conducted Swahili and facilitated by two data collectors, one that led the
330 interview and the other that took notes. Prior to the onset of the interviews, the data collectors
331 administered an informed consent process in which they read aloud an ICF. Participants that agreed
332 to participate either signed the ICF or provided an inked thumbprint. All interviews and discussions
333 were recorded on a digital device. Data collection pairs transcribed all interviews and discussions,
334 in Swahili, within one day of completing them. Swahili language transcripts were reviewed by a
335 qualitative specialist from the *Connect* team to assure their quality. Transcripts and ICF were
336 maintained password encrypted electronic files or in locked cabinets at the IHI. Transcripts were
337 then cleaned and translated into English.

338 **Qualitative data analysis**

339 To analyze the data, we first reviewed the transcripts, memoing extensively on patterns in the data,
340 their meanings and ways in which these could be studied in a more structured analytical process
341 (62,63). Based on this, we constructed causal pathway models (CPM) to develop a theory of how

342 WAJA worked to produce the evaluation outcomes and how contextual conditions influenced that
343 process (64). In doing so, we identified the relationships between the following constructs in the
344 data: elements of the *Connect* implementation strategy, proximal outcomes, the mechanisms that
345 the strategy triggered to affect proximal outcomes, and the determinants that either helped or
346 hindered implementation. We established these constructs as analytic themes and created codes
347 aligned to each theme.

348 We uploaded 75 transcripts into *Dedoose* analytic software and coded. For this we adapted steps
349 associated with grounded theory (65,66). First, we conducted ‘open coding’ in which we utilized
350 codes from the ‘strategy’, ‘outcome’ and ‘determinant’ themes. Then, we sorted the coded
351 transcripts by implementation outcome codes and examined relationships within and across
352 segments of code to examine which factors exerted the most influence over implementation,
353 whether these influences were positive or negative, and how they shaped outcomes. Using
354 segments of text that were assigned ‘open codes’, we, then, pursued ‘axial coding’, utilizing codes
355 from the ‘mechanism’ theme only. In this analysis, we defined ‘mechanisms’ as events or
356 processes through which strategies produce outcomes (67). After identifying mechanisms, we
357 observed thematic linkages in the data with an emphasis on understanding how determinants
358 affected the activation of mechanisms and whether they generated expected outcomes. We used
359 coded segments of text to map findings against CPM configurations that we had developed earlier
360 to refine them and reach conclusions about the mechanisms and determinants of WAJA
361 implementation (68). Finally, we triangulated our qualitative and quantitative findings, and linked
362 conclusions on the generative process of implementation outcomes with evidence on WAJA
363 effectiveness. Based on this, we formulated hypotheses on the relationship between
364 implementation dynamics and MNCH outcomes that were measured during the trial.

365 **Ethical considerations**

366 Approval for the *Connect* trial was granted by the ethical review boards of the IHI (IHI/IRB/No.
367 16-2010), the National Institute for Medical Research of Tanzania (NIMR/HQ/R.8a/Vol.IX/1203),
368 and the Institutional Review Board of Columbia University Medical Center (Protocol AAF3452).

369 **Results**

370 **Outcome evaluation**

371 The characteristics of women and children across intervention and comparison arms before the
372 trial were generally similar (Supplemental File 2). Table 3 shows the effect of WAJA on MNCH
373 outcomes. The intervention had no effect on the mother-level outcomes that had been established
374 *a priori*. There is some indication that the intervention might have inhibited utilization of ANC
375 and PNC at clinics, possibly since WAJA performed the information, education, and counseling
376 components of these services in households, though all findings are statistically insignificant.

377 Our findings indicate that the WAJA intervention improved child health. Above and beyond
378 changes in the incidence of childhood illness that occurred with the passage of time, the reduction
379 in the odds of diarrhea incidence was greater among under-five year-olds in intervention villages
380 than in comparison villages ($\beta_3 = 0.51$, 95% CI: 0.32-0.81, $p = 0.004$). We found a similar outcome
381 regarding the incidence of childhood febrile and respiratory illness ($\beta_3 = 0.59$, 95% CI: 0.38-0.94,
382 $p = 0.028$). Findings indicate significant effects of WAJA on access to essential care and treatment
383 for diarrheal, febrile, and respiratory sickness in children. After accounting for changes that
384 occurred with the passage of time, we found that children in intervention villages that had diarrhea
385 in the two weeks prior to data collection were 1.71 times more likely to receive ORT than such

386 children in comparison settings; however, this finding was not significant at a 0.05 level ($\beta_3 = 1.71$,
387 95% CI: 1.06-3.18, $p=0.074$). However, the effects of WAJA exposure on children with febrile
388 and respiratory illness were greater. Compared to children with fever in comparison areas, those
389 in intervention communities were 1.80 times more likely to receive a malaria test ($\beta_3=1.80$, 95%
390 CI: 0.99-3.18, $p = 0.050$), and compared to children with febrile and/or respiratory symptoms in
391 comparison communities, those in intervention communities were 1.68 times more likely to
392 receive either antibiotic or ACT treatment ($\beta_3 = 1.68$, 1.00-2.91, $p=0.048$).

393

Table 3: Effect of WAJA deployment and implementation on MNCH outcomes.

Outcome		Baseline (2011)			Endline (2015)			Difference in Difference (Impact)		
		Intervention (%, (n))	Comparison (%, (n))	Diff. %	Intervention (%, (n))	Comparison (%, (n))	Diff. %	β_3 (DiD estimator)	95% CI	<i>p</i> value
<i>Mother-level outcomes⁴</i>										
1	First trimester ANC initiation	16 (72)	17 (72)	1	17 (67)	24 (92)	7**	0.65	0.38, 1.13	0.13
2	4+ ANC sessions (facility only)	41 (188)	44 (189)	3	43 (169)	46 (177)	3	0.81	0.39, 2.32	0.35
3	Facility delivery	71 (322)	74 (320)	3	83 (326)	86 (331)	3	0.81	0.46, 1.44	0.48
4	Exclusive breastfeeding	41 (186)	39 (168)	2	45 (177)	39 (150)	6	1.33	0.85, 2.06	0.21
5	≥1 PNC session (Facility only)	36 (166)	34 (147)	2*	25 (98)	33 (127)	8*	0.83	0.52, 1.33	0.44
<i>Child-level outcomes⁵</i>										
6	Diarrhea in past 2 weeks	13 (135)	11 (124)	2	6 (48)	12 (92)	6***	0.51	0.32, 0.81	<0.01
7	Febrile & respiratory symptoms in past 2 weeks	14 (138)	12 (127)	2	5 (40)	11 (85)	6*	0.59	0.38, 0.94	0.03
8	ORT for children with diarrhea [□]	56 (75)	61 (75)	5	54 (26)	41 (38)	13**	1.71	1.06, 3.18	0.07
9	Malaria test for febrile children [†]	49 (171)	55 (200)	6*	69 (84)	60 (93)	9**	1.80	0.99, 3.27	0.05
10	Appropriate care for children w/ febrile or respiratory symptoms [‡]	50 (182)	49 (195)	1	58 (110)	49 (112)	9**	1.68	1.00, 2.91	0.05

***denotes statistical significance at 1%, ** 5%, * 10%

⁴For mother level outcomes, n=454 and 394 in intervention arm at baseline and endline; and 428 and 384 in comparison arm at baseline and endline.

⁵For child-level outcomes, n=1,038 and 798 in intervention arm at baseline and endline; and 1,066 and 767 in comparison arm at baseline and endline.

[□]Out of 135 and 48 children with diarrhea in intervention arm at baseline and endline; out of 124 and 92 children with diarrhea in comparison arm at baseline and endline.

[†]Out of 349 and 122 children with febrile symptoms in the intervention arm at baseline and endline; out of 396 and 155 children with febrile symptoms in the comparison arm at baseline and endline.

[‡]Out of 367 and 190 children with febrile or respiratory symptoms in the intervention arm at baseline and endline; out of the 396 and 229 children with febrile or respiratory symptoms in the comparison arm at baseline and endline.

Process evaluation

Figures 4-7 are the refined CPM that illustrate the findings of the qualitative process evaluation. *Connect* deployed an implementation strategy that included nine salient components (Cells 2, Figure 4-7) to address specific modifiable factors (Cells 1) by activating mechanisms (Cells 3), which *Connect* hypothesized would generate proximal outcomes (Cells 4) on the pathway to the MNCH outcomes (Cells 5). Whether the implementation strategy components could succeed was determined by preconditions in the environment, the presence or absence of which were essential for or prevented implementation success (Cells 8 and 9). Implementation effectiveness was also moderated by contextual factors (Cells 6 and 7), which amplified or diminished the force with which mechanisms incurred the intended effect.

The qualitative analysis reveals how the *Connect* causal pathway played out at four levels (69). The implementation strategy engaged community members in recruiting, selecting, and deploying WAJA to generate the perception that the intervention originated locally and had been adapted to meet local needs, and, with this, promote communities' acceptance of WAJA and adoption of desired behavior changes (Figure 4). *Connect* fostered collaboration between health system and community stakeholders, designed a WAJA work package and eligibility requirements that were responsive to stakeholders' needs and consistent with health system processes. The objective of this was to align communities' and health systems' receptivity to the program, ensure the intervention was compatible with the meanings that stakeholders attached to it, and make it feasible for them to adapt to changes instigated by WAJA implementation (Figure 5). *Connect* also built WAJAs' capacities through training, hiring and remunerating the cadre, and created systems to supervise WAJA and meet their logistical requirements. *Connect* believed this would motivate and engender confidence in the cadre, establish PHC delivery readiness in communities, and, thereby,

help achieve better MNCH outcomes (Figure 6). Finally, by providing financial and technical support to CHMT, *Connect* sought to enable the health systems' adoption of the WAJA program as a core and sustainable component of the larger PHC system (Figure 7). These causal pathways came to fruition with mixed results.

Beneficiary level

At the beneficiary level consistent patterns emerged across examples of community members that developed positive connections with WAJA. Community members generally referred to their relationship with WAJA in terms of a kinship bond, calling them '*WAJA, watoto wetu*' (WAJA, our children), '*vijana vyetu*' (our youths), '*wanangu*' (my child). In addition, the participatory recruitment and selection instilled in villagers' confidence in the cadre. According to a mother: "Because of our faith in [WAJA], we selected them. So, they cannot do anything to betray us." (Mother, Lukolongo, Kilombero, 2012).

However, their connection to communities occasionally caused difficulty.

One day I was educating my old friends about family planning, and they asked me 'how many are we in our family', because they know we are many. They told me 'How come you are many and now you are telling us about family planning?' That also is a problem. (WAJA, Nyambunda, Rufiji, 2013).

Others believed that it was inappropriate for youth to get involved in reproductive health issues. A Village Supervisor reported:

Many pregnant women are not free to show their condition. If you give them education, they says 'this [WAJA]with no family, how does he know to tell me about [being pregnant]?' (Village Supervisor, Lumemo, Kilombero, 2012).

The qualitative data, however, illustrates that most resistance to the intervention dissipated as communities acquired experience with WAJA. This was facilitated by involvement of village leaders in introducing WAJA to communities and establishing clarity on their roles. Community members recall leaders “calling a village meeting where [leaders] say to citizens ‘those WAJA who studied are back with this responsibility’ and sending them to the streets where we recognize them” (Mother, Minepa, Ulanga, 2012). In other instances, WAJA reported difficulty in gaining communities’ trust: “At the beginning, the biggest thing was the lack of being known [because] there was no meeting. In our village there are conflicts and there have not been village meetings in months” (WAJA, Lukolongo, Kilombero, 2012).

Over time, word spread in communities that helped establish widespread acceptability of the program. According to one early skeptic,

“We first saw these [WAJA] and said how is it that they have become our doctors? Then we hear from more [people] that [WAJA’s] medicines were good, and they give good lessons. Before when our child got sick there was rushing [to facilities], but now we do not rush to facilities anymore.” (Father, Kisawasawa, Kilombero, 2014).

Community members believed that WAJA understood them especially and tailored services to meet their needs. According to a mother:

The method [WAJA] use is good language. If your child needs a treatment, they sit with [the caregiver] and they advise her. By telling her to go to the hospital based on the good language he used, she understands and will go rather than short answer language we don’t understand.” (Mother, Mgomba North, Rufiji, 2013).

The acceptability of the WAJA created conditions in which beneficiaries could learn and adopt desired MNCH practices. Nevertheless, participants, especially men, lamented that WAJA could not perform more services.

WAJA don't have an idea on how to treat [men]. So, I would like to see WAJA being trained more so that they can help us rather than going to the health facilities
(Father, Mgomba North, Rufiji, 2014).

As Figure 4 shows, the components of the implementation strategy that targeted factors at the beneficiary level achieved success. Preconditions for effectiveness were in place at the outset of implementation, and *Connect* activities withstood adverse moderating factors or helped to mitigate their negative influences. Overall, the analysis suggests that change mechanisms were activated and generated the intended responses. See Figure 4.

INSERT FIGURE 4

Fig 4. Beneficiary-level Causal Pathway Model

Stakeholder level (local health system and community)

At the support system stakeholder level, *Connect* sought to establish an ‘intervention-values-systems fit’ in which members of communities and the local health system had a shared receptivity to the intervention and opportunities and abilities to adapt to the changes it introduced. This was based on the belief that if there was alignment between characteristics of the intervention, the meanings and values attached to the WAJA program by those affected by it in communities and local health system, and their absorptive capacities for strategic change, then effectiveness of the program would be greater (70,71). To establish a shared receptivity to the intervention, *Connect*

facilitated collaboration between district employees and community members during intervention startup. According to a member of the Kilombero CHMT that served as focal person to *Connect*:

The village has a process to make sure that applicants belong to that village and know how to serve [the village]. Then, still the district team checks the [authenticity of] education certificates and interviews [applicants]. Then if [WAJA] are chosen by the village and complete studies the district hires them. We have boarded the same bus to start this program (Connect Focal Person, Kilombero CHMT, 2012).

In addition, the WAJA service delivery package included both preventive and basic curative care for children as a measure of “first aid” to handle simple illness. As a village supervisor from Rufiji explains, this combination helped address communities’ perceived needs.

Before WAJA your child may be sick but [parents] are not aware because lack of education. Then it becomes emergency, so the child will get more sick while you get the money, but now when the child is sick you can see it right away, and WAJA gives drugs as first aid (Village Supervisor, Mangwi, Rufiji, 2013).

Facility staff also appreciated the blended service delivery package, which they felt helped rationalize recourse to clinics for care. They were also pleased that the training and eligibility requirements were compatible with how the local health system worked.

This project has been received well by the district because WAJA have received nine-month training, which means they can be hired and because of that their contracts were approved. This shows that [WAJA] are employed and will work as normal staff do. (District Medical Officer, Rufiji, 2014).

However, as implementation continued, weaknesses of local health system constrained districts’ absorptive capacity. Rather than intervene to ensure optimal implementation conditions at

facilities, *Connect* relied on local health systems to adapt independently to the changes that were instigated by WAJA deployment. This frustrated WAJAs, who recalled situations such as “I educated a pregnant woman before delivery to go [deliver at hospital] but when she reached [the hospital] she observed that there was no service, and she told her husband ‘there is not any service. Its better I deliver at home’” (WAJA, Mgomba North, Rufiji, 2013). Health care workers at facilities were upset by these failures. When WAJA referred sick children, staff at facilities, often, could not help:

A child might have malaria scorching hot, but you can fail to get medicine, or you can get medicine but fail to get syringe. You tell [the caregiver] to buy [the missing item] because we do not have enough working equipment (Health Facility Supervisor, Mngeta, Kilombero, 2013).

The fragility of logistics systems illuminated a deeper divergence between individuals involved in the intervention. Whereas *Connect* staff and district counterparts deployed WAJA to empower communities and connect them to the health system, community members felt WAJA should act as ‘doctors’ that address needs unmet due to the weak health system. According to one WAJA: “The difficulty is that people see me as a doctor. When I refer the patient... They ask, ‘why go to the facility where we get nothing if we chose you to work here for us?’” (WAJA, Lukolongo, Ifakara, 2012). Mothers voiced that perspective: “I would like WAJA to be given more trainings so that it will not be necessary to go to the hospital because when we go there, there are no medications” (Mother, Mgomba North, Rufiji, 2014).

Figure 5 illustrates the stakeholder causal pathway. Preconditions for the implementation effectiveness were not in place and the strategy did not contain elements that strengthened absorptive capacities of support system actors to adapt to the changes that ensued after WAJA

deployment. Because of this, the targeted change mechanism, i.e., the ‘intervention-values-systems’ fit, was never activated. In turn, proximal and distal outcomes did not arise as intended. See Figure 5.

INSERT FIGURE 5

Fig 5. Stakeholder-level (local health system and community) Causal Pathway Model

WAJA level

In addition, *Connect* sought to build capacity, inspire motivation and, in doing so, help establish PHC implementation readiness in communities. These interventions focused on WAJA, primarily, and included training, employment and remuneration, and clinical and community supervision. Throughout the trial, these inputs had their intended effect: beyond the training and deployment of WAJA, being paid and accorded an ‘organizational identity’ that motivated WAJAs’ productivity and commitment:

The thing that pushed me is that I had no work [before becoming a WAJA] and I had received little education and I observed that the community was struggling... Now when we pass through the community [community members] recognize us as ones that can help them... This motivates me (WAJA, Kisawasawa, Ifakara, 2012).

However, over time, three contextual factors affected WAJAs’ sense of ‘organizational citizenship’. Chronic failures in the supply chain in the later years of the project left WAJA feeling betrayed: “It is as if [the intervention] has entered the government system. First, they will replace [bicycle] tires, then they say they will replace medicines. But, when you wait you do not get the promises that they told us” (WAJA, Lumemo, 2014).

Relationships with health facility supervisors were crucial to WAJAs' motivation: "He always comes to ask us about the challenges we face and keeps regularly in touch to see if we need help with a patient. This is what motivates us, too" (WAJA, Minepa, Ifakara, 2013). Yet, there were frequent lapses in supervision, which supervisors attributed to excessive workload.

We have been given transportation, which gives us motivation to do our work effectively with the WAJA, at the village, but we do not get enough support with our services. Who can provide our services if we are [in the community]? (Health Facility Supervisor, Mlabani, Ifakara, 2012).

WAJAs' success also depended on their relationships with village leaders. WAJA benefited when village authorities helped mobilize households, enforce community health rules, and solve complex problems. One WAJA reports:

Where I come from, it's the village health committee that makes decisions and implements the fines. So, as I pass through the community to inspect households, which are supposed to have a latrine toilet, I find some households have difficulty with this. When I go to this household, they might refuse or chase [me] away, so I report this so that the committee can help the household or charge fines. (WAJA, Lumemo, Ifakara, 2013).

However, WAJA did not always experience productive collaboration with village leaders:

In my village, the government does not cooperate. The public doesn't trust the executive. We had the lack of cupboards for storing the medicine. This was troubling [me] until there came some doctors who strongly rebuked [the Village Executive Officer]. Another thing the meetings.... The meetings should be held

every three months, but since last year we have not had one. (WAJA, Mangwi, Rufiji, 2013).

Ubiquitously, village stakeholders complained that while WAJA were remunerated, Village Supervisors and other members of village governments were not. As one Village Supervisor lamented: “We fail to do our job because we don’t have allowance, and the WAJA will not listen to you, the supervisor, as you are only a volunteer while that one is getting paid” (Village Supervisor, Nyambunda, Rufiji, 2012).

In addition, geographic and logistical barriers impeded WAJA performance. The wetland terrain of the Rufiji delta was particularly vulnerable to extreme rainfall: “What disrupts our schedule is the weather condition. There are some hamlets which you cannot reach because of rivers that get created by monsoon rains” (WAJA, Nyambunda, Rufiji, 2012). WAJA deployed to expansive, rural communities struggled to meet coverage requirements: “What hinders us is the distances from some homes and the rest of the community. Sometimes bicycle might be damaged, and the distance is so far, in the bush” (WAJA, Lukolongo, Ifakara, 2012).

Pursuit of the WAJA-level causal pathway was achieved with mixed success. Although the preconditions for implementation effectiveness were in place for some of the program, lapses occurred that were addressed by the *Connect Project* when districts could not. WAJA often struggled to overcome difficult community dynamics and environmental constraints. Nevertheless, triangulation of qualitative and quantitative findings suggests that, despite challenges, WAJA maintained their confidence and motivation, and implementation readiness in communities, which helped achieve some of the intended distal MNCH outcomes. See Figure 6.

INSERT FIGURE 6

Fig 6. WAJA-level Causal Pathway Model

Organizational level

Finally, at the organizational level, *Connect* sought to strengthen systems to adopt and manage the WAJA intervention. This started with the IHI providing financial and embedded technical assistance to CHMT during the first two years of the trial. Although *Connect* periodically backstopped districts in the provision of essential working materials to WAJA from 2013-15, the strategy largely failed at incorporating the intervention in the government system. One stakeholder commented: “The challenge is how we can incorporate [WAJA] in the health system. That challenge is too big for us, as it requires cooperation between us, the Ministry of Health as well Ministry of Regional Government, which now we do not see” (District Medical Officer, Ulanga, 2014).

In addition, district leaders felt that the CHW sub-system was simply too costly and complicated to adopt in two years.

WAJA program has come here as pilot and will not last forever, and we need more resources. Our budget from the basket fund should be spent on services at facilities. ‘OS’ (Other Sources), which we received from the central government, this can go to [the WAJA intervention] ... But if you spend on office affairs, fuel, the allowances, salaries, and everything in the administration activities, it is not enough. (District Medical Officer, Rufiji, 2014).

It follows that, during 2013-2015, WAJA depended on support from the IHI to sustain implementation.

As a district I can't say that we can accommodate WAJA so that they can be sustainable. The WAJA are still doing their duties as usual and I still visit them to deliver supplies and do follow up, but for most things now we wait for it to get done [at the IHI] with Connect (Connect Focal Person, Kilombero, 2014).

As these stakeholders discussed, the combination of weak health systems and an inadequate district support strategy contributed to breakdown in the organizational level causal pathway. Preconditions for strategic success were never in place and *Connect's* financial and technical support to districts was insufficient vis-à-vis the costs and complexity of integrating the WAJA into local health systems. See Figure 7.

INSERT FIGURE 7

Fig 7. Organizational-level Causal Pathway Model

Discussion

This study evaluated the effect of WAJA deployment on MNCH service utilization, childhood morbidity and access to sick childcare, and explained how these findings were generated. The quantitative analysis demonstrates that the intervention failed to connect communities to the formal health system; however, WAJA deployment was associated with childhood morbidity reduction as well as increases in timely access to appropriate of sick childcare. The qualitative analysis elucidates how the implementation strategy did and did not affect intended outcomes and the determinants of that process. Altogether, this study provides an opportunity to hypothesize about the relationship between CHW interventions, the mechanisms through which they change proximate outcomes, how contextual conditions shape these processes, and how this affects MNCH.

Intervention source, adaptability, and visibility of results. By engaging communities in cocreation of the intervention, adapting training procedures, and using community members to provide MNCH care, *Connect* elicited the perception that the WAJA intervention had been internally developed and that lifesaving interventions had been adapted and configured in the social environment to meet communities' needs. Early-stage resistance subsided as skeptics became familiar with the WAJA and observed their impact. These findings add to literature on acceptability and diffusion of innovation, which emphasizes similar factors (71,72). This analysis suggests that these mechanisms helped *Connect* achieve critical proximal outcomes, such as legitimacy, household members satisfaction, and community acceptance, which, we conjecture, facilitated caregivers' uptake of health behaviors that, in turn, led to positive health effects, importantly the reduced risk of childhood illness. Additional more focused research is needed to better understand the mechanisms through which community-based programming triggers acceptability, and to demonstrate whether this is associated with behavior change.

However, our analysis found that the process used to determine the WAJA service delivery package did not sufficiently engage communities and include some components that were valuable to them, and was, thus, was a notable barrier to acceptability. Future research ought to investigate the feasibility of strategies that integrate citizen accountability structures into PHC policy and implementation processes (73,74). Furthermore, the qualitative analysis found that acceptability was greater in communities with strong leadership that proactively supported WAJA (34,75–77). Future research should focus on ways to strengthen these structures as a step toward incorporating communities into wider health systems.

Intervention-values-systems fit. The qualitative findings bring into focus how weaknesses of the health system stymied creation of such an 'intervention-values-systems' fit (70,78). Whereas

Connect managers viewed WAJAs as ‘connectors’ deployed to link communities to the health system and motivate them to take prevention and promotion of health into their own hands, community members saw WAJA as ambulatory doctors in place to compensate for a health system that failed them. This divergence of perspectives and misalignment of the intervention design, communities’ perceived needs, the readiness of the health system to routinely provide MNCH care, and its limited absorptive capacity produced a climate of implementation replete with referral noncompliance, ill-prepared WAJA and health care workers, and frustrated communities. This finding has implications for CHW programs that are situated in weak health systems. To succeed in these environments, CHW implementation strategies should incorporate systems strengthening components that address root causes of communities’ suboptimal use of facility-based care. We hypothesize that this will help establish an implementation climate of greater compatibility between the roles of CHW, communities’ perceptions and willingness to use the CHW intervention, and the capacity of delivery systems to meet expectations. In doing so, future CHW programs may succeed in areas where *Connect* did not, for example strengthening linkages between communities and the health system and increasing use of facility-based MNCH services. Previous research has focused on compatibility between intervention features and capacities of delivery systems to learn and adapt (79,80), existing workflows and systems in the adopting organization (81,82), and implementer characteristics (83,84). In addition, studies have reported on the adaptability of interventions vis-a-vis value systems conditioned by religion, traditional social and communication networks and diverse cultures (85–88). This analysis illuminates how characteristics of systems condition the ways in which stakeholders perceive, value, and use interventions; and how this affects the introduction of CHW. Future research should explore these

relationships, and how they shape the prospects of introducing evidence-based interventions in health systems.

Readiness for implementation. *Connect's* pragmatic objective to build capacity of the system to adopt and implement the WAJA intervention largely failed, a finding that is consistent with examples from many CHW initiatives which encountered organizational and sustainability challenges (89). In particular, CHW programs that emphasize IMCI have struggled to maintain capabilities to implement essential components of integrated care systems, such as supervision, remuneration or incentivization of cadres and supply chain logistics (90–93). Future research should focus on how to strengthen public sector health system leadership and coordination capacities as a precursor to extending the reach of PHC programs to the community-level (58,94).

Motivation and organizational commitment. Beyond building WAJA knowledge and skills, *Connect* succeeded at engendering the commitment of the cadre by giving them contracts and remuneration for performance, extending formal supervision processes to the community, and tapping into existing community structures to avail WAJA with necessary support. The qualitative analysis illustrated how this triggered motivation, confidence, and enhanced organizational citizenship behaviors. These mechanisms not only made WAJAs' work more feasible and enabled their reach in communities. Moreover, they withstood adverse contextual influences, such as lapses in health system functionality, inconsistent support from community leaders and geographic and weather-related barriers and enabled the achievement of positive health effects. Based on this, we conjecture that programs that blend efforts to professionalize CHW, facilitate opportunities for supervision and support, and ensure the functionality of logistics systems elicit levels of hard work, motivation, and confidence from CHW that, in turn, leads to desirous performance outcomes.

In LMICs, there is dearth of research on the dynamic interplay between individuals and their organizations and how this affects implementation. Our finding that the professionalization of WAJA enhanced their willingness to work hard echoes earlier studies which highlight the relevance of personal growth, professional development, and both working and social relationships to CHW motivation (95). It is noteworthy that WAJA motivation was inhibited when incentivization schemes came into tension with social relationships and hierarchies. Bhattacharrya et al. make a distinction between factors that motivate CHW and factors that motivate others to support and sustain CHW (96). Indeed, ‘complementary incentives’ are an important consideration when establishing incentivization schemes not just for CHW but for sustaining the wider ‘community health system’(97).

Integration of communities into the health system. The qualitative analysis illuminated contextual factors that impeded organizational adoption of the intervention, an objective of *Connect*. Notably, the costs and complexity of doing so was high relative to extant capacities of systems to learn and adapt. Earlier studies have underscored the need to anticipate these demands and address them proactively to ensure that delivery systems are poised to depart from existing practices, mindful of the intricacy and number of steps required to do so and a realistic sense of the increase in organizational target units that must be reached by implementation (71,98–100). Previous research has also demonstrated the importance of external policies, incentives, or regulations, led by governments or other central entities, that instruct, motivate and channel direct and indirect support to implementers for the uptake and spread of interventions in health systems (37,43).

The study suffered from some limitations. Recall bias may have interfered with measurement in the surveys, which relied on participants’ recollection of care received, in some instances, as far back as two-years prior to data collection. The analysis conducted multiple statistical tests and,

therefore, faces risks associated with multiplicity of analyses and outcomes. Qualitative findings might have been affected by ‘social desirability’ bias in that respondents might have adulterated their responses to please the team that led the intervention. Child survival in the study districts during the time of and surrounding *Connect* had been improving at a pace more rapid than was average for much of Tanzania. Thus, it is not clear if the same results would have been posted had WAJA been deployed in other districts. Finally, our discussion features hypotheses of the linkages between intervention components, mechanisms of change, implementation determinants, proximal outcomes, and health effects. Although these propositions are substantiated by our analysis, additional research is needed to understand these relationships more deeply and test them.

Conclusion

The evaluation of *Connect*, a pragmatic trial with embedded implementation research, shows the outcomes and processes of introducing CHW in the realities of a health system struggling to maintain effective coverage of facility based PHC. The attribution of null effects to systemic weaknesses points to the need for strategies that strengthen and align community and health systems’ core capacities, as well as their abilities to learn, adapt and integrate best evidence-based interventions. In the case of WAJA in Tanzania, there is evidence that suggests that, by addressing this gap, it is possible to accelerate child mortality reduction and improve MNCH. If policymakers, implementation teams and communities, and researchers work together with a common vision of community health systems strengthening, they can help achieve universal health care in Tanzania and similar settings.

Supplemental information

1. Supplemental File 1 (S1 Appendix): CONSORT checklist of items for reporting pragmatic trials.
2. Supplementary File 2 (S2 Appendix): Socio-demographic balance of baseline sample (2011).

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge the funding and advisory support of the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation (grant number DDCF2009058a) and Comic Relief UK (grant number 112259). We also recognize the contributions of Ruth Wilson, Awena Malendo, Mustafa Ngozi and Ahmed Hingora. Finally, we recognize with gratitude the leadership and importance of staff and supporters from Kilombero, Rufiji and Ulanga districts, including staff of their respective Council Health Management Teams and authorities of the villages in which this research was conducted.

References

1. Perry HB, Rassekh BM, Gupta S, Freeman PA. Comprehensive review of the evidence regarding the effectiveness of community-based primary health care in improving maternal, neonatal and child health: 7. shared characteristics of projects with evidence of long-term mortality impact. *J Glob Health*. 2017 Jun;7(1):10907.
2. Jacobs C, Michelo C, Moshabela M. Implementation of a community-based intervention in the most rural and remote districts of Zambia: a process evaluation of safe motherhood action groups. *Implementation Science*. 2018 Dec 31;13(1):74.
3. Jolly SP, Chowdhury TR, Rahman M, Alam A, Afsana K. Prevention of social exclusion and role of antenatal care by BRAC community health workers in improving safe motherhood and neonatal care in urban slums of Bangladesh. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(7):e0235340.
4. Satti H, Motsamai S, Chetane P, Marumo L, Barry DJ, Riley J, et al. Comprehensive Approach to Improving Maternal Health and Achieving MDG 5: Report from the Mountains of Lesotho. *PLoS One*. 2012 Aug 27;7(8):e42700.
5. George A, Young M, Nefdt R, Basu R, Sylla M, Clarysse G, et al. Community health workers providing government community case management for child survival in sub-Saharan Africa: who are they and what are they expected to do? *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2012 Nov;87(5 Suppl):85–91.
6. Haines A, Sanders D, Lehmann U, Rowe AK, Lawn JE, Jan S, et al. Achieving child survival goals: potential contribution of community health workers. *Lancet*. 2007 Jun 23; 369(9579):2121–31.
7. Johnson AD, Thiero O, Whidden C, Poudiougou B, Diakité D, Traoré F, et al. Proactive community case management and child survival in periurban Mali. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2018 Mar;3(2):e000634.
8. Gilmore B, McAuliffe E. Effectiveness of community health workers delivering preventive interventions for maternal and child health in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health*. 2013 Dec 13;13(1):847.
9. Phillips JF, Greene WL, Jackson EF. *Lessons from Community-based Distribution of Family Planning in Africa*. New York; 1999. Available from: https://knowledgecommons.popcouncil.org/departments_sbsr-pgy/260/.
10. Scott VK, Gottschalk LB, Wright KQ, Twose C, Bohren MA, Schmitt ME, et al. Community Health Workers' Provision of Family Planning Services in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review of Effectiveness. *Stud Fam Plann*. 2015 Sep;46(3):241–61.

11. Ramathebane MM, Makatjane TJ, Thetsane RM, Mokhehi M. Assessment of tuberculosis knowledge among Lesotho village health workers and utilisation of their tuberculosis services by the communities they serve. *Afr J Prim Health Care Fam Med*. 2019 Jul 31;11(1): 1-7.
12. Wroe EB, Dunbar EL, Kalanga N, Dullie L, Kachimanga C, Mganga A, et al. Delivering comprehensive HIV services across the HIV care continuum: a comparative analysis of survival and progress towards 90-90-90 in rural Malawi. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2018 Jan 1;3(1):e000552.
13. Rich ML, Miller AC, Niyigena P, Franke MF, Niyonzima JB, Socci A, et al. Excellent Clinical Outcomes and High Retention in Care Among Adults in a Community-Based HIV Treatment Program in Rural Rwanda. *JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*. 2012 Mar 1;59(3):e35–42.
14. Dunbar EL, Wroe EB, Nhlema B, Kachimanga C, Gupta R, Taylor C, et al. Evaluating the impact of a community health worker programme on non-communicable disease, malnutrition, tuberculosis, family planning and antenatal care in Neno, Malawi: protocol for a stepped-wedge, cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(7):e019473.
15. Lewin S, Munabi-Babigumira S, Glenton C, Daniels K, Bosch-Capblanch X, Van Wyk BE, et al. Lay health workers in primary and community health care for maternal and child health and the management of infectious diseases. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2010;(3).
16. Corley AG, Thornton CP, Glass NE. The Role of Nurses and Community Health Workers in Confronting Neglected Tropical Diseases in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Systematic Review. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2016 Sep 15;10(9):e0004914.
17. Barnett ML, Gonzalez A, Miranda J, Chavira DA, Lau AS. Mobilizing Community Health Workers to Address Mental Health Disparities for Underserved Populations: A Systematic Review. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*. 2018 Mar 20;45(2):195–211.
18. Mutamba BB, van Ginneken N, Smith Paintain L, Wandiembe S, Schellenberg D. Roles and effectiveness of lay community health workers in the prevention of mental, neurological and substance use disorders in low and middle income countries: a systematic review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2013 Dec 13;13(1): 1-11.
19. Bhutta Z, Lassi ZS, Pariyo G, Huicho L. Global Experience of Community Health Workers for Delivery of Health Related Millennium Development Goals : Global Health Workforce Alliance; 2010. Available from: <https://chwcentral.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/Global-Experience-of-Community-Health-Workers-for-Delivery-of-Health-Related-Millennium-Development-Goals>.
20. Singh P, Sachs JD. 1 million community health workers in sub-Saharan Africa by 2015. *The Lancet*. 2013 Jul;382(9889):363–5.

21. Perry H, Zulliger R. How Effective Are Community Health Workers? An Overview of Current Evidence with Recommendations for Strengthening Community Health Worker Programs to Accelerate Progress in Achieving the Health-Related Millennium Development Goals. Baltimore; 2012. Available from: https://www.childhealthtaskforce.org/sites/default/files/2019-07/How%20Effective%20are%20CHWs_Evidence%20Summary%20Condensed%28JHSPH%2C%202012%29.pdf.
22. Dahn B, Woldemariam A, Perry H, Maeda A, von Glahn D, Panjabi R, et al. Strengthening primary health care through community health workers: investment case and financing recommendations. Geneva; 2015. Available from: <http://www.healthenvoy.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/CHW-Financing-FINAL-July-15-2015.pdf>.
23. Gordon C McCord, Liu A, Singh P. Deployment of community health workers across rural sub-Saharan Africa: financial considerations and operational assumptions. Bulletin of the World Health Organization; 2013; 91: 244-253b.
24. Vaughan K, Kok MC, Witter S, Dieleman M. Costs and cost-effectiveness of community health workers: evidence from a literature review. Hum Resour Health. 2015 Dec 1;13(1): 1-16.
25. Black RE, Taylor CE, Arole S, Bang A, Bhutta ZA, Chowdhury AMR, et al. Comprehensive review of the evidence regarding the effectiveness of community-based primary health care in improving maternal, neonatal and child health: 8. summary and recommendations of the Expert Panel. J Glob Health. 2017;7(1):10908.
26. Perry HB, Zulliger R, Rogers MM. Community Health Workers in Low-, Middle-, and High-Income Countries: An Overview of Their History, Recent Evolution, and Current Effectiveness. In: Fielding JE, editor. Annual Review of Public Health. 2014 Mar 18; 35: 399-421.
27. Freeman P, Perry HB, Gupta SK, Rassekh B. Accelerating progress in achieving the millennium development goal for children through community-based approaches. Glob Public Health. 2012 Apr 1; 7(4): 400-19.
28. Schneider H, Okello D, Lehmann U. The global pendulum swing towards community health workers in low- and middle-income countries: a scoping review of trends, geographical distribution and programmatic orientations, 2005 to 2014. Hum Resour Health. 2016 Dec 26;14(1): 1-2.
29. Perry H, Crigler L, Hodgins S. Developing and strengthening community health worker programs at scale: a reference guide and case studies for program managers and policy makers . Baltimore; 2014. Available at: https://www.mchip.net/sites/default/files/mchipfiles/CHW_ReferenceGuide_sm.pdf.

30. Naimoli JF, Frymus DE, Quain EE, Roseman EEL. Community and formal health system support for enhanced community health worker performance: A U.S. Government evidence summit. Washington, D.C.; 2012. Available at: [https://www.childhealthtaskforce.org/sites/default/files/2019-07/Community%20and%20Formal%20Health%20System%20Support%20for%20Enhanced%20CHW%20Performance_Evidence%20Summit%20Final%20Report\(USAID,%202012\).pdf](https://www.childhealthtaskforce.org/sites/default/files/2019-07/Community%20and%20Formal%20Health%20System%20Support%20for%20Enhanced%20CHW%20Performance_Evidence%20Summit%20Final%20Report(USAID,%202012).pdf).
31. Naimoli JF, Frymus DE, Wuliji T, Franco LM, Newsome MH. A Community Health Worker “logic model”: towards a theory of enhanced performance in low- and middle-income countries. *Hum Resour Health*. 2014 Dec 2;12(1): 1-16.
32. McGorman L, Marsh DR, Guenther T, Gilroy K, Barat LM, Hammamy D, et al. A Health Systems Approach to Integrated Community Case Management of Childhood Illness: Methods and Tools. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2012 Nov 7;87(5_Suppl):69–76.
33. Liu A, Sullivan S, Khan M, Sachs S, Singh P. Community Health Workers in Global Health: Scale and Scalability. *Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine: A Journal of Translational and Personalized Medicine*. 2011 May;78(3):419–35.
34. Schneider H, Lehmann U. From community health workers to community health systems: Time to widen the horizon? *Health Syst Reform*. 2016;2(2):112–8.
35. Lehmann U, Twum-Danso NAY, Nyoni J. Towards universal health coverage: what are the system requirements for effective large-scale community health worker programmes? *BMJ Glob Health*. 2019;4(Suppl 9):e001046–e001046.
36. World Health Organization. World Health Report 2008: Primary Health Care, Now More Than Ever. Geneva, Switzerland; 2008. Available at: https://reliefweb.int/report/world/world-health-report-2008-primary-health-care-now-more-ever?gclid=Cj0KCQiA5NSdBhDfARIsALzs2ECCIEMEfFNjD6UWtC6lS0V0E4g1b_pGO6q_4P8W_D5hCfwFcHqbn2UaAhUDEALw_wcB.
37. Cometto G, Ford N, Pfaffman-Zambruni J, Akl EA, Lehmann U, McPake B, et al. Health policy and system support to optimise community health worker programmes: an abridged WHO guideline. 2018 Dec 1;6(12): e1397–404.
38. Zulu JM, Kinsman J, Michelo C, Hurtig AK. Integrating national community-based health worker programmes into health systems: a systematic review identifying lessons learned from low-and middle-income countries. *BMC Public Health*. 2014 Dec 22;14(1): 1-7.
39. Zulu JM, Perry HB. Community health workers at the dawn of a new era. *Health Res Policy Syst*. 2021 Oct;19(S3):1-5.
40. Kok MC, Dieleman M, Taegtmeier M, Broerse JEW, Kane SS, Ormel H, et al. Which intervention design factors influence performance of community health workers in low-

- and middle-income countries? A systematic review. *Health Policy Plan.* 2015 Nov 1;30(9):1207–27.
41. Scott K, Beckham SW, Gross M, Pariyo G, Rao KD, Cometto G, et al. What do we know about community-based health worker programs? A systematic review of existing reviews on community health workers. *Hum Resour Health.* 2018 Dec;16(1): 1-7.
 42. Khumalo GE, Lutge EE, Naidoo P, Mashamba-Thompson TP. Barriers and facilitators of rendering HIV services by community health workers in sub-Saharan Africa: a meta-synthesis. *Fam Med Community Health.* 2021 Sep 24;9(4):e000958.
 43. Pallas SW, Minhas D, Pérez-Escamilla R, Taylor L, Curry L, Bradley EH. Community Health Workers in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: What Do We Know About Scaling Up and Sustainability? *Am J Public Health.* 2013 Jul;103(7):e74–82.
 44. Kane SS, Gerretsen B, Scherpbier R, Dal Poz M, Dieleman M. A realist synthesis of randomised control trials involving use of community health workers for delivering child health interventions in low and middle income countries. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2010 Dec 13;10(1): 1-7.
 45. Kok MC, Kane SS, Tulloch O, Ormel H, Theobald S, Dieleman M, et al. How does context influence performance of community health workers in low- and middle-income countries? Evidence from the literature. *Health Res Policy Syst [Internet].* 2015;13(1):13.
 46. Jaskiewicz W, Tulenko K. Increasing community health worker productivity and effectiveness: a review of the influence of the work environment. *Hum Resour Health.* 2012 Dec 27;10(1):38.
 47. Glenton C, Colvin CJ, Carlsen B, Swarz A, Lewin S, Noyes J, Rashidian A. Barriers and facilitators to the implementation of lay health worker programmes to improve access to maternal and child health: a qualitative evidence synthesis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.* 2013;(10).
 48. Baqui AH, El-Arifeen S, Darmstadt GL, Ahmed S, Williams EK, Seraji HR, et al. Effect of community-based newborn-care intervention package implemented through two service-delivery strategies in Sylhet district, Bangladesh: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet.* 2008;371(9628):1936–44.
 49. Geldsetzer PI, Mboggo EI, Larson EI, Andrew Lema I, Magesa L, Machumi LI, et al. Community health workers to improve uptake of maternal healthcare services: A cluster-randomized pragmatic trial in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. 2019; *PLoS Medicine.* 2019 Mar 29; 16(3): e1002768.
 50. Kanté AM, Exavery A, Jackson EF, Kassimu T, Baynes CD, Hingora A, et al. The impact of paid community health worker deployment on child survival: The Connect randomized cluster trial in rural Tanzania. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019 Dec;19(1): 1-14.

51. Geubbels E, Amri S, Levira F, Schellenberg J, Masanja H, Nathan R. Health and Demographic Surveillance System Profile: The Ifakara Rural and Urban Health and Demographic Surveillance System (Ifakara HDSS). *Int J Epidemiol*. 2015 Jun;44(3):848–61.
52. Mrema S, Kante AM, Levira F, Mono A, Irema K, de Savigny D, et al. Health and Demographic Surveillance System Profile: The Rufiji Health and Demographic Surveillance System (Rufiji HDSS). *Int J Epidemiol*. 2015 Apr;44(2):472–83.
53. Heggenhougen K, Vaughan P, Muhondwa E, Rutabanzibwa, Ngaiza J. Community health workers: the Tanzanian experience. *Community health workers: the Tanzanian experience*. Oxford University Press; 1987.
54. Greenspan JA, McMahon SA, Chebet JJ, Mpunga M, Urassa DP, Winch PJ. Sources of community health worker motivation: a qualitative study in Morogoro Region, Tanzania. *Hum Resour Health*. 2013 Dec 10;11(1):52.
55. Ministry of Health and Social Welfare. The Primary Health Care Service Development Programme (MMAM). Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; 2007 May.
56. Shoo R, Mzige A. Training of Community Health Workers in Tanzania: Review of Community Health Worker cadres training programs in Tanzania, published evidence, their impact and the way forward. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; 2011 Jun.
57. Ramsey K, Hingora A, Kante M, Jackson E, Exavery A, Pemba S, et al. The Tanzania Connect Project: a cluster-randomized trial of the child survival impact of adding paid community health workers to an existing facility-focused health system. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2013 May 31;13: 1-14.
58. Baynes C, Semu H, Baraka J, Mushi H, Ramsey K, Kante AM, et al. An exploration of the feasibility, acceptability, and effectiveness of professional, multitasked community health workers in Tanzania. *Glob Public Health*. 2017 Aug;12(8): 1018-32.
59. Phillips JF, Hingora A. Introducing Community Health Agents to accelerate achievement of Millennium Development Goals 4 and 5 in Tanzania: The Connect Project. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and New York, USA; 2010 Aug. Report No.: IHI/IRB/No. 16-2010.
60. The United Republic of Tanzania Ministry of Health and Social Welfare J 2009 J. Health Sector Strategic Plan III. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania; 2009 May.
61. Skinner CJ. Probability Proportional to Size Sampling. *Wiley StatsRef: Statistics Reference Online*. 2016 Aug 5;1–5.
62. Glaser BG. The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis. *Soc Probl*. 1965 Apr;12(4): 436-45.
63. Boeije H. A Purposeful Approach to the Constant Comparative Method in the Analysis of Qualitative Interviews. *Qual Quant [Internet]*. 2002;36(4):391–409. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020909529486>

64. Lewis CC, Klasnja P, Powell BJ, Lyon AR, Tuzzio L, Jones S, et al. From Classification to Causality: Advancing Understanding of Mechanisms of Change in Implementation Science. *Front Public Health*. 2018 May;6: 136.
65. Corbin JM, Strauss A. Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qual Sociol*. 1990;13(1):3–21.
66. Corbin J, Strauss A. Analytic Ordering for Theoretical Purposes. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 1996 Jun 29;2(2):139–50.
67. Lewis CC, Boyd MR, Walsh-Bailey C, Lyon AR, Beidas R, Mittman B, et al. A systematic review of empirical studies examining mechanisms of implementation in health. *Implementation Science*. 2020 Dec 16;15(1): 1-25.
68. Miles M, Huberman A. *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*. 3rd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage; 1991.
69. Leeman J, Birken SA, Powell BJ, Rohweder C, Shea CM. Beyond “implementation strategies”: Classifying the full range of strategies used in implementation science and practice. *Implementation Science*. 2017;12(1):1–9.
70. Klein KJ, Sorra JS. The Challenge of Innovation Implementation. *Academy of Management Review*. 1996 Oct;21(4):1055–80.
71. Greenhalgh T, Robert G, Macfarlane F, Bate P, Kyriakidou O. Diffusion of Innovations in Service Organizations: Systematic Review and Recommendations. *The Milbank Quarterly*. 2004;82(4):581–629.
72. Fixsen DL, Naoom SF, Blase KL, Friedman RM, Wallace F. *Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature*. Tampa, FL; 2005. Available at: <https://nirn.fpg.unc.edu/resources/implementation-research-synthesis-literature>.
73. George AS, Scott K, Sarriot E, Kanjilal B, Peters DH. Unlocking community capabilities across health systems in low- and middle-income countries: lessons learned from research and reflective practice. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2016 Nov;16: 43-46.
74. Schaaf M, Topp SM, Ngulube M. From favours to entitlements: community voice and action and health service quality in Zambia. *Health Policy Plan*. 2017 Jul;32(6):847–59.
75. Bhattacharji S, Abraham S, Muliylil J, Job JS, John K, Joseph A. Evaluating community health worker performance in India. *Health Policy Plan*. 1986;1:232–9.
76. Gryboski et al., Yinger N v, Dios RH, Worley H, Fikree FF. *Working With the Community For Improved Health*. Washington, D.C.; 2006; Available at: <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/25470052/working-with-the-community-for-improved-health>.
77. Elling RH, Lee OJ. Formal Connections of Community Leadership to the Health System. *Milbank Mem Fund Q*. 1966 Jul;44(3):294-306.

78. Means AR, Kemp CG, Gwayi-Chore MC, Gimbel S, Soi C, Sherr K, et al. Evaluating and optimizing the consolidated framework for implementation research (CFIR) for use in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *Implementation Science*. 2020;15(1): 1-9.
79. Barnsley J, Lemieux-Charles L, McKinney MM. Integrating Learning into Integrated Delivery Systems. *Health Care Manage Rev*. 1998 Jan;23(1):18–28.
80. Shortell SM, Bennett CL, Byck GR. Assessing the impact of continuous quality improvement on clinical practice: what it will take to accelerate progress. *Milbank Quarterly*. 1998;76(4):510,593-624.
81. Atun R, de Jongh T, Secci F, Ohiri K, Adeyi O. Integration of targeted health interventions into health systems: a conceptual framework for analysis. *Health Policy Plan*. 2010 Mar 1;25(2):104–11.
82. May C, Finch T, Mair F, Ballini L, Dowrick C, Eccles M, et al. Understanding the implementation of complex interventions in health care: the normalization process model. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2007 Dec;7(1): 1-7.
83. Zhou S, Ma J, Dong X, Li N, Duan Y, Wang Z, et al. Barriers and enablers in the implementation of a quality improvement program for acute coronary syndromes in hospitals: a qualitative analysis using the consolidated framework for implementation research. *Implementation Science*. 2022 Jun; 17(1): 36.
84. Zulu DW, Silumbwe A, Maritim P, Zulu JM. Integration of systematic screening for tuberculosis in outpatient departments of urban primary healthcare facilities in Zambia: a case study of Kitwe district. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022 Dec 2;22(1):732.
85. Naeem F, Gobbi M, Ayub M, Kingdon D. University students' views about compatibility of cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) with their personal, social and religious values (a study from Pakistan). *Ment Health Relig Cult*. 2009 Dec;12(8):847–55.
86. Nazzar A, Adongo PB, Binka FN, Phillips JF, Nazzar A, Adongo PB, et al. Developing a Culturally Appropriate Family Planning Program for the Navrongo Experiment. *Stud Fam Plann*. 1995;26(6):307–24.
87. Cabassa LJ, Baumann AA. A two-way street : Bridging implementation science and cultural adaptations of mental health treatments. *Implementation Science*. 2013;8(1):1-14.
88. Barrera M, Berkel C, Castro FG. Directions for the Advancement of Culturally Adapted Preventive Interventions: Local Adaptations, Engagement, and Sustainability. *Prevention Science*. 2017;18(6):640–8.
89. Gilson L, Walt G, Heggenhougen K, Owuor-Omondi L, Perera M, Ross D, et al. National community health worker programs: how can they be strengthened? *J Public Health Policy*. 1989 Jan;10(4):518–32.

90. Banek K, Nankabirwa J, Maiteki-Sebuguzi C, Diliberto D, Taaka L, Chandler CI, et al. Community case management of malaria: exploring support, capacity and motivation of community medicine distributors in Uganda. *Health Policy Plan.* 2015 May 1; 30(4): 451-61.
91. Miller NP, Bagheri Ardestani F, Wong H, Stokes S, Mengistu B, Paulos M, et al. Barriers to the utilization of community-based child and newborn health services in Ethiopia: a scoping review. *Health Policy Plan.* 2021 Aug 12;36(7):1187–96.
92. Riri JV, Silumbwe A, Mweemba C, Zulu JM. Facilitators and barriers to implementation of integrated community case management of childhood illness: a qualitative case study of Kapiri Mposhi District. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2022 Dec 14;22(1):497.
93. Callaghan-Koru J a, Hyder A a, George A, Gilroy KE, Nsona H, Mtimuni A, et al. Health workers' and managers' perceptions of the integrated community case management program for childhood illness in Malawi: the importance of expanding access to child health services. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2012 Nov;87(5 Suppl):61–8.
94. Kouam CE, Delisle H, Ebbing HJ, Israël AD, Salpéteur C, Aïssa MA, et al. Perspectives for integration into the local health system of community-based management of acute malnutrition in children under 5 years: a qualitative study in Bangladesh. *Nutr J.* 2014 Dec;13: 1-5.
95. Colvin CJ, Hodgins S, Perry HB. Community health workers at the dawn of a new era: 8. Incentives and remuneration. *Health Res Policy Syst.* 2021 Oct 12;19: 1-25.
96. Bhattacharyya, K., Winch, P., LeBan K and TM. Incentives and Disincentives: How They Affect Motivation, Retention and Sustainability. Washington, D.C; 2021; Available at: <https://chwcentral.org/resources/community-health-worker-incentives-and-disincentives-how-they-affect-motivation-retention-and-sustainability>.
97. Scott K, Beckham SW, Gross M, Pariyo G, Rao KD, Cometto G, et al. What do we know about community-based health worker programs? A systematic review of existing reviews on community health workers. *Hum Resour Health.* 2018 Dec 16;16(1): 1-17.
98. Kochevar LK, Yano EM. Understanding Health Care Organization Needs and Context. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2006 Feb;21(S2):S25–9.
99. Grol RPTM, Bosch MC, Hilscher MEJL, Eccles MP, Wensing M. Planning and Studying Improvement in Patient Care: The Use of Theoretical Perspectives. *Milbank Quarterly.* 2007 Mar;85(1):93–138.
100. Plsek PE, Greenhalgh T. The challenge of complexity in health care. *Br Med J.* 2001;323(7313):625–8.




Figure 1




Figure 2

Baseline Household Survey (2011)




Figure 3a

Endline Household Survey (2015)




Figure 3b




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6




Figure 7