Barriers to and enablers of quality improvement in primary health care in low- and middle-income countries: a systematic review

4

5 Camlus Odhus¹*, Ruth Kapanga², Elizabeth Oele³

6

7 ¹Division of Health Research, Faculty of Health and Medicine, Lancaster University, Lancaster, United

8 Kingdom

9 ²Ruth Razanajafy Kapanga, County Department of Health, Kakamega County Government,

10 Kakamega, Kenya

11 ³Elizabeth Oele, County Department of Health, County Government of Kisumu, Kisumu, Kenya

12

14 E-mail address: codhus20@gmail.com

15 Abstract

16 The quality of health care remains generally poor across primary health care settings, especially in

17 low- and middle-income countries where tertiary care tends to take up much of the limited

18 resources despite primary health care being the first (and often the only) point of contact with the

19 health system for nearly 80 per cent of people in these countries. Evidence is needed on barriers and

20 enablers of quality improvement initiatives. This systematic review sought to answer the question:

21 What are the enablers of and barriers to quality improvement in primary health care in low- and

- 22 middle-income countries? It adopted an integrative review approach with narrative evidence
- 23 synthesis, which combined qualitative and mixed methods research studies systematically. Using a

^{13 *}Camlus Odhus

24	customized geographic search filter for LMICs developed by the Cochrane Collaboration, Scopus,
25	Academic Search Ultimate, MEDLINE, CINAHL, PSYCHINFO, EMBASE, ProQuest Dissertations and
26	Overton.io (a new database for LMIC literature) were searched in January and February 2023, as
27	were selected websites and journals. 7,077 reports were retrieved. After removing duplicates, four
28	reviewers screened titles, abstracts, and full texts, and performed quality appraisal and data
29	extraction and synthesis. 50 reports from 47 studies were included, covering 52 LMIC settings. Six
30	themes related to barriers and enablers of quality improvement were identified and organized using
31	the model for understanding success in quality (MUSIQ) and the consolidated framework for
32	implementation research (CFIR). These were: microsystem of quality improvement, intervention
33	attributes, implementing organization and team, health systems support and capacity, external
34	environment and structural factors, and execution. Decision makers, practitioners, funders,
35	implementers, and other stakeholders can use the evidence from this systematic review to minimize
36	barriers and amplify enablers to better the chances that quality improvement initiatives will be
37	successful in resource-limited settings. PROSPERO registration: CRD42023395166.

38 Introduction

This review synthesizes literature on barriers to and enablers of efforts by health workers and
different stakeholders to improve the quality of primary health care in low- and middle- income
countries.

The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) contends that "Quality improvement (QI) is
essential to achieving the triple aim of improving the health of the population, enhancing patient
experiences and outcomes, and reducing the per capita cost of care, and to improving provider
experience" [1].
Improving the quality of primary health care is fundamental to the achievement of health goals in

47 lower-middle-income countries [2]. Primary health care (PHC) is all too important because up to
48 eight in every ten people in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) depend on it to meet their

49	health and care needs [3]. For the better part of modern healthcare history, the poor quality of
50	healthcare has generated concerns among practitioners, researchers, and policymakers [4-7] and
51	those concerns have only grown louder [2]. This is because despite more, though increasingly
52	uncertain, investments and rapid innovation, health outcomes have stagnated with rising
53	inequalities in many LMICs [8, 9] potentially leading to wastage, harm, and even preventable deaths
54	[10].
55	While barriers (constraints or limitations) prevent the realization of full benefits from quality
56	improvement (QI) interventions, enablers (also known as promoters, facilitators, or motivators)
57	unlock the potential of such interventions and typically enhance the desired level of quality of
58	primary health care. Both range from the individual or micro (e.g., nurse manager knowledge and
59	behaviour), to institutional-organizational or meso (e.g., shared beliefs, attitudes and practices at a
60	health centre or hospital), to system-wide and societal or macro influences, e.g., implicit, or explicit
61	values that drive QI culture, priority-setting, or investments.
62	First, it is necessary to define key terms. Primary health care (PHC) is challenging to define because it
63	includes or precludes different packages of health services in different contexts. Perhaps it is due to
64	this challenge that the World Bank, the World Health Organization and others [3] opted to define
65	PHC rather broadly as "a health- and social-service delivery platform or system uniquely designed to
66	meet communities' health and health care needs across a comprehensive spectrum of services-
67	including health services from promotive to palliative—in a continuous, integrated, and people-
68	centred manner." PHC services are often attuned to the prevailing socioeconomic, political and
69	historical contexts of communities, in addition to the financial and health workforce considerations
70	in the given country setting [11, 12].
71	Competing but comparable definitions of quality of care which hold important implications for how
72	quality improvement (in healthcare) is defined and operationalized have been proposed by the
73	World Health Organization [13], by the United States National Academy of Medicine, formerly
74	Institute of Medicine or IOM [14], and others [15, 16]. However, consensus remains elusive [15]. But,

75	QI - with roots in manufacturing in 1920s – can be defined as a framework with tools, approaches,
76	techniques, and skillsets including assessment and measurement, goal-setting, and shifts in mindsets
77	geared towards improving equity, access, effectiveness, patient-centeredness, and safety of
78	healthcare [16, 17]. Ongoing debates on the level (individual or population), scope (bounded setting
79	or whole systems), and approaches (evidence-based practice, multidisciplinary) to healthcare quality
80	improvement are unlikely to be concluded soon [18-20]. The review considered the lack of
81	consensus by being as inclusive as possible, avoiding a one-size-fits-all approach to defining quality
82	improvement.
83	Some of the existing reviews have synthesized evidence on patient safety culture in Latin American
84	Hospitals [21], barriers and enablers to the provision of emergency obstetric care in Nigeria [22] and
85	in LMICs [23], and interventions to improve anti-retroviral therapy programmes in sub-Saharan
86	Africa [24]. A COCHRANE review studied the use of reminders in health care [25]. Notably, an
87	umbrella review [26] describing the influence of contextual factors on hospital QI using the Model
88	for Understanding Success in Quality (MUSIQ) tool [27] found that previous systematic reviews
89	overwhelmingly included studies from high income countries in North America, Europe, and
90	Southeast Asia and very few from LMICs (Egypt, South Africa, Zambia, Sudan, Costa Rica, Brazil, and
91	Argentina). A more recent realist-inspired review [28] confined itself to a specific type of QI, namely
92	"QI collaboratives" to investigate contexts, mechanisms and outcomes but still included only five
93	(out of 32) primary studies from LMICs. Still, other reviews have confined themselves to 'training
94	and measurement' [29-31] and patient safety education [32, 33]. No systematic review was found
95	that synthesized literature from low- and middle-income countries to inform holistic quality
96	improvement policy and practice specifically in primary health care.

97 Review aim and questions

98 The systematic review aimed to describe the barriers to and enablers of quality improvement (QI) 99 within primary health care in low- and middle- income countries (LMICs). The review sought to 100 answer the following three closely related questions:

101	1.	What are the barriers to and enablers of QI in primary health care in low- and middle-
102		income countries?
103	2.	What is the shared knowledge, beliefs, values, attitudes, and practices (collectively called
104		'culture') of LMICs' health workers and stakeholders regarding QI in primary health care?
105	3.	What micro (individual or personal), meso (institutional or organizational) and macro
106		(societal or structural) factors motivate health workers and managers involved in primary

107 health care Ql in LMICs?

108 Review approach and methods

Review approach

110 An integrative approach [34] incorporating narrative synthesis [35] for this systematic literature 111 review. Integrative reviews are suitable for combining studies from disparate methodological 112 approaches such as mixed methods and qualitative studies explicitly and has played an expanding 113 role in health systems and policy research [34], contributing to evidence-based policy and practice. 114 The framework for integrative review commences with problem identification, proceeds through a 115 literature search, appraisal of data and analysis, before concluding with data presentation. 116 A narrative approach to evidence synthesis relies on 'storytelling', as its name suggests, and is 117 commensurate with the overall integrative review approach [35]. Correctly performed, narrative 118 synthesis can minimize bias in reviews, ensuring that the eventual review output can be trusted by 119 policymakers and practitioners alike. In the present review, this approach was used to enrich the 120 data analysis and presentation stages of the integrative review. The findings of this systematic 121 review incorporating primary studies on different aspects of QI were synthesized narratively. To 122 comprehensively answer the review question, both mixed methods and qualitative studies 123 investigating barriers, enablers, culture, and other contextual influences on diverse quality 124 improvement interventions in primary health care in low- and middle-income countries were 125 included.

126 Literature search strategy

127	The search for primary research reports was performed in January and February 2023. Electronic
128	databases (MEDLINE, PSYCHINFO, EMBASE and CINHAL) were searched using a mix of free-text (key
129	words) and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH terms), refined for each database using EBSCO
130	interface. More search explored TRIP, Academic Search Ultimate, Web of Science, Scopus, and Africa
131	Index Medicus. The key terms used to develop the literature search strategy drew upon the SPIDER
132	mnemonic [37] included "Quality Improvement" AND "Primary Health Care" AND "Low- middle-
133	income countries".
134	A scoping search was first used to check how studies are indexed and the relevant key words and
135	synonyms. It was also used to test and refine the search strategy. A priori search strategy was then
136	developed and applied to each database flexibly. A sample search strategy used for MEDLINE is
137	contained in supplementary file (S3 Fig). Neither time nor language filters were applied at this stage.
138	Boolean and near field operators were used to expand and narrow the search as appropriate. A
139	geographic search filter for LMICs developed by the Cochrane Collaboration's Effective Practice and
140	Organisation of Care (EPOC) group [36] was applied to exclude high income countries. Literature was
141	searched and retrieved in January and February 2023.
142	Grey literature including dissertations and thesis reports were sought from PROQUEST and the
143	WHO and UNICEF public websites were also searched as was the preprint server, Medrxiv. To further
144	reduce publication bias, Overton.io (an open research initiative to expand access to grey literature
145	from LMICs) was also searched for grey literature. Finally, selected QI-focused journals (Health Policy
146	and Planning, Implementation Science, International Journal for Healthcare Quality, BMJ Open
147	Quality, Journal for Healthcare Quality, BMJ Quality and Safety, Journal of Health Services Research)
148	were hand-searched as were reference lists of systematic reviews in the field of QI.

149 Study selection

- All (n=7,077) reports were imported into Rayyan systematic review management (web platform)
- 151 where (n=4,110) duplicates were removed automatically and manually. Titles and abstracts
- 152 (n=2,967) were screened by two reviewers independently and included (n=227) if they were deemed
- 153 relevant. Conflicts throughout the selection process were resolved by consensus and did not require
- 154 the intervention of a third person. At full text review, reports were read multiple times and
- subjected to inclusion and exclusion criteria as shown in Table 1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria
- 156 were derived from the SPIDER mnemonic [37] and signified the information power of the primary
- 157 research report to contribute answers to the review question(s).

SPIDER element	Include	Exclude	
Sample	Facility-based HCWs Community-based health workers Health managers, policymakers and stakeholders across the health system	Exclude if others included and lumped alongside these in findings.	
Phenomenon of interest	Quality improvement (not just quality of care or general health systems capacity or situation assessment) Quality includes safety, effectiveness, patient- centeredness, timeliness, efficiency, equity in health uptake/access, utilization, or outcomes. Must be primary care or primary health care oriented, reported separately from tertiary and referral level.	Exclude high income country context, exclude health technology assessments, exclude other systematic and umbrella reviews. Also exclude very low-quality studies (judged by consensus) and those from tertiary care (university/teaching and research hospitals). Exclude editorials and opinion pieces, economic evaluations, and clinical case reports. Include only primary empirical research (mixed or qualitative) reporting enablers to and barriers of quality improvement from perspective of health workers, health managers or regulators as study participants.	
Design	Mixed methods and Qualitative designs. Mixed methods papers have qualitative data detailing enablers or barriers.	Quantitative design with no discernible data on contextual drivers of QI measured or reported	
Evaluation	Intervention to improve quality of health care i.e., efforts introduced to Change quality from level X to Y or measured from time X to time Y i.e., a QI initiative rather than just a measurement of quality of care.	Economic evaluations with no accompanying contextual data One-off measurement seeking to perceptions of stakeholders on quality of care rather than on QI intervention/initiative/ project	
Research type	Qualitative data reported separate from quantitative findings in mixed methods. Qualitative research findings qualitatively reported (not quantified in percentages or numerical values). Semi-structured or in-depth Interviews, focus groups, observation, ethnography etc.	Surveys, Randomized Trials with no process evaluations reporting barriers or enablers of QI initiative or QI project	

- 160 Eventually, 50 research reports from 47 studies were found that met the inclusion criteria for the
- 161 systematic review following independent decisions by both reviewers. Fig 1 is a PRISMA flow chart
- showing results of the study selection process [38].
- 163

164 Fig 1. PRISMA Flow Chart

165

Assessment of study quality and relevance

167 The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool, MMAT, checklist [39] was used to critically assess the quality of 168 all 50 included full text reports prior to data extraction. MMAT checklist was especially suitable 169 because it was developed for systematic reviews incorporating primary studies from different 170 designs (qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods). The first two screening questions ask 171 whether there were clear research questions and if the data collected allowed the primary 172 researchers to address the study's research question. For qualitative studies the tool has five themes 173 (with ves, no, or can't tell response options): coherence between methodology and research 174 question, coherence between data collection methods and research question, adequacy of findings 175 given the data, coherence between the interpretation of findings and the data, and coherence in the 176 research cycle from data sources, collection, analysis, and interpretation. To assess mixed methods studies MMAT focuses more on the appropriateness of mixing methods, whether the various 177 178 methodologies were suitably combined, and how rigour and trustworthiness for each research 179 tradition was maintained in the primary research. Each quality criteria entails "yes", "no", or "can't 180 tell" response options. In keeping with best practice for integrative reviews and narrative synthesis, 181 no scoring was done, and no study was excluded from the analysis based on the results of the critical 182 appraisal, but the strengths and limitations of each study were considered in the ensuing synthesis.

183 Data extraction

184	The lead author extracted data from all 50 included reports while a second reviewer independently
185	extracted data from a sample of 23, about half of all included reports. A comparison of both datasets
186	showed no major inconsistencies. The bespoke data extraction form also had sections to capture QI
187	theory (of change), description of the QI intervention, study setting, sample and population, barriers,
188	and enablers as well as motivations and other contextual influences. Lastly, data on study
189	conclusions, limitations and strengths, and recommendations (where available) were included. Data
190	extraction made use of Microsoft Office Forms, hosted online.

191 Data analysis

192 Data analysis involved the use of two frameworks commonly applied in Quality Improvement (QI)

193 research. The Model for Understanding Success in Quality (MUSIQ) developed by [27] was

194 predominantly used, complemented with the Consolidated Framework for Implementation

195 Research, CFIR, [40]. MUSIQ contains concepts for understanding the external context of QI

196 interventions while CFIR complemented this by providing a way to organise attributes intrinsic to the

197 Ql intervention itself. Concepts from these two frameworks were deductively applied to the entire

dataset of 50 research articles and inductive coding with labels grounded in the data was done

199 where data did not fit into the *a priori* coding framework. The entire process was iterative with

200 multiple revisions. Atlas.ti version 9 (ATLAS.ti Scientific Software Development GmbH, Berlin) was

201 used for coding and categorization.

202 First, to enable detailed and systematic analysis of this large dataset and in concert with the

203 integrative review approach, studies were classified and grouped by geographic region, country

204 income status and study topical focus. This allowed systematic comparison of studies and

205 integration of their findings. Next, deductive codes from MUSIQ and CFIR were applied to the data

206 extracted from studies in addition to new (inductive) codes. Codes were then grouped into

207 categories (still informed by MUSIQ and CFIR) before being displayed in tables and matrices and

208	network diagrams. Through comparisons and contrasts, noting surprising or unique findings and
209	variability within and across subgroups, the analysis moved into the final phase. Here, a description
210	of patterns in the form of themes concluded the analysis by narratively synthesizing subgroup
211	patterns into an overall picture to address the review's three aims: to describe the evidence on
212	barriers and enablers of primary healthcare quality improvement; to uncover individual motivations
213	(of health workers, managers and other stakeholders) for undertaking QI; and to describe what the
214	culture (shared knowledge, language, or artifacts) of QI looks like in PHC settings in LMICs contexts.
215	Verification of results was done by going back to primary studies to ascertain the link with eventual
216	conclusions (S2 Table).

217 **Results**

218 Characteristics of included studies

219 Fifty primary research reports were included in the analysis. Twenty-eight had mixed methods 220 design while 22 were qualitative, as summarized in Table 2. Signifying increasing interest in primary 221 health care quality improvement by researchers, 41 of the studies were published in the last five 222 years (2018 to date) while only nine were reported between 2012 and 2017. Although the review 223 had aimed to include studies since 2000, none of the included studies covered the period 2000 to 224 2011. Turning to geographical coverage (S3 Table) for this systematic review that sought literature 225 from low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) on barriers and enablers of quality improvement in 226 relation to primary health care, fourty-one of the studies were based in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), 227 seven from Asia and two from Latin America (Costa Rica which is upper middle-income and Haiti 228 which is lower middle-income). All seven studies based in Asian countries came from lower middle-229 income settings (India had three while Indonesia, Tajikistan, Papua New Guinea, and Sri Lanka had 230 one study each). Out of the fourty-one studies from SSA, 37 reported research conducted in a 231 single-country set-up while four covered multiple countries. In total, research reports covered 45 232 SSA countries. A close examination revealed that three publications [41, 42] were likely from the

same QI intervention in Tanzania and Uganda and a further two publications [43, 44] were from the same project in Nigeria. Table 2. Characteristics of included studies

Author	Country/ setting	Торіс	Purpose/ Aim (as described in the study)	Research design
Giessler et al. [45]	Kenya: Four government health facilities in Nairobi and Kiambu Counties	Maternal health (patient centred care)	Study focuses on the experiences of both clinical and non-clinical staff who took part in a quality improvement collaborative focused on improving patient centred care for maternal heath and family planning in public facilities in Kenya.	Descriptive qualitative exploration using semi-structured interviews.
Odusola et al. [46]	Nigeria: Kwara State	Hypertension prevention and care using health insurance	To explore perspectives of insurance managers and primary care staff on factors that might inhibit or facilitate the implementation of high-quality hypertension care in practice.	Qualitative design and semi- structured individual interviews.
Pesec et al. [47]	Costa Rica: nationwide	Health care reforms: collection and use of data for quality improvement	To identify the sources of PHC data in Costa Rica's healthcare system and describe how these data are used for quality improvement.	Qualitative methodology with in- depth, in-person semi-structured interviews.
Lall et al. [48]	South India: Kolar, Karnataka State, in three government healthcare facilities	Non-communicable diseases: service reorganization	We critically analyse the implementation process using implementation and quality improvement frameworks to identify contextual factors that may have resulted in the differential uptake of interventions at the different primary health care centres.	Mixed methods: Case experimental design with observation and the implementation of interventions.
Wakida et al. [49]	Uganda: Mbarara district, about 270 Kilometers by road, southwest of Kampala	Clinical practice guidelines (CPG) implementation: mental health disorders	This study aimed to assess the feasibility and acceptability of an educational intervention towards improvement of the primary health care practitioners' uptake of the clinical practice guidelines in integrating mental health services into primary health care in Mbarara district, southwestern Uganda.	Descriptive cross-sectional qualitative study.
Bogren et al. [50]	Democratic Republic of Congo: South Kivu Province	Maternal and newborn health: health worker training	To explore contextual factors influencing a training intervention focusing on health care practice during childbirth.	Qualitative research design, and data was collected through focus- group discussions (FGDs).
Tibeihaho et al. [51]	Uganda: 13 districts	Institutionalizing continuous quality improvement	To understand how the continuous quality improvement processes introduced by the CODES project were institutionalized at the district level.	Qualitative research design: District documents relevant to the continuous quality improvement process were also reviewed.

	Gage et al. [52]	Zimbabwe: Centenary, Chipinge, Mwenezi, Binga and Mangwe districts	Continuous quality improvement through performance-based financing	To evaluate the continuous quality improvement (CQI) pilot in Zimbabwe: first, what is the effect of the CQI model on quality of care and second, what factors enabled or impeded quality improvements during CQI implementation?	Mixed methods approach: quantitative analyses of the PBF quality checklists using quasi- experimental design. And qualitative analyses of document reviews, in-depth interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD).
	Tiruneh et al. [53]	Ethiopia: Selected rural areas	Maternal newborn health	To evaluate the effect of the PC-Solutions strategy on improving MNH care behaviours and practices in selected rural areas of Ethiopia.	Mixed-methods research. We used before-and-after cross-sectional survey. The qualitative method included.
	Patterson et al. [54]	Malawi: facilities that provided basic or comprehensive childbirth services.	Quality of care and culture	To identify what would be necessary to foster organizational cultures in Malawi closer to the hypothetical "culture of quality" outlined in the public health literature.	Ethnographic data were generated through observation and semi- structured interviews.
	Demes et al. [55]	Haiti: Northern Department	A fingerprint initiative to curb absenteeism	To explore the quality improvement initiatives in the context of Haiti by assessing the process and outcomes of the implementation of the fingerprint initiative in three health facilities in the Northern Department.	Exploratory and qualitative descriptive study.
	Kim et al. [56]	Uganda: Busia and Oyam districts	Quality improvement collaborative for community-based family planning	To identify the factors that were supportive of the community-based quality improvement collaborative implementation, as perceived by the collaborative actors and in relation to the Bruce Framework.	Descriptive mixed methods process evaluation design: desk review of program documents, extraction of program monitoring data, and qualitative research methods.
	Lokossou et al. [57]	Benin: Savè-Ouèssè (SAO) health zone	Community health workers: motivation, retention, and performance	To present the results of implementing quality improvement approach at the community level in the Savè-Ouèssè (SAO) health zone in Benin and to examine the perceptions of the actors involved in the implementation to strengthen the local components of health systems.	Mixed-methods approach that included a quantitative (analysis of indicator trends) and a qualitative study.

Vail et al. [58]	India: Bihar state	New born resuscitation	To characterize the logistical, cultural, and structural barriers to the use of evidence-based practices in immediate neonatal care, defined as care required during the immediate transition to post-natal life, and Neonatal resuscitation.	Qualitative using semi-structured interviews.
Visser et al. [59]	South Africa: Greater Tzaneen sub-district (municipality) of Limpopo province	HIV/AIDS care and treatment: nurse- monitored care (task shifting)	To evaluate the quality of care provided at three selected nurse-initiated and managed anti- retroviral therapy facilities in the Greater Tazneen sub-district of Limpopo province and, to explore the effects of clinical mentoring and support on improving the quality of care.	A mixed methods study that used concurrent quantitative and qualitative research methods was conducted.
Tancred et al. [60]	Southern Tanzania: Tandahimba district	Maternal and newborn health at community level	To understand the perceptions and motivations for the behaviours of both those engaged in implementing quality improvement and those affected by their problem-solving strategies.	A mixed methods process evaluation.
Jaribu et al. [61]	Southern Tanzania, Ruangwa district, located in Lindi Region	Institutional childbirth services	We used in-depth interviews with health workers at various levels in the health system to explore their perception of the QI intervention and to identify facilitators and barriers in relation to QI implementation.	Qualitative study with in-depth interviews.
Kinney et al. [62]	Four sub-Saharan African countries: Rwanda, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, Nigeria	Maternal and perinatal death surveillance and response	The aim of this study was to systematically assess the level of implementation of maternal and perinatal death surveillance and response (MPDSR) in four sub-Saharan African countries, applying a standardised scoring methodology, and to describe common facilitators and barriers to sustainable MPDSR practice.	Mixed methods: qualitative and quantitative data collection methods - observations, review of documents and semi structured key informant interviews.
Ayele et al. [63]	Northern Ethiopia: Tigray region	Maternal and perinatal death surveillance and response	To assess the implementation status of MPDSR and its associated factors as well as explore the barriers and facilitators of MPDSR implementation and operation in Tigray region, Northern Ethiopia.	Mixed methods: quantitative (facility-based cross-sectional study) and qualitative (in-depth interviews and focus group discussions) approaches.

Tayebwa et al. [64]	Rwanda	Maternal and perinatal death surveillance and response	To assess experiences in implementing maternal and perinatal death review, and/or integrated MPDSR processes in Rwanda by identifying factors that have affected its implementation	Mixed methods with qualitative and quantitative data.
Kinney et al. [65]	South Africa: Western Cape	Perinatal death audit programme	To understand the 'how' or 'why' of sustained implementation, allowing for comparison across settings to gain insights on factors influencing sustained implementation of perinatal audit.	Multiple Case study.
Basenero et al. [66]	Namibia: three regions with high burdens of HIV—Khomas, Ohangwena, and Zambezi	Integrating Hypertension and HIV/AIDS care	In this work, we report the implementation of a quality improvement collaborative —the Namibia Project for Retention of Patients on ART (NAMPROPA)—whose objective was to improve uptake of HTN screening and treatment in routine HIV care in Namibia.	Mixed methods.
Schuele & MacDougall [67]	Papua New Guinea: Madang and Morobe Provinces	Accreditation of lower-level health facilities to higher level facilities	To critically examine driving and restraining forces in the implementation process of the national health service standards, understand how hidden power relations work in the implementation process, and assess agenda setting to influence change.	Qualitative with semi-structured interviews and FGDs.
Hutchinson et al. [68]	Uganda: Kayunga District	Malaria surveillance	The aims were: (i) to describe the context in which, and the processes through which, the collaborative improvement (CI) intervention effected change; (ii) to identify any factors that support or undermine CI; and (iii) to investigate for any unintended consequences of the CI intervention.	Qualitative study.

Yapa et al. [69]	South Africa: Hlabisa sub-district of KwaZulu- Natal, 220 km north of Durban	Antenatal HIV Care and Testing	To identify determinants of practice, and whether 'normalisation' of continuous quality improvement (CQI) into routine services could occur in this setting, by examining the following: (i) health worker participation in CQI by describing 'dose' and 'reach'; (ii) the 'black box' of implemented changes in practice; (iii) time trends in endpoint achievements and time to intervention uptake; and (iv) CQI mentor and health worker experiences of implementing the intervention.	Convergent mixed methods: Process evaluation of CQI as implemented in our stepped- wedge cluster RCT.
Limato et al. [70]	Indonesia: 3 Puskesmas in Cianjur district, West Java province	Primary health care quality improvement	This study aimed to contribute to improving health service quality in the primary health care system in Indonesia.	Qualitative: in-depth interviews.
Baker et al. [71]	Southern Tanzania: Tandahimba district	Understanding QI from perspective of health workers	To investigate how different components of a collaborative QI intervention were understood and experienced by health workers, and therefore contributed positively to its mechanisms of effect.	Qualitative process evaluation with semi-structured interviews.
Umunyana at al. [72]	Rwanda	Management of birth asphyxia	Our study aimed to show that a capacity development package focused on mentorship as part of a larger quality improvement strategy would contribute to improved clinical skills and better neonatal outcomes for birth asphyxia at scale.	Mixed methods before-after design.
Stover et al. [73]	Ethiopia: Amhara and Oromiya Regional Health Bureaus	Maternal Newborn health (district level improvement)	This article describes the methods by which and the extent to which Maternal and Newborn Health in Ethiopia Partnership was able to develop the capacity of coaches and teams to support continuous improvement in CMNH care.	Mixed methods: Surveys and individual interviews
Tancred et al. [74]	Sothern Tanzania: Tandahimba district Uganda: Mayuge district	Community maternal newborn child health	We describe the experience implementing EQUIP's QI approach at the community level for increased demand for maternal and newborn health services and improved community-level maternal and newborn care practices.	Qualitative data as part of in-depth mixed methods process evaluation.

Chandani et al. [75]	Malawi and Rwanda	Supply chain systems for CHW child health commodities	This paper will discuss the results of scaling proven, simple demand-based resupply procedures, using mobile technology and traditional methods for communication, and establishing multilevel, performance-driven QI teams in Malawi and Rwanda, and the potential contributions these interventions had on supply chain outcomes for CHWs.	A mixed-method approach; qualitative data was collected using a case study methodology, and quantitative data was collected.
Horwood et al. [76]	South Africa: KwaZulu- Natal province	Electronic clinical decision-making support systems (CDSSs): electronic integrated management of childhood illnesses (eIMCI)	To track eIMCI uptake and prospectively explore their experiences of eIMCI implementation in primary health care (PHC) clinics in one district in Kwa Zulu Natal.	Longitudinal mixed methods study, which was nested within a randomized controlled trial (RCT).
Mantell et al. [77]	South Africa: The City of Tshwane, Gauteng Province, and Bojanala in Northwest Province	Ward-based primary healthcare outreach teams	This paper examines program implementation and barriers and successes from the perspectives of the national department of health, implementing partners, facility-level staff, and the outreach team.	The process evaluation used a parallel convergent mixed-methods design, with concurrent collection of qualitative and quantitative data at multiple levels.
Thekkur et al. [78]	Sri Lanka: nine provinces	Primary Healthcare System- Strengthening	To assess if primary medical care institutions were re-organised according to the standards endorsed by the ministry of health, and to explore the challenges perceived by the healthcare workers implementing this project	An explanatory mixed-methods study with quantitative component (cross-sectional descriptive study) and a qualitative component.
Mutambo et al. [79]	South Africa: KwaZulu- Natal Province	Child-friendly spaces (child-centred HIV care)	To explore the experiences of health care workers, primary care givers and HIV seropositive children on the use of child-friendly spaces in PHC facilities in KwaZulu-Natal	Qualitative explorative, descriptive, and contextual design.

Schierhout et al. [80]	India: West Godavari District in rural Andhra Pradesh state	Digital health interventions and cardiovascular disease	This study aims to identify variation in outcomes and implementation of SMARTHealth India, a cluster randomised trial of an ASHA-managed digitally enabled primary health care (PHC) service strengthening strategy for cardiovascular disease risk management, and to explain how and in what contexts the intervention was effective.	Realist evaluation and an explanatory sequential mixed method.
Djellouli et al. [81]	Burkina Faso: Kaya district Kenya: Kwale County (Matuga constituency) Malawi: Ntchisi district Mozambique: Chiuta district	Maternal and Child Health - post natal care	This evaluation aimed to uncover how the interventions implemented resulted in increased uptake, frequency of delivery and quality of evidence based postpartum care and what worked, for whom and within which contexts.	Case study design and realist evaluation methods using mixed methods.
Werner et al. [82]	Tajikistan	Business Plans (health facility management tools)	The objectives of this study are (i) to describe the history, process of implementation and consolidation of Business Plans in the Tajik health system by means of the ExpandNet/WHO framework, (ii) to identify barriers and facilitators to scaling up and based on that (iii) to extract lessons learnt related to scaling up health innovations.	Qualitative.
Coulibaly et al. [83]	Mali: 3 of the 10 Health Districts in Koulikoro region	Performance-based financing	How is performance-based financing implemented and adapted to the socio-political, health and institutional contexts in Mali?	Qualitative multiple case study approach.
Bradley et al. [84]	Ethiopia: 4 regions	Rural primary health care	To generate hypotheses about factors that may explain the variation in performance across primary health care units.	An in-depth qualitative study, drawn from a longitudinal study
Sukums et al. [85]	Tanzania: Lindi rural district Ghana: Kassena- Nankana district	Antenatal/ intrapartum care and performance-based incentives	To describe health workers' acceptance and use of the electronic clinical decision support system for maternal care in rural PHC facilities of Ghana and Tanzania and to identify factors affecting successful adoption of such a system.	Longitudinal mixed methods study.

Nahimana et al. [86]	Rwanda: Kirehe and South Kayonza districts in the Eastern Province	Newborn care	To describe the integration of key elements of All Babies Count (ABC) program into routine systems and the results evaluating 12 months sustainability of improvements seen during the ABC program and factors related to the success and challenges of sustainability.	Mixed methods convergent sequential design. Quantitative evaluation using a pre-post design. Focus group discussions and in- depth interviews.
Quaife et al. [87]	Ethiopia: 7 intervention districts matched with 7 comparison districts (woredas)	Health worker knowledge and motivation	To evaluate whether and how the Ethiopia Health Care Quality Initiative affected health worker knowledge and motivation, and if effects differed by cadre.	We used mixed methods, combining a repeated quantitative survey with supporting in-depth qualitative interviews.
Olaniran et al. [88]	Nigeria: Lagos health system	Maternal and neonatal health and patient experience and satisfaction	To contribute to the evidence base about how and why QI works using the implementation of the national healthcare quality improvement and how this was adapted in the Lagos health system.	A qualitative study using a multiple-case study design. Combined an exploratory with an explanatory approach.
Manzi et al. [89]	Rwanda: Kirehe and Southern Kayonza districts	Child health (mentorship)	To inform program implementers and policy makers of the key components needed and potential barriers and resistance which can be addressed proactively when implementing similar health facility-based mentorship interventions.	A qualitative study using focus group discussions (FGDs)and in- depth interviews.
Werdenberg et al. [90]	Rwanda: Kirehe and Southern Kayonza districts	Newborn health	This paper reviews the implementation process and implementation outcomes of the ABC initiative including feasibility and fidelity, acceptability, self- reported changes in health care worker (HCW) attitudes and practice of QI, implementation and the resulting change package.	Mixed methods: quantitative surveys, and qualitative data from FGDs and review of program documents.
Hounsou et al. [91]	Benin	Maternal and perinatal survival	The present study aims to examine whether, and to what extent, implementation of the four components of MPDSR took place in Benin and identify lessons for improving MPDSR implementation going forward	Retrospective, mixed-methods study.

Pallangyo et al. [92]	Tanzania: Dar es Salaam city area	Maternal and child health (postpartum care)	To explore the strategies used by facilitators and health care providers within a facilitation intervention to improve post-partum care in government-owned health institutions in Ilala suburb in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.	A qualitative design with focus group discussions (FGDs) and intervention documentation.
Eboreime et al. [44]	Nigeria: Kaduna state	Decentralized primary health care planning	To explore the role of actors and context in the implementation and sustainability of diagnose- intervene-verify-adjust (DIVA) by comparing experiences between Nigerian local government areas (LGAs) (analogues of districts) in Kaduna state.	An integrated mixed methods approach.
Eboreime at al. [43]	Nigeria: Kaduna state	Decentralized primary health care planning	To evaluate the effectiveness of DIVA as a model for improving health system performance through integrated PHC operational planning in Kaduna, Nigeria.	Embedded mixed methods evaluation.

259 **Topics from included research**

260	Researchers overwhelmingly focused on topics related to improvements in maternal and child
261	health (MCH) with twenty-nine studies, including some two conducted in Kenya [45, 81] and
262	some five that focused on maternal and perinatal deaths: in Ethiopia [63]; in Benin [91]; in
263	South Africa [65]; in Rwanda [64] and in Rwanda, Tanzania, Zimbabwe and Nigeria [62]. A
264	summary of studies by topic of focus is contained in supplementary files (S4 Table). As well,
265	five studies documented QI in relation to non-communicable diseases: hypertension service
266	coverage in Nigeria [46]; digital health interventions for cardiovascular health in India [48, 80];
267	mental health services in Uganda [49]; and integration of hypertension and HIV services in
268	Namibia [66]. Three studies explored QI in HIV/AIDS: nurse-monitored HIV/AIDS care and
269	treatment as part of task-shifting [59] and antenatal HIV care and testing [79] in South Africa,
270	and service expansion through integration in Namibia [66]. One study [68] sought to further
271	the understanding of collaborative QI in malaria surveillance in Uganda. Three studies: in
272	Rwanda and Nigeria [75); in South Africa [76]; and in India [80] investigated the application of
273	digital interventions to improve PHC service delivery.

274 Themes

- 275 Barriers to and enablers of quality improvement in primary health care at micro, meso- and
- 276 macro- level were distilled into six themes, guided by the model for understanding success in
- 277 quality (MUSIQ) and the consolidated framework for implementation research (CFIR), and are
- 278 described next. Themes are closely related and mutually interacting.

279 Theme 1: Microsystem and individual health worker(s)

280 motivation

281	The willingness and commitment of individual health workers to make improvements, their
282	ability and self-efficacy regarding change efforts, shared values, beliefs, and norms that affect
283	teamwork, interpersonal communication and decision making, and the capacity of health
284	workers and managers to lead QI can constrain or promote QI in PHC settings. Three multi-
285	country studies in Sub-Saharan Africa [62, 81, 85], 19 single country studies in SSA (three
286	apiece in Nigeria, South Africa and Uganda, two each in Benin, Ethiopia and Rwanda, and one
287	study across Benin, Kenya, Mali, Tanzania and Zimbabwe reported various aspects of
288	individual- and microsystem- level barriers to and enablers of QI along with the two studies
289	[47, 55] from Latin America (Costa Rica and Haiti). Studies in Indonesia [70]; in Sri Lanka [78];
290	in India [48]; in Tajikistan [82]; and in Papua New Guinea [67] also discussed aspects of
291	microsystems and individual health worker motivations for quality improvement. All studies
292	had good quality ratings using the mixed methods appraisal tool.

293 Health workers and other primary health care stakeholders reported that job satisfaction 294 arising from participating in QI activities was an important source of motivation, encouraging 295 them to increase efforts and stirring up their desire to address the community's health needs. 296 Added to this, health workers felt extrinsically motivated by financial and non-financial 297 incentives as was the case in Nigeria [46] where Odusola and colleagues found that such 298 inputs bolstered efforts to expand hypertension preventive services and in Haiti where those 299 health workers that perceived an initiative to reduce absenteeism favourably because they 300 thought it promoted openness in the performance-based financing scheme [55]. On the other 301 hand, lack of recognition for putting in effort dimmed motivation levels. Other motivators 302 included a strong desire to help one's community and appreciation of the justification for a 303 proposed QI project.

304	Motivation also arose out of observation of positive changes in the PHC setting due to QI and
305	this was underscored by grateful clients or patients. Leadership by PHC facility and district QI
306	mentors who remained committed and were able to showcase the use of context-specific data
307	for QI was also found to enable QI. On the contrary, health workers did not like overlapping QI
308	data streams because this, they perceived, stole time that they would otherwise spend caring
309	for their patients.
310	Studies also reported the importance of buy-in by health workers and their managers into
311	proposed QI interventions. This was signified by health workers embracing a spirit of personal
312	sacrifice to receive public praise, including by PHC clients from the community. Further,
313	research reports found that participants often embraced QI because they had grown
314	dissatisfied with existing dismal quality of PHC services and felt an urgency to change [67, 76,
315	81, 83, 89].
316	Self-efficacy and capability to undertake QI was also highlighted in studies. A high level of
317	technical and managerial proficiency acquired after implementing QI initiatives over time as
318	reported from research in Kenya and Costa Rica [45, 47], promotes effective production,
319	analysis, and use of PHC data for improvement. Moreover, participants in QI felt empowered
320	and competent following training sessions which also served to help develop an understanding
321	of their roles and responsibilities in QI [48] leading to increasing levels of comfort with QI
322	approaches and methods [51]. Health workers reported that they could not spare time to
323	attend QI meetings due to clinical engagements, a possible constraint. Other barriers reported
324	in the literature included the sense of despair with which some easily gave up on QI initiatives

326 methods process evaluation of continuous quality improvement in South Africa [69] where 327 health workers were discouraged by layers of managerial approval. In such cases across 328 multiple PHC contexts, QI tasks were perceived to be time consuming - reducing health

when faced with multiple obstacles. An example of this came from a convergent mixed

325

```
workers' confidence in the QI initiative - and abandoned [44, 47, 48, 51, 53, 57, 58, 62, 67, 68,
72, 73, 75-77, 83, 85-87, 92].
```

331	Health workers developed personal skills through their participation in QI initiatives. Skills such
332	as empathy and enhanced communication with PHC clients reportedly led to deeper
333	connections with fellow health workers but also clients. This was seen to facilitate QI. Still,
334	familiarity with patient-centered approaches to PHC, regular review meetings where gaps and
335	root causes to poor service quality were discussed, and internal supervision where knowledge
336	was shared and additional skills acquired was reported in the literature as important enablers.
337	On the other hand, health workers in PHC who felt inadequately skilled in technical and clinical
338	aspects and in the use of technology reported difficulties engaging effectively in QI [72, 76,
339	85].

340 Culture, comprised of shared norms, values, knowledge, artefacts, and practices, was found to 341 play an important role in health workers' efforts to improve the quality of primary health care 342 (PHC). For example, QI efforts appeared to thrive in PHC settings with strong culture of using 343 data to orchestrate healthcare improvements, where health workers' attitudes shift to focus 344 more on the needs of patients (e.g., the desire to alleviate pain and reduce suffering), and 345 where HCWs learn better and systematic approaches to solving problems [45, 46, 51, 54]. 346 Additionally, culture of quality manifested in health workers being able to work across 347 disciplinary boundaries, where QI initiatives stir up healthy competition, and where 348 participants reported collective responsibility for cohesion, meritocracy, a strong sense of 349 taking responsibility for failure and success, and high standards in the PHC setting or 350 workplace [54, 63]. Microsystem culture such as working with unsupportive colleagues where 351 workload is not shared and characterized by a rejection of quality checklists [81] was found to 352 be unsupportive of QI. In Indonesia, Limato and others [70] conducted 28 in-depth interviews 353 in West Java Province. This led them to conclude that health workers at government-owned

354 PHC facilities had a general tendency to reject transparency and accountability, which led to 355 the failure of a QI initiative built around performance-based financing. Evidence on workplace 356 culture's role in boosting or dooming QI interventions also came from other studies in multiple 357 LMIC contexts [47, 53, 58, 59, 62, 64, 65, 68, 76-78, 83].

Theme 2: Attributes of quality improvement intervention 358

360

363

- 359 Component attributes of a quality improvement intervention discussed under this theme
- 361 perceive it to be beneficial, its cost, potential to be scaled up, and perceived sustainability.

include its strength and the quality of evidence underpinning it, how and whether participants

- 362 Other characteristics of the QI intervention that can enable or constrain its implementation
- may include its trialability (being trialed in small measures where potential failure is not 364 catastrophic), the ease with which it can be integrated into existing health worker roles and
- 365 tasks, and whether clients were afforded opportunity to shape its design. Rounding up the key
- 366 attributes of any QI intervention is the source of the intervention which may dictate its
- 367 acceptability, its complexity i.e., ease with which implementers understand it, scope, and
- 368 disruptiveness during roll out; and closely related to this, feasibility (the extent that

369 implementers feel confident that they can adopt the QI intervention) [27, 40].

370 Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) studies contributing to this theme included five each from Tanzania 371 and South Africa; four from Ethiopia; and two each from Rwanda and Nigeria. Five African 372 countries (Benin, Kenya, Mali, Namibia and Zimbabwe) each had a single-country study while 373 Tanzania, Rwanda, Kenya, Nigeria Malawi, Burkina Faso, Mozambigue, and Ghana were each 374 part of a multi-country study. In Asia, Indonesia, Tajikistan, Sri Lanka and Papua New Guinea 375 each contributed a study with India contributing two. Studies from Haiti and Costa Rica round 376 up the list of those that contribute an understanding of enablers and barriers related to QI 377 intervention attributes in primary health care in LMICs.

378	Quality improvement implementation is enabled when health workers and managers perceive
379	an intervention to be effective e.g., by observing the desired outcomes for patients and
380	successful acquisition of new skills [43, 62, 67, 71, 73, 76, 77, 83]. A relative advantage accrues
381	when implementers view a new QI initiative as better than current practice and when the
382	intervention is designed to foster collaboration among a diverse team of workers, and even
383	PHC clients. In contrast, QI is constrained when a QI project does not lead to any tangible
384	improvement or is seen to bear negative or unanticipated consequences like creating an
385	administrative burden for already overstretched HCWs that may manifests in multiple
386	reporting channels. Other barriers were reported in the literature: an intervention package
387	that does not envisage nor address other contextual and health systems barriers to successful
388	implementation such as when was QI focused on short term technical fixes but did not address
389	nor consider structural bottlenecks to PHC quality.
390	Cost, scalability, and sustainability aspects of quality improvement was closely related. As

391 enablers, the design of a QI intervention needs to make provision for long-term work to 392 sustain changes while ensuring that its costs do not overwhelm the PHC system's capacity [47, 393 55, 62, 70]. At the same time, QI is scalable when QI interventions are perceived to be easily 394 transferable to a new area of work within a PHC setting, to other health workers, or even to 395 other health facilities by adopting small incremental changes rather than rapid disruptions [43, 396 51, 56, 73-75]. Additionally, QI interventions are supported by health workers and health 397 facilities when perceived to be sustainable, i.e., when participants feel confident of continued 398 implementation beyond the planned intervention period [44, 47, 49, 55, 65, 69, 73, 77, 82].

The significance of designing QI interventions in a manner that ensures that health workers see alignment between the proposed QI package and their everyday work responsibilities (job expectations in the PHC practice setting) while complementing participants' and health system's values was addressed by Ulrike Baker and colleagues [71] in their qualitative process

403 evaluation of quality improvement in Southern Tanzania and Mary Kinney and her 404 counterparts [65] who used multiple case studies to understand sustainability of maternal and 405 perinatal death surveillance (MPDSR) in South Africa. Good examples of facilitating factors 406 regarding trialability pointed to QI interventions that had been adapted and pre-tested to suit 407 local conditions [60, 74]. Barriers that may thwart assimilation included new interventions that 408 are difficult to integrate into routine PHC practice or those that require substantial 409 modifications to service delivery workflows and an array of new skills for practitioners, new 410 initiatives perceived to be inflexible or rigid, in addition to those that do not explicitly build on 411 existing initiatives [43, 44, 80-83, 88, 90, 92].

412 Paying attention to the preferences of PHC clients when designing QI interventions that affect 413 them was thought to enable QI in addition to health workers' inputs to intervention design 414 and was outlined by Mutambo and colleagues [79] who explored HCWs' perspectives during 415 the setting up of child-friendly spaces in PHC clinics in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. However, 416 Umunyana and others [72] in Rwanda and Olaniran and colleagues [88] in Nigeria reported 417 that QI interventions that do not allow implementers to make or suggest adaptations might 418 lead to such initiatives being viewed as alien and imposed, potentially leading to their 419 rejection and failure.

420 Less complex QI interventions focus on a specific problem, are not too general and do not try 421 to address too many things instantly or concurrently. These were some of the enabling factors 422 identified in the literature. Other facilitating factors included having streamlined management 423 structures in their design. Barriers identified by participants in relation to intervention 424 complexity included those that are considered hard to understand, not easily translatable into 425 tangible action plans, and QI interventions perceived as not user-friendly [42, 51, 66-68, 70, 426 77, 83, 87, 88, 92], and found that QI projects considered feasible, timely and aligned local 427 priorities were widely embraced, contributing to successful implementation.

428 Theme 3: Organization and implementing team

429	Buy-in (ownership), norms and culture, leadership, and decision-making at the organization
430	level complement the tenure, prior experiences, cohesion, and skills of the implementing team
431	to shape QI processes and outcomes. Also, maturity of the organization's approach to QI,
432	presence of subject matter specialists able and willing to guide health workers at primary
433	health care facilities, and the participation of physicians in QI initiatives received important
434	considerations in research reports included in this review and are described under this theme.
435	Studies outlined the barriers to and enablers of primary health care quality improvement at
436	the meso level in 15 different countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) as reported in 36 different
437	articles. The SSA countries include Uganda, Rwanda, Ethiopia, Burkina Faso, Mozambique, and
438	Mali that are low-income settings; lower middle-income countries of Benin, Ghana, Kenya,
439	Malawi, Nigeria, Tanzania and Zimbabwe; and South Africa and Namibia being upper middle-

440 income settings.

441 Ensuring that leaders, managers, health workers and other stakeholders buy in to QI initiatives 442 in primary health care emerged strongly from the literature. Baker and others [71] found that 443 health care workers (HCWs) were more receptive to continuous quality improvement (CQI) 444 and welcomed on-job-training meant to bolster their skills in Southern Tanzania. This was 445 echoed by Coulibaly and colleagues [83] in Mali where positive reception of a performance-446 based financing scheme for improving PHC services was noted among the initiative's 447 strengths. Elsewhere, adequately preparing the team prior to introducing QI, having point 448 persons to champion QI in the health facility and primary health care network, managers and 449 team members who do not mind taking up additional or new responsibilities and an 450 enthusiastic team that readily and publicly commit to PHC quality improvements were also 451 important enablers of QI [45, 46, 49, 51]. In areas where there was little buy in, such as in

452	Papua New Guinea [67] where regional managers exercising their hidden powers opposed QI
453	and in Indonesia [70] where 'ego programming', the tendency by those that perceive
454	themselves to be outside a QI programme to decline participation, QI initiatives faltered.
455	Organizations also rejected QI outright, with some declaring proposed interventions to be
456	unsuitable without due consideration e.g., in Uganda [68] while middle managers in
457	decentralized PHC settings simply went missing and did not cooperate or support frontline
458	HCWs with QI efforts e.g., in Rwanda and Malawi [75].

Ql interventions can flourish in organizations and teams with the right norms and where 459 460 culture is supportive. A new way of solving intractable problems, regular team reviews that are 461 focused on quality of care [51], finding ways to cope positively with scarcity when resources 462 arent adequate and lack of control at lower levels in centralized PHC settings [54] were 463 mentioned. A quality culture with shared values, attitudes, practices at the organization level 464 includes regular data analysis that drives action and improvement cycles, with feedback loops 465 built around effective communication where QI progress is shared with stakeholders who in 466 turn are responsive. Some downsides to quality culture reported in the literature include 467 unchallenged absenteeism by HCWs [55]; decreasing concern for and normalization of 468 common adverse PHC outcomes [58]; adversarial relationships between managers and HCWs; 469 and a perversive lack of accountability where no follow up is done to ascertain achievement of 470 agreed QI work plan targets [62, 78, 81], which constrain the ability of primary health care to 471 meet patient and client needs.

The maturity of an organization in undertaking quality improvement (QI) was reportedly facilitated by accreditation processes which inspire a virtuous cycle of QI. Organizations undergoing accreditation are expected to plan for QI, allocate budgets and subsequently avail resources needed to enhance the quality of PHC services over time [67]. But the presence of concurrent and similar QI programmes in the same organization might introduce

477	fragmentation and bring about confusion regarding organizations' priorities, a potential
478	barrier [70]. Lack of institutional knowledge, where implementers do not fully understand
479	organizational bureaucracies, can also hamper QI [82] where planned changes are complex
480	and system wide. QI teams with short tenure due to high staff turnover appeared to reduce
481	organizational maturity for QI implementation, e.g., in Benin where QI team members took up
482	new jobs, and lack of community support and irregular monetary incentives affected teams'
483	longevity [57].

484	Using pre-post designs with interviews and focus groups, the role of leadership in facilitating
485	QI was reported by Limato and colleagues [70] in Indonesia and Nahimana and colleagues [86]
486	in Rwanda where leaders owned and steered interventions. In contrast, Hounsou and
487	colleagues [91] using mixed methods reported that a lack of interest by managers constrained
488	MPDSR in Benin. Senior leaders, especially, need to actively embrace and publicly show
489	support for QI for it to succeed as health workers do not wish to second guess their bosses'
490	allegiances [55, 60, 64, 69, 79, 84]. While such champions can drive change within
491	organizations and foster acceptance of QI initiatives, wearing too many hats can contribute to
492	a lack of focus and become a distraction for QI. Weak leadership by governments in LMICs
493	especially means that QI stewardship and monitoring was frequently left to donors and
494	external partners, and this is in part because of lack of clarity in QI leadership arrangements
495	and high turnover of leaders. In a sub-unit in Ethiopia, for example, leadership constantly
496	changed hands [53]. Similarly, Eboreime and colleagues [44] linked weak leadership to
497	organization culture unfovourable for QI, which proved detrimental to efforts to strengthen
498	PHC quality in Kaduna state in Nigeria.

Physician involvement in QI also acted as an enabler and a barrier, depending on the context.
Physicians assume leadership and help build other health workers' skills. However, in
Karnataka State in India [48] found QI constrained in situations where the physician over-

502asserted authority and ignored other team members' contributions. Findings in Bihar [58], still503in India, also highlighted the important gap left when doctors did not take up their roles as QI504mentors in the context of management of birth complications for newborns, with fatal505consequences.

506	Positive team experiences from successful legacy QI projects also reportedly produced domino
507	effects e.g., in Tanzania [92] cross-pollination of ideas occurred when successful initiatives
508	were shared across institutions. Incidentally, in both South Africa [65] and Southern India [48]
509	strong social networks among health workers enabled QI whereas less cohesive teams
510	reported worse outcomes. Strong teams also reported better, inclusive decision-making from
511	the start of a QI project and balanced top-down and bottom-up approaches in decision
512	making. Here, diversity was a strength as everyone was involved. A good example came from
513	Uganda [68] where Hutchinson and colleagues used qualitative methods to study collaborative
514	improvement (CI) for malaria surveillance. They report that CI was undertaken by small,
515	committed teams who willingly involved patients and volunteers. Conversely, barriers to QI
516	arise when team leaders do not genuinely involve others like non-technical (auxiliary) staff,
517	who begin to feel sidelined.

518 Elaborating on the importance of subject matter specialists for advancing QI initiatives, in 519 Uganda [49] participants received excellent support from a mental health specialist who had 520 good knowledge of clinical practice guidelines, joining champions to bolster QI. The 521 development of skills and knowledge also increases when trained team members report back 522 to fellow health care workers, enabling key QI concepts such as Pareto charts, root cause 523 analysis, and PDSA cycles to percolate in the team for a shared understanding [72, 73], with 524 regular on-job training [69]. One-off training that leaves QI team members without adequate 525 knowledge and skills needed to implement QI were characterized as barriers [73].

526 Theme 4: Health systems support and capacity

527	Availability, adequacy, and distribution of resources needed to deliver primary health care
528	(PHC) services to communities were key contextual drivers for QI reported in studies. Studies
529	found weaknesses in primary health care (PHC) systems pillars required for quality
530	enhancements, signifying inadequate capacity for quality improvement. These include gaps in
531	staffing, supplies and commodities, equipment and devices, physical space and infrastructure,
532	data infrastructure and reporting, learning and knowledge systems, management of patient
533	referrals, and leadership and governance. Some enablers of and barriers to QI under this
534	theme e.g., those relating to leadership and management and to staff training and
535	development, inevitably affect and are affected by those discussed in the other themes in this
536	review. Tellingly, no country among the LMICs studied reported adequate or excess levels of
537	resourcing for QI. Consequently, most of this section describes barriers to QI rather than
538	enablers.

Fourty-two studies highlighting various aspects of health systems support and capacity came
from 13 different Sub-Saharan Africa countries. There were also five studies conducted in four
Asian countries (India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Tajikistan) and two studies from Latin America
(Haiti and Costa Rica).

The first barrier to QI in LMICs concerns a dearth of health workers which pervades health systems and within these, primary health care delivery structures do not appear exempt. Low numbers, frequent leave of absence, and rapid turnover of staff are each associated with high workload and were reported as important constraints to quality improvement [49, 60, 62-64, 66, 68, 75-78, 81, 85, 86, 90, 94]. Where staff are available, aligning job descriptions and incentives appeared in the literature as a potential enabler of QI.

549	Adequate, well designed physical space aids intuitive flow of clients, encourages health
550	workers to undertake certain tasks that are important for quality of care such as handwashing
551	or waste segregation, or even providing oversight to acute cases in the newborn unit from the
552	nurses' station. On the other hand, literature pointed to sub-optimal infrastructure (poorly
553	designed) and or limited physical spaces as barring improvement actions [50, 79, 81, 83, 92].
554	This manifested as lack of much needed laboratories and pharmacy stores in Sri Lanka (78), for
555	example.

- 556 Studies discussed the role of medical equipment and data infrastructure in relation to quality
- 557 improvement [69, 72, 77-79, 83, 85, 87, 90]. Participatory and data-driven QI activities,
- revising data and tools to ensure harmonization of reporting systems were found to facilitate
- 559 QI. Inadequate patient records at the primary health care facility level as well as a lack of
- 560 equipment, on the other hand, were mentioned as constraining attempts to enhance PHC
- 561 service delivery and quality. As with equipment and staffing, stockouts of essential supplies
- and medicines was also reported as barrier to QI in primary health care settings in low- and
- 563 middle-income countries (LMICs) including but not limited to Sri Lanka [78], India [80],
- 564 Ethiopia [84], Nigeria and Tanzania [85, 88] and Rwanda [86].
- 565 Availability of resources to support quality improvement was the focus of studies in Kenya
- 566 [45], Uganda (51, 56), Democratic Republic of the Congo [50], Zimbabwe [52], Ethiopia [53, 73,
- 567 84], Malawi [54, 75], Haiti (55), India [58], Benin [57, 94], South Africa [59, 65, 69, 77],
- 568 Tanzania [61, 74, 92], Zimbabwe [62], Rwanda [64], Namibia [66], Indonesia [70], Mozambique
- and Burkina Faso [81], Tajikistan [82], Mali [83], and Nigeria [43, 44, 88], underscoring its
- 570 importance to impede QI and shared concerns across many LMIC contexts.

571 Studies in Rwanda [64, 72], in Namibia [66], in India [80], and (83) in Mali [80] described the 572 need for strong patient referral systems because continuity of care is integral to PHC.

573	Inadequate patient referral systems, they reported, affected QI where the initiative aimed to
574	enhance linkage and networking within a care network. Other enablers uncovered took the
575	form of continuing (medical/health/nursing) education [46] and knowledge exchange
576	platforms [47, 49, 53, 82]. Knowledge exchange platforms, it was reported, could enhance
577	chances of successful quality improvement by breaking down silos and fostering the
578	integration of care packages.
579	As previously reported under microsystems and QI team and organization support, facilitative
580	and regular follow up and mentorship enabled QI to happen in LMICs. Facilitating aspects such
581	as feedback from the district health management team and mentorship for frontline HCWs
582	supported skills-building and enabled implementers to brainstorm challenges. Unsurprisingly,
583	QI implementing health workers found unpredictable follow up and punitive supervision
584	geared towards fault-finding undesirable for efforts to improve the quality of primary health
585	care.
586	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite
586 587	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that
586 587 588	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that limit access to PHC budgets as part of larger health systems configuration can also bar QI in
586 587 588 589	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that limit access to PHC budgets as part of larger health systems configuration can also bar QI in LMICs. Conversely, Manisha Yapa and colleagues [69] report that availability of key guidelines
586 587 588 589 590	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that limit access to PHC budgets as part of larger health systems configuration can also bar QI in LMICs. Conversely, Manisha Yapa and colleagues [69] report that availability of key guidelines and tools, and according to Werner et al. [82], national policies e.g., those that give a high
586 587 588 589 590 591	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that limit access to PHC budgets as part of larger health systems configuration can also bar QI in LMICs. Conversely, Manisha Yapa and colleagues [69] report that availability of key guidelines and tools, and according to Werner et al. [82], national policies e.g., those that give a high visibility to PHC can indeed foster a supporting environment for PHC-focused quality
586 587 588 589 590 591 592	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that limit access to PHC budgets as part of larger health systems configuration can also bar QI in LMICs. Conversely, Manisha Yapa and colleagues [69] report that availability of key guidelines and tools, and according to Werner et al. [82], national policies e.g., those that give a high visibility to PHC can indeed foster a supporting environment for PHC-focused quality improvement.
586 587 588 589 590 591 592	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that limit access to PHC budgets as part of larger health systems configuration can also bar QI in LMICs. Conversely, Manisha Yapa and colleagues [69] report that availability of key guidelines and tools, and according to Werner et al. [82], national policies e.g., those that give a high visibility to PHC can indeed foster a supporting environment for PHC-focused quality improvement.
586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 594	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that limit access to PHC budgets as part of larger health systems configuration can also bar QI in LMICs. Conversely, Manisha Yapa and colleagues [69] report that availability of key guidelines and tools, and according to Werner et al. [82], national policies e.g., those that give a high visibility to PHC can indeed foster a supporting environment for PHC-focused quality improvement. Elsewhere, sub-optimal government policies and guidelines e.g., failure to integrate clinical decision support systems (CDSS) across the entire health system rather than in one or few
586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 593 594	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that limit access to PHC budgets as part of larger health systems configuration can also bar QI in LMICs. Conversely, Manisha Yapa and colleagues [69] report that availability of key guidelines and tools, and according to Werner et al. [82], national policies e.g., those that give a high visibility to PHC can indeed foster a supporting environment for PHC-focused quality improvement. Elsewhere, sub-optimal government policies and guidelines e.g., failure to integrate clinical decision support systems (CDSS) across the entire health system rather than in one or few vertical programmes was a key constraint contributing to non-use by trained health workers
586 587 588 589 590 591 592 593 593 594 595	Quoting program and policy stakeholders in South Africa, Joan Mantell and colleagues [77] cite fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that limit access to PHC budgets as part of larger health systems configuration can also bar QI in LMICs. Conversely, Manisha Yapa and colleagues [69] report that availability of key guidelines and tools, and according to Werner et al. [82], national policies e.g., those that give a high visibility to PHC can indeed foster a supporting environment for PHC-focused quality improvement. Elsewhere, sub-optimal government policies and guidelines e.g., failure to integrate clinical decision support systems (CDSS) across the entire health system rather than in one or few vertical programmes was a key constraint contributing to non-use by trained health workers [76]. Mutambo and others [79]) also observed that a government policy forbidding the

597	clattering of walls had the unanticipated consequence of limiting the ability of QI
598	implementers to decorate a children's clinic. The QI team had hoped to encourage play and
599	boost service uptake by making the HIV clinic child friendly. Both studies were conducted in
600	South Africa.

601 Theme 5: External environment and structural factors

- 602 The external environment forms the larger context in which quality improvement
- interventions are implemented. It transcends the social, economic, political, legal, and other
- 604 normative aspects that shape societal and national health systems priorities and may
- 605 indirectly or directly affect execution of QI projects or initiatives [27, 40]. In the present
- 606 review, external incentives and societal pressures that drive change, macro-level allocation of
- 607 resources and other externalities, and community characteristics such as social norms affect
- 608 Ql implementation in varied ways. Such structural factors are not enacted or imposed by social
- actors intending to shape QI interventions (although they may end up doing just that) but to
- address other intractable systemic or societal concerns. Thus, it is important for QI
- 611 implementers, researchers, and policy makers to be aware of these and to make necessary
- 612 adjustments to their QI programmes, where possible.
- 613 Evidence on external environment and structural barriers and enablers that affect QI
- 614 implementation came from 19 countries reported in 31 studies. Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA)
- 615 contributed 26 studies from 14 countries while Asia had five countries' experiences reported
- 616 in three studies. Six studies were conducted in Rwanda, five in Tanzania, four in South Africa,
- 617 three in Ethiopia and two each in Malawi and Nigeria. Kenya, Burkina Faso, Mozambique,
- 618 Namibia, Mali, Benin, Ghana, and Uganda in SSA and Papua New Guinea, Tajikistan, India,
- 619 Indonesia, and Sri Lanka in Asia each had one research report included in this review.

620	Increased visibility of PHC business plans for donors, high level politicians and citizens in
621	Tajikistan, and its high-level prioritization by the central government, was reportedly an
622	important enabler [82]. On the other hand, studies in Kaduna state in Nigeria [43, 44]
623	reported that the government at state and national level had not prioritized PHC
624	improvements and largely left the implementation of interventions geared towards PHC
625	systems strengthening to donors, placing constraints on the relevant Primary Health Care
626	Development Agency. Interestingly, weak coordination between the central government and
627	semi-autonomous peripheral governments in Tajikistan thwarted the scale up of QI plans due
628	to insufficient intergovernmental engagement [82].

629Strong societal norms seep into the health system, through to individual health workers and630managers, and shape contexts of health systems where QI is implemented. As an example,

631 Hounsou and colleagues [91] used a retrospective mixed methods approach to explore

632 implementation of the maternal perinatal death surveillance and response (MPDSR)

633 mechanism in Benin and found that a culture of blame had a chilling effect in the reporting

and audit of maternal deaths; a similar finding to Ayele et al. [63] in Ethiopia who also used

635 mixed methods with administrative MPDSR data and in-depth interviews to report that health

636 workers feared litigation and blame by relatives of deceased PHC clients. In this context, broad

637 community dissatisfaction with explanations of causes of death and an overly litigatory

638 society. However, in Mali, Coulibaly and colleagues [83] documented positive collaboration

among health workers due to strong societal norms that encourage competitiveness,

640 irrespective of place of employment. The inherent competitiveness inspired health workers to
641 put in their best effort in QI implementation.

External pressures and incentives sometimes combined synergistically with socioeconomic
policies to enable quality improvement in primary health care. This was the case in Tajikistan
where the government introduced, rather serendipitously, a new health financing policy

645 providing for per capita payments for PHC. The policy reduced financial barriers in the 646 provision of PHC services. However, the QI research literature also reported areas where new 647 policies had negative unintended consequences like the introduction of user fees in Rwanda 648 which led to financial difficulties for women seeking ante-natal care, a component of a newly 649 introduced QI package [86]. Expectedly, Wedernberg et al. [90] also reported socio economic 650 challenges for patients that hindered access to PHC services in Rwanda.

651 Other external issues are more intractable. Impassable or unmotorable roads impede access 652 to PHC clinics for communities and make it difficult for QI supervisors to undertake regular 653 visits. Shaky internet constrains health workers' from downloading learning materials. And 654 extended power outages make life difficult for both managers and health workers alike. Good 655 telephone connectivity may enable QI by making it easier for mentors to check in with 656 frontline implementers without the necessity of a long, costly road travel. At the same time, 657 good roads make travel within PHC networks easier for both communities and QI teams and 658 supervisors. While responsibility for none of these structural issues lies within the health 659 system, their inadequacies have the effect of introducing bottlenecks in quality improvement 660 efforts, especially in LMICs, where resources are scarce. Added to these, poor weather 661 conditions, unsafe work environments, conflict, and security threats, further complicated 662 matters, and may even see an exodus of skilled health workers besides diverting resources 663 away from life-saving quality PHC. Expanding the list of challenges to QI that was found in the 664 literature is the onset of COVID-19 pandemic which disrupted PHC in Sri Lanka, as was possibly 665 the case globally in early 2020. Multiple research [43, 63, 67, 69, 78, 80, 81, 84, 85] reported 666 these macro level barriers in one form or the other. Nahimana and colleagues [86] add to this 667 long list of protracted constraints detailing how a prolonged drought and famine and the 668 resulting refugee crisis, as happened in in eastern Burundi, rolled back progress in improving 669 PHC in Kirehe district in Rwanda.

670

671 Theme 6: Execution of quality improvement intervention

or z no quality improvement intervention is going to attain the desired objective un	672	No quality improvement intervention is going to attain the desired objective unl	ess
--	-----	--	-----

- 673 implemented. Although this theme is being presented last, it is perhaps the most insightful,
- following this comprehensive synthesis of the evidence on barriers to and enablers of quality
- 675 improvement in primary health care in low- and middle-income countries. Execution includes
- elements of dosage and reach, and how the QI intervention is executed (with scope, quality,
- 677 time, and cost) to achieve the intended results.
- 678 The twenty-two studies that underly this theme came from 17 countries. Eighteen of those 679 studies originated from thirteen countries in Sub-Saharan Africa whereas four studies from 680 Asia were derived from four different country contexts. Of the 17 countries in total, six are 681 low-income countries, nine are lower middle-income countries and two are upper middle-682 income countries. South Africa and Rwanda each had four studies; Ethiopia, Benin, Malawi, 683 and Tanzania each had two studies included and the rest (Mali, Namibia, Papua New Guinea, 684 India, Malawi, Kenya, Mozambique, Burkina Faso, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Ghana, and Nigeria) 685 were covered by a single research report.

686 Dosage (frequency and intensity) and reach (coverage) of QI interventions to a large extent 687 determine whether a QI change package is successful or not. Thus, reaching adequate 688 numbers of implementers with knowledge and skills, whether by offering training sessions 689 repeatedly or targeting and delivering them when most participants are available, were 690 deemed important enablers [69, 70, 71]. Developing results oriented QI work plans and 691 executing these in a participatory manner, ensuring periodic verification of whether a QI 692 intervention is being implemented as planned, using feedback data from PHC facilities, and 693 rolling out a QI package incrementally - where subsequent sessions build on earlier ones in a

694 responsive manner – also facilitated quality improvement [72, 74, 78, 79, 82, 83, 87, 89].

695 Contrary to these, keeping a limited focus of QI throughout its implementation, not unfurling

all planned aspect of an intervention, and late roll of only a few aspects posed major

697 hindrances, signaling a lack of fidelity to the specific QI's design and intent [44, 81, 94], and its

698 potential failure. This could be attributed to the lack of clear implementation plans, overly

ambitious QI work plans, and skewing QI implementation from original plans under pressure

from funders, which exacerbate the challenges of QI implementation.

701 Already described earlier, supervision and mentorship were identified by the health workers 702 among the biggest enablers of QI during the execution stage, according to Umunyana et al. 703 [72]. Baker and colleagues [71] also reported positive impressions of health workers from 704 being visited at their host health facility by mentors and supervisors. However, such visits 705 needed to be reflexive (questioning own stance, habits, values, attitudes) and reflective 706 (learning from everyday experiences) to enable QI. In the case of tech-driven QI such as 707 electronic integrated management of childhood illnesses (eIMCI), promptness with which 708 implementation challenges were addressed also counted as an enabler for improved practice. 709 Non-implementation of support supervision and limited training for implementers was 710 identified as a constraint to QI [76]. When health workers do not practice new skills gained 711 from QI for extended periods, they potentially forget QI techniques, underscoring the 712 importance of ongoing support and mentorship [69, 78, 83]. Being humble and non-713 judgmental as a mentor-supervisor, Manzi and colleagues [89] reported, was preferred by PHC 714 health workers following interviews and focus group discussion in Rwanda. Such mentors or 715 supervisors assumed a wide range of roles such as facilitators, trainers, coaches, and role 716 models [92] which enabled QI implementation. They could also act as champions, identifying 717 blockers at various levels of the organization early enough and converting them to supporters 718 thereby bolstering QI implementation [63-66, 80, 90].

719	Engaging communities and targeting multiple stakeholders was further identified in research
720	reports as key enablers, e.g., in Rwanda [64, 86, 90], Tanzania [74], Ethiopia [73, 84], India
721	[80]) and Nigeria [43] besides Burkina Faso, Malawi, Mozambique and Kenya [81], where QI
722	implementers needed to work collaboratively with community resource persons and opinion
723	leaders and make use of local knowledge to tailor their communication. As an enabler,
724	engaging with a diverse array of QI stakeholders during implementation was specifically
725	outlined by Kinney et al. [65] in South Africa, Basenero et al. [66] in Namibia, and Coulibaly et
726	al. [83] in Mali. A boycott of QI by community catchments of primary health care facilities
727	happened in some instances where their local leaders had not been involved in QI
728	implementation, constraining implementation. Also, QI activities geared towards improving
729	access and quality of PHC services were hampered because clients kept off due to previous
730	negative experience when seeking care, and because of limited risk communication by service
731	providers. Nevertheless, reminders in home-based records for patients, where applicable,
732	facilitated good communication between health workers and their clients [62, 63, 65, 66, 80,
733	83, 90, 92].

Another enabler during QI implementation entailed the redesign of work/patient flows, as described from stakeholders' experiences in South Africa, Rwanda, Uganda, Ethiopia, and Tanzania. Because sub-optimal physical infrastructure was identified as a key barrier to the provision of quality PHC, QI interventions that sought to re-design the clinic workflow, as needed, in a patient-centered manner, likely made it easier for health workers to adhere to care protocols.

Among others, [63, 88] found that QI implementation is more successful if it includes enhancements in documentation of care processes, and when stocks of key commodities are tracked and reported regularly. Conversely, failure by implementers to keep track of the availability of drugs and other stocks, aside from the actual stockout, constrains

744	implementation. Further, QI roll out should pay due attention to limited staff time and
745	competing tasks as described earlier, which can present significant challenges to participation
746	by HCWs. Failure to consider this may mean that some staff miss numerous QI meetings and
747	training sessions and place avoidable constraints on QI implementation [69].

748 **Discussion**

749	This review aimed to identify the barriers (constraints) and enablers (facilitators) to quality
750	improvement in primary health care settings of low- and middle-income country contexts. The
751	review supports the notion, overall, that many contextual barriers exist that minimize the
752	effectiveness of quality improvement interventions, initiatives, or projects in these settings. At
753	the same time, the review identified several factors that may promote the implementation of
754	quality improvement interventions in this setting. Barriers and facilitators related to the
755	inherent characteristics of the QI intervention, the immediate (micro) context, the
756	implementing team and host organization at meso level, the larger health systems context,
757	and at macro level, the societal and structural factors. Additional considerations are related to
758	the execution of the QI intervention. These findings are important for those that design,
759	promote, implement, regulate, and sponsor or fund quality improvement. They are also
760	important for users and clients of primary health care services in LMIC countries because they
761	point to how QI interventions can be further enhanced to support the attainment of PHC
762	objectives of equitable, accessible, acceptable, timely, effective, and patient-centered care;
763	and more broadly, health systems and societal development goals.
764	Reflecting on the review process, one of the challenges faced in selecting studies for inclusion
,	henceding on the review process, one of the endlenges faced in scienting studies for metasion

concerned the definition of quality improvement for which there is still no consensus. A
 second dilemma surfaced around the definition of primary health care – and subsequent
 isolation of QI interventions in PHC - especially given the interconnectedness of PHC and

768	tertiary (even secondary) care in any given health system. Consequently, decisions had to be		
769	made that both optimized sensitivity of the review and minimized selection bias, noting the		
770	lack of consensus, especially regarding the definition of quality improvement. The review thus		
771	includes studies where actors at the micro, meso and macro levels actively sought to		
772	undertake quality improvement for primary health care using diverse approaches. Quality		
773	(healthcare) was broadly defined as that which is safe, effective, people-centred, timely,		
774	equitable, integrated, and efficient, following the World Health Organization (WHO) guidance		
775	[13]. WHO normative guidance plays an outsize role in the formulation of guidelines in LMIC		
776	health systems. Accordingly, quality improvement was conceptualized as any deliberate		
777	intervention that aimed to enhance any, some or all these aspects of healthcare quality. The		
778	definition of primary health care included clinical interventions of curative, rehabilitative and		
779	palliative nature, public health interventions meant to improve health at the population level		
780	including preventative interventions, and policy level interventions meant to affect health		
781	systems domains (financing, human resources, commodities and supplies, infrastructure etc.),		
782	if they targeted positive changes in health planning, resourcing, delivery, and outcomes at the		
783	district level and below. This inclusive, broad approach makes the review highly relevant to the		
784	diverse real-world LMIC contexts in which QI implementation takes place.		
705			
/85	The systematic review, in analysing data from included studies, adopted the Model for		
786	Understanding Success in Quality, MUSIQ [27] and the Consolidated Framework for		
787	Implementation Research, CFIR [40]. This review used concepts and categories from both		
788	frameworks to code and later organize the results thematically.		
789	The review found that various barriers and enablers of QI in primary health care in LMIC		
790	contexts relate to all the broad categories proposed by MUSIQ and CFIR frameworks, with		
791	many being inter-related, reflecting the complexity of health systems in which QI interventions		

are introduced, implemented, and thereby constrained or enabled. The Miscellaneous

- category under MUSIQ includes considerations related to the trigger for QI and whether QI
 tasks are strategic to the organization and were subsumed under the others in the present
 review.
- Accordingly, MUSIQ and CFIR proved useful for organizing the large amount of data derived
 from 50 diverse studies from equally varied countries and PHC settings. Additions to the CFIR
 framework [40] further helped with the synthesis and integration.
- 799 The results of this review echo those from an earlier umbrella review [26] which included 800 reviews with primary research studies on the effectiveness, performance, and effects of 801 quality management strategies in hospitals. They found 56 reviews focused almost exclusively 802 on South-East Asia, Europe, and North America, with negligible research on the Americas and 803 sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) contexts. Like this present review, Kringos and colleagues found that 804 35 of the 56 studies frequently reported contextual factors using the MUSIQ framework. The 805 reported barriers and enablers included external environment, organization, QI support and 806 capacity, microsystems, and QI team categories [26].
- A more recent realist review [28] explored factors that affect the effectiveness of quality improvement collaboratives (QICs), among the topics covered in the present review. Having synthesized the findings of 32 research abstracts, Zamboni et al [28] reported that factors inherent in external support, QI team, macro or structural aspects of implementation contexts can enable or constrain QICs, resonating with this review.
- Like most previously published systematic reviews on quality improvement that have tended to focus only on hospitals, Stokes and colleagues [23] synthesized research on barriers and enablers related to maternity care in LMICs. With a more limited database search covering only MEDLINE and CINAHL, they included nine studies, all of which were based on sub-Saharan Africa. Seven of the studies reviewed by Stokes et al. [23] discussed clinical audits and

817	feedback, like the five in this review that focused on maternal and perinatal death surveillance			
818	and response (MPDSR). A key finding of theirs, congruent with this present review, was that			
819	intrinsic motivation of health workers was a driver of the implementation of guidelines.			
820	However, the present review included community based PHC up to district hospital settings.			
821	This review used an integrative approach [34] with results being synthesized narratively [35]).			
822	Studies were found on different topics including malaria surveillance, the application of digital			
823	technologies to improve health, expansion of access and quality of HIV/AIDS care, efforts to			
824	improve the quality of maternal, newborn and child health services, reduction of childbirth			
825	related deaths of women and newborns, and non-communicable diseases. Some studies were			
826	cross-cutting and did not look at specific packages of interventions within PHC. These were			
827	classified as either continuous quality improvement or quality improvement collaboratives if			
828	they explored QI processes using those two approaches, or primary health care systems			
829	strengthening, if they were broad enough to include many domains of the health system.			
830	These categories helped to compare results and are not necessarily rigid or <i>a priori</i> .			
831	Importantly, there are many overlaps among them but this further demonstrates the			
832	suitability of the integrative and narrative approaches used for the review, given the review			
833	question.			
834	Primary research studies also used many varied approaches to collect and analyse data on			
835	constraints and enabler of QI. Key informant interviews, in-depth interviews, semi-structured			
836	interviews, document reviews, field notes, participant- and non-participant observations,			
837	surveys, focus group and informal discussions, reflexive diaries, and health systems			
838	(administrative) performance monitoring were some of the data collection approaches used			
839	by QI researchers. Frequently, these were used in combination, with researchers aiming for			
840	data saturation. Sample sizes also ranged from a few tens to several hundred for both			

841 qualitative and mixed methods design with homogenous and heterogenous groups of quality

842	improvement and primary health care stakeholders. As well, included studies adopted a mix of		
843	varied frameworks including MUSIQ, CFIR, Tailored Implementation for Chronic Diseases		
844	(TICD), RE-AIM (reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, maintenance), COM-B		
845	(capability, opportunity, motivation, behaviour), PARIHS (promoting action on research		
846	implementation in health services), Breakthrough Model for Improvement, Positive deviance,		
847	Data to improvement pathway, and Adaptive management framework. These frameworks,		
848	where used, informed QI intervention design, data collection and analysis. Theories were also		
849	infused in QI research and included Force Field Analysis derived from Kurt Lewin's force field		
850	theory, Normalization Process Theory (NPT), Barth's Transactional Model of Culture, Gidden's		
851	Structuration Theory, and Carl May's Extended NPT. Perhaps given that most QI projects are		
852	part of implementation research initiatives, the extended use of frameworks and theories is		
853	not surprising. Due to the carefully thought-out theory-driven process evaluations, well-		
854	defined samples aiming for data saturation, and method mixing, studies were generally of		
855	good quality, having been subjected to critical appraisal, with congruent aims and methods,		
856	verifiable findings, and justified conclusions.		

857 Strength and limitations

858 The search for literature was comprehensive, covering all major health databases, grey 859 literature repositories, selected websites, and even specialty journals. Moreover, no limiters 860 were applied during search and retrieval. The selection of studies was guided by the review 861 question and definitions adopted a broad and inclusive approach while guarding against scope 862 creep - the tendency for reviews to balloon in size and become unmanageable. Studies were 863 systematically screened and appraised for quality by two reviewers independently. Data 864 extracted from 50 per cent of studies was compared between two independent reviewers for 865 consistency. Together, these measures ensure that the review is relevant, with a low chance of 866 bias, while being applicable across wide LMIC contexts. The review also included studies with a

867	range of methods applicable to process evaluations that elicit contextual barriers to and
868	enablers of quality improvement initiatives in primary health care. This was necessary to
869	answer the review question comprehensively. Of note, the review found relatively recent
870	articles and covered almost all countries in sub-Saharan Africa, seven in Asia and two in Latin
871	America, making it the most comprehensive of its kind so far. Lastly, the use of MUSIQ and
872	CFIR framework that are widely used in reviews and primary research on QI supported
873	rigorous and transparent analysis.

874 Some limitations exist, nevertheless. Few studies were included from Latin America and Asia, 875 the other continents with many LMIC countries. However, similarities in the contextual 876 barriers to and enablers of QI in PHC irrespective of country context emerged during analysis, 877 and are seemingly shared across LMICs in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Still, policymakers 878 and practitioners should carefully consider the contexts of included studies before transferring 879 the review's conclusions to their unique PHC contexts. As there are ongoing debates regarding 880 evolving definitions of QI, some researchers may avoid referring explicitly to QI, and such 881 studies could have been missed. To mitigate this, a broad and inclusive definition that reflects 882 the complex and interconnected nature of social, clinical, and public health interventions in 883 the health system was applied to the review.

884 **Conclusion**

This is the first review of its kind that synthesizes research on quality improvement from lowand middle-income countries with a focus on primary health care. The uncovered themes related to barriers and enablers at the microsystem and individual health worker level, those intrinsic to the QI intervention, others that reside in the organization and team implementing QI, additional ones arising out of the larger health system, external environment including the wider society, and how the QI intervention is executed. The review found many similarities

891	and few contrasts among varied country contexts. Importantly, barriers and enablers are
892	closely related and dynamic, likely affecting and affected by each other. The review found that
893	relatively fewer (22) included studies exploring how the external environment and structural
894	barriers and enablers affect QI implementation. It further found that how QI initiatives are
895	executed had been explored in at least 17 countries out of all the six themes. This signals the
896	opportunity for future research to investigate how wider (macro-level) issues and how the
897	actual implementation process of QI is impeded or promoted to make primary health care
898	better for those that provide, use, fund, regulate or design it in LMIC contexts.

Supporting information

900	S1 Checklist.	PRISMA	checklist
-----	---------------	--------	-----------

- 901 S1 Table. Keywords for database search
- 902 S2 Table. Keywords for database search
- 903 S3 Fig. MEDLINE EBSCO search strategy
- 904 S4 Fig. ProQuest database search strategy
- 905 S4 Table. Studies by geographic and income distribution
- 906 S5 Table. Themes and sub-themes
- 907 S6 Table. QI topic of research

908 Acknowledgements

- 909 Professor Mark Limmer provided useful guidance in the development of the research protocol and
- 910 during the conduct of the systematic review. Dr Tracy Epton of Manchester University also provided

- 911 useful suggestions regarding the review methodology and approach, which shaped the conduct of this
- 912 review. John Barbrook provided useful insights into the database search process, from a librarian

913 information scientist perspective, which helped us to fine-tune our literature search strategy. Dr Kevin

914 Oyula undertook quality appraisal and data extraction for one of the included research reports.

915 **References**

916 AHRQ. Quality Improvement in Primary Care: Agency for Healthcare Resarch and Quality; 2023 1. 917 [cited 2023 May 11, 2023]. Online webpage]. Available from: https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/factsheets/quality/qipc/index.html. 918 919 2. Kruk ME, Gage AD, Arsenault C, Jordan K, Leslie HH, Roder-DeWan S, et al. High-quality health 920 systems in the Sustainable Development Goals era: time for a revolution. Lancet Glob Health. 921 2018;6(11):e1196-e252. 922 3. Barış ES, R.; Wang, H.; Zhao, F.; Pate, M. A. Walking the Talk - Reimagining Primary Health Care 923 after COVID-19: The World Bank; 2021. Available from: http://hdl.handle.net/10986/35842. 924 Kleinert S, Horton R. From universal health coverage to right care for health. Lancet. 4. 925 2017;390(10090):101-2. 926 5. Horton R. Offline: Tackling the despair of England's NHS. The Lancet. 2017;389(10066):238. 927 6. Medicine Io. To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Institute of Medicine, America 928 CoQoHCi: 1999. 929 7. Medicine Io. To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System. In: Kohn LT, Corrigan JM, 930 Donaldson MS, editors. To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System. Washington (DC)2000. 931 8. Barber RM, Fullman N, Sorensen RJD, Bollyky T, McKee M, Nolte E, et al. Healthcare access and 932 quality index based on mortality from causes amenable to personal health care in 195 countries and 933 territories, 1990-2015: A novel analysis from the global burden of disease study 2015. The Lancet 934 (British edition). 2017;390(10091):231-66. 935 9. Al-Janabi A, Al-Wahdani B, Ammar W, Arsenault C, Asiedu EK, Etiebet M-A, et al. Bellagio 936 Declaration on high-quality health systems: from a quality moment to a quality movement. Lancet Glob 937 Health. 2018;6(11):e1144-e5. 938 10. Zimlichman; E, Nicklin; W, Aggarwal; R, Bates DW. Health Care 2030: The Coming 939 Transformation. New England Journal of Medicine. 2021. 940 11. WHO, UNICEF, editors. Declaration of Alma-Ata. International Conference on Primary Health 941 Care, Alma-Ata, USSR; 1978 6-12 September 1978; Alma Ata: World Health Organization. 942 12. WHO, editor Declaration of Astana. Global Conference on Primary Health Care; 2019 25 and 26 943 October 2018: World Health Organization. 944 WHO. Quality of Care Online (WHO website): World Health Organization; 2023 [Available from: 13. 945 https://www.who.int/health-topics/quality-of-care#tab=tab_1. 946 Medicine Io. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Crossing 14. 947 the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Washington (DC): National Academy 948 Press; 2001. p. 360. 949 15. Campbell SM, Roland MO, Buetow SA. Defining quality of care. Soc Sci Med. 2000;51(11):1611-950 25. 951 16. Batalden PB, Davidoff F. What is "quality improvement" and how can it transform healthcare? 952 Qual Saf Health Care. 2007;16(1):2-3.

953 17. Schwartz C. What is guality improvement, anyway? 954 https://www.saskhealthguality.ca/blog/what-is-guality-improvement-anyway/2021 [cited 2023 June 28 955 2023]. Available from: https://www.saskhealthguality.ca/blog/what-is-guality-improvement-anyway/. Mercuri M. The "problem(s)" with quality improvement in health care. J Eval Clin Pract. 956 18. 957 2019;25(3):355-7. 958 19. Djulbegovic B, Bennett CL, Guyatt G. A unifying framework for improving health care. J Eval Clin 959 Pract. 2019;25(3):358-62. 960 20. Mondoux S, Shojania KG. Evidence-based medicine: A cornerstone for clinical care but not for 961 quality improvement. J Eval Clin Pract. 2019;25(3):363-8. 962 Camacho-Rodriguez DE, Carrasquilla-Baza DA, Dominguez-Cancino KA, Palmieri PA. Patient 21. 963 Safety Culture in Latin American Hospitals: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis. Int J Environ Res 964 Public Health. 2022;19(21). 965 22. Hussein J, Hirose A, Owolabi O, Imamura M, Kanguru L, Okonofua F. Maternal death and 966 obstetric care audits in Nigeria: a systematic review of barriers and enabling factors in the provision of emergency care. Reprod Health. 2016;13(41):47-. 967 968 Stokes T, Shaw EJ, Camosso-Stefinovic J, Imamura M, Kanguru L, Hussein J. Barriers and enablers 23. 969 to guideline implementation strategies to improve obstetric care practice in low- and middle-income 970 countries: a systematic review of qualitative evidence. Implement Sci. 2016;11(1):144. 971 24. Muhula S, Gachohi J, Kombe Y, Karanja S. Interventions to improve early retention of patients in 972 antiretroviral therapy programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: A systematic review. PLoS One. 973 2022:17(2):e0263663. 974 Pantoja T, Grimshaw JM, Colomer N, Castanon C, Leniz Martelli J. Manually-generated 25. 975 reminders delivered on paper: effects on professional practice and patient outcomes. Cochrane 976 Database Syst Rev. 2019;12(12):CD001174. 977 26. Kringos DS, Sunol R, Wagner C, Mannion R, Michel P, Klazinga NS, et al. The influence of context 978 on the effectiveness of hospital quality improvement strategies: a review of systematic reviews. BMC 979 Health Serv Res. 2015;15:277. 980 27. Kaplan HC, Provost LP, Froehle CM, Margolis PA. The Model for Understanding Success in 981 Quality (MUSIQ): building a theory of context in healthcare quality improvement. BMJ Qual Saf. 982 2012;21(1):13-20. 983 Zamboni K, Singh S, Tyagi M, Hill Z, Hanson C, Schellenberg J. Effect of collaborative quality 28. 984 improvement on stillbirths, neonatal mortality and newborn care practices in hospitals of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh, India: evidence from a quasi-experimental mixed-methods study. Implement Sci. 985 986 2021;16(1):4. 29. 987 Galipeau J, Moher D, Campbell C, Hendry P, Cameron DW, Palepu A, et al. A systematic review 988 highlights a knowledge gap regarding the effectiveness of health-related training programs in 989 journalology. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2015;68(3):257-65. 990 Khurshid Z, De Brún A, Martin J, McAuliffe E. A Systematic Review and Narrative Synthesis: 30. 991 Determinants of the Effectiveness and Sustainability of Measurement-Focused Quality Improvement 992 Trainings. The Journal of continuing education in the health professions. 2021;41(3):210-20. 993 31. Khurshid Z, De Brún A, Moore G, McAuliffe E. Virtual adaptation of traditional healthcare quality 994 improvement training in response to COVID-19: a rapid narrative review. Human resources for health. 995 2020;18(1):81-. 996 32. Farhan R. M, Hanfiah Juni M, Afiah M. Z. N. SYSTEMATIC REVIEW ON EFFECTIVENESS OF 997 METHODS OF DELIVERY AND REMINDER OF HEALTH EDUCATION MODULE TO IMPROVE ADHERENCE 998 ON CHILDHOOD IMMUNIZATION SCHEDULE. International Journal of Public Health & Clinical Sciences 999 (IJPHCS). 2018;5(6):54-73. 1000 Goldman J, Smeraglio A, Lo L, Kuper A, Wong BM. Theory in quality improvement and patient 33. 1001 safety education: A scoping review. Perspect Med Educ. 2021;10(6):319-26. 1002 Whittemore R, Knafl K. Methodological Issues in Nursing Research: The integrative review-34

1003 updated methodology. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2005;52(5):546-53.

1004 35. Popay J, Roberts H, Sowden A, Petticrew M, Arai L, Rodgers M, et al. Guidance on the Conduct 1005 of Narrative Synthesis in Systematic Reviews 2006. 1006 36. Sutton A, Campbell F. The ScHARR LMIC filter: Adapting a low- and middle-income countries geographic search filter to identify studies on preterm birth prevention and management. Res Synth 1007 1008 Methods. 2022;13(4):447-56. 1009 37. Cooke A, Smith D, Booth A. Beyond PICO: the SPIDER tool for qualitative evidence synthesis. 1010 Qual Health Res. 2012;22(10):1435-43. 1011 38. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting 1012 items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Systematic 1013 Reviews. 2015;4(1). 1014 Hong QN, Pluye P, Fabregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, et al. Mixed Methods 39. 1015 Appraisal Tool (MMAT) Version 2018 User guide2018 August 1st, 2018. 1016 Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Opra Widerquist MA, Lowery J. Conceptualizing outcomes for use 40. 1017 with the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR): the CFIR Outcomes Addendum. 1018 Implement Sci. 2022;17(1):7. 1019 Baker U, Petro A, Marchant T, Peterson S, Manzi F, Bergström A, et al. Health workers' 41. 1020 experiences of collaborative guality improvement for maternal and newborn care in rural Tanzanian 1021 health facilities: A process evaluation using the integrated 'Promoting Action on Research 1022 Implementation in Health Services' framework. PloS one. 2018;13(12):e0209092. 1023 Tancred T, Mandu R, Hanson C, Okuga M, Manzi F, Peterson S, et al. How people-centred health 42. 1024 systems can reach the grassroots: experiences implementing community-level quality improvement in 1025 rural Tanzania and Uganda. Health policy and planning. 2018;33(1):e1-e13. 1026 Eboreime EA, Nxumalo N, Ramaswamy R, Ibisomi L, Ihebuzor N, Eyles J. Effectiveness of the 43. 1027 Diagnose-Intervene- Verify-Adjust (DIVA) model for integrated primary healthcare planning and 1028 performance improvement: an embedded mixed methods evaluation in Kaduna state, Nigeria. BMJ 1029 open. 2019;9(3):e026016. 1030 Eboreime EA, Nxumalo N, Ramaswamy R, Eyles J. Strengthening decentralized primary 44. 1031 healthcare planning in Nigeria using a quality improvement model: how contexts and actors affect 1032 implementation. Health Policy Plan. 2018;33(6):715-28. Giessler K, Seefeld A, Montagu D, Phillips B, Mwangi J, Munson M, et al. Perspectives on 1033 45. 1034 implementing a quality improvement collaborative to improve person-centered care for maternal and 1035 reproductive health in Kenya. Int J Qual Health Care. 2020;32(10):671-6. 1036 Odusola AO, Stronks K, Hendriks ME, Schultsz C, Akande T, Osibogun A, et al. Enablers and 46. 1037 barriers for implementing high-quality hypertension care in a rural primary care setting in Nigeria: 1038 perspectives of primary care staff and health insurance managers. Glob Health Action. 2016;9:29041. 1039 47. Pesec M, Spigel L, Granados JMM, Bitton A, Hirschhorn LR, Brizuela JAJ, et al. Strengthening 1040 data collection and use for quality improvement in primary care: the case of Costa Rica. Health Policy 1041 Plan. 2021;36(5):740-53. 1042 48. Lall D, Engel N, Devadasan N, Horstman K, Criel B. Team-based primary health care for non-1043 communicable diseases: complexities in South India. Health Policy Plan. 2020;35(Supplement 2):ii22-1044 ii34. 1045 49. Wakida EK, Obua C, Musisi S, Rukundo GZ, Ssebutinde P, Talib ZM, et al. Implementing clinical 1046 guidelines to promote integration of mental health services in primary health care: a qualitative study of 1047 a systems policy intervention in Uganda. Int J Ment Health Syst. 2019;13:49. 1048 50. Bogren M, Mwambali SN, Berg M. Contextual factors influencing a training intervention aimed 1049 at improved maternal and newborn healthcare in a health zone of the Democratic Republic of Congo. 1050 PLoS One. 2021;16(11):e0260153. 1051 Tibeihaho H, Nkolo C, Onzima RA, Ayebare F, Henriksson DK. Continuous quality improvement 51. 1052 as a tool to implement evidence-informed problem solving: experiences from the district and health

1053 facility level in Uganda. BMC Health Serv Res. 2021;21(1):83.

1054 52. Gage AD, Gotsadze T, Seid E, Mutasa R, Friedman J. The influence of Continuous Quality 1055 Improvement on healthcare quality: A mixed-methods study from Zimbabwe. Soc Sci Med. 1056 2022;298:114831. 1057 53. Tiruneh GT, Zemichael NF, Betemariam WA, Karim AM. Effectiveness of participatory 1058 community solutions strategy on improving household and provider health care behaviors and 1059 practices: A mixed-method evaluation. PLoS One. 2020;15(2):e0228137. 1060 54. Patterson PB, Mumtaz Z, Chirwa E, Mambulasa J, Kachale F, Nyagero J. Culture's Place in Quality 1061 of Care in a Resource-Constrained Health System: Comparison Between Three Malawi Districts. Qual 1062 Health Res. 2021;31(13):2528-41. 1063 55. Demes JAE, Becerril-Montekio V, Torres-Pereda P, Jasmin ER, Dube JG, Coq JG, et al. Analysis of 1064 implementation outcomes of quality improvement initiatives in Haiti: the fingerprint initiative. Rev 1065 Panam Salud Publica. 2021;45:e68. 1066 Kim C, Kirunda R, Mubiru F, Rakhmanova N, Wynne L. A process evaluation of the quality 56. 1067 improvement collaborative for a community-based family planning learning site in Uganda. Gates Open 1068 Res. 2019;3:1481. 1069 Lokossou V, Sombie I, Some DT, Dossou CA, Awignan N. [Do quality improvement teams 57. 1070 contribute to the improvement of community Health Workers' performance in Benin?]. Sante Publique. 1071 2019;Vol. 31(1):165-75. 1072 58. Vail B, Morgan MC, Dyer J, Christmas A, Cohen SR, Joshi M, et al. Logistical, cultural, and 1073 structural barriers to immediate neonatal care and neonatal resuscitation in Bihar, India. BMC 1074 Pregnancy Childbirth, 2018:18(1):385. 1075 59. Visser CA, Wolvaardt JE, Cameron D, Marincowitz GJO. Clinical mentoring to improve quality of 1076 care provided at three NIM-ART facilities: A mixed methods study. Afr J Prim Health Care Fam Med. 2018;10(1):e1-e7. 1077 1078 60. Tancred T, Manzi F, Schellenberg J, Marchant T. Facilitators and Barriers of Community-Level 1079 Quality Improvement for Maternal and Newborn Health in Tanzania. 2017. 1080 Jaribu J, Penfold S, Manzi F, Schellenberg J, Pfeiffer C. Improving institutional childbirth services 61. 1081 in rural Southern Tanzania: a qualitative study of healthcare workers' perspective. BMJ Open. 1082 2016;6(9):e010317. 1083 Kinney MV, Ajayi G, de Graft-Johnson J, Hill K, Khadka N, Om'Iniabohs A, et al. "It might be a 62. 1084 statistic to me, but every death matters.": An assessment of facility-level maternal and perinatal death 1085 surveillance and response systems in four sub-Saharan African countries. PLoS One. 1086 2020;15(12):e0243722. 1087 Ayele B, Gebretnsae H, Hadgu T, Negash D, F GS, Alemu T, et al. Maternal and perinatal death 63. 1088 surveillance and response in Ethiopia: Achievements, challenges and prospects. PLoS One. 1089 2019;14(10):e0223540. 1090 Tayebwa E, Sayinzoga F, Umunyana J, Thapa K, Ajayi E, Kim YM, et al. Assessing Implementation 64. 1091 of Maternal and Perinatal Death Surveillance and Response in Rwanda. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 1092 2020;17(12). 1093 65. Kinney M, Bergh AM, Rhoda N, Pattinson R, George A. Exploring the sustainability of perinatal 1094 audit in four district hospitals in the Western Cape, South Africa: a multiple case study approach. BMJ 1095 Glob Health. 2022;7(6). Basenero A, Neidel J, Ikeda DJ, Ashivudhi H, Mpariwa S, Kamangu JWN, et al. Integrating 1096 66. 1097 hypertension and HIV care in Namibia: A quality improvement collaborative approach. PLoS One. 1098 2022;17(8):e0272727. 1099 67. Schuele E, MacDougall C. The missing bit in the middle: Implementation of the Nationals Health 1100 Services Standards for Papua New Guinea. PLoS One. 2022;17(6):e0266931. 1101 Hutchinson E, Nayiga S, Nabirye C, Taaka L, Westercamp N, Rowe AK, et al. Opening the 'black 68. 1102 box' of collaborative improvement: a qualitative evaluation of a pilot intervention to improve quality of 1103 malaria surveillance data in public health centres in Uganda. Malar J. 2021;20(1):289.

1104 69. Yapa HM, Dhlomo-Mphatswe W, Moshabela M, De Neve J, Herbst C, Jiamsakul A, et al. A
1105 Continuous Quality Improvement Intervention to Improve Antenatal HIV Care Testing in Rural South
1106 Africa: Evaluation of Implementation in a Real-World Setting. Int J Health Policy Manag. 2022;11(5):6101107 28.

Limato R, Tumbelaka P, Ahmed R, Nasir S, Syafruddin D, Ormel H, et al. What factors do make
quality improvement work in primary health care? Experiences of maternal health quality improvement
teams in three Puskesmas in Indonesia. PLoS One. 2019;14(12):e0226804.

1111 71. Baker U, Petro A, Marchant T, Peterson S, Manzi F, Bergstrom A, et al. Health workers'
1112 experiences of collaborative quality improvement for maternal and newborn care in rural Tanzanian
1113 health facilities: A process evaluation using the integrated 'Promoting Action on Research
1114 Implementation in Health Services' framework. PLoS One. 2018;13(12):e0209092.

1115 72. Umunyana J, Sayinzoga F, Ricca J, Favero R, Manariyo M, Kayinamura A, et al. A practice 1116 improvement package at scale to improve management of birth asphyxia in Rwanda: a before-after 1117 mixed methods evaluation. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2020;20(1):583.

1118 73. Stover KE, Tesfaye S, Frew AH, Mohammed H, Barry D, Alamineh L, et al. Building district-level
1119 capacity for continuous improvement in maternal and newborn health. J Midwifery Womens Health.
1120 2014;59 Suppl 1:S91-S100.

112174.Tancred T, Mandu R, Hanson C, Okuga M, Manzi F, Peterson S, et al. How people-centred health1122systems can reach the grassroots: experiences implementing community-level quality improvement in1123rural Tanzania and Uganda. Health Policy Plan. 2018;33(1):e1-e13.

1124 75. Chandani Y, Duffy M, Lamphere B, Noel M, Heaton A, Andersson S. Quality improvement
1125 practices to institutionalize supply chain best practices for iCCM: Evidence from Rwanda and Malawi.
1126 Res Social Adm Pharm. 2017;13(6):1095-109.

1127 76. Horwood C, Luthuli S, Mapumulo S, Haskins L, Jensen C, Pansegrouw D, et al. Challenges of
1128 using e-health technologies to support clinical care in rural Africa: a longitudinal mixed methods study
1129 exploring primary health care nurses' experiences of using an electronic clinical decision support system
1130 (CDSS) in South Africa. BMC Health Serv Res. 2023;23(1):30.

1131 77. Mantell JE, Masvawure TB, Zech JM, Reidy W, Msukwa M, Glenshaw M, et al. "They are our eyes
1132 outside there in the community": Implementing enhanced training, management and monitoring of
1133 South Africa's ward-based primary healthcare outreach teams. PLoS One. 2022;17(8):e0266445.

Thekkur P, Fernando M, Nair D, Kumar AMV, Satyanarayana S, Chandraratne N, et al. Primary
Health Care System Strengthening Project in Sri Lanka: Status and Challenges with Human Resources,
Information Systems, Drugs and Laboratory Services. Healthcare (Basel). 2022;10(11).

1137 79. Mutambo C, Shumba K, Hlongwana KW. User-provider experiences of the implementation of
1138 KidzAlive-driven child-friendly spaces in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. BMC Public Health. 2020;20(1):91.
1139 80. Schierhout G, Praveen D, Patel B, Li Q, Mogulluru K, Ameer MA, et al. Why do strategies to
1140 strengthen primary health care succeed in some places and fail in others? Exploring local variation in the

effectiveness of a community health worker managed digital health intervention in rural India. BMJ Glob Health. 2021;6(Suppl 5).

1143 81. Djellouli N, Mann S, Nambiar B, Meireles P, Miranda D, Barros, H.; , et al. Final Evaluation of the
1144 MOMI Project in Burkina Faso, Kenya, Malawi and Mozambique. Final Report.: Institute for Global
1145 Health, University College London (UCL) and Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade do Porto (FMUP);
1146 2016.

Werner SS, Afandiyeva G, Karimova G, Kiefer S, Abdujabborov N, Dzhamalova M, et al. Scaling
up Business Plans in Tajikistan: a qualitative study of the history, barriers, facilitators and lessons learnt.
Glob Health Action. 2021;14(1):1947552.

115083.Coulibaly A, Gautier L, Zitti T, Ridde V. Implementing performance-based financing in peripheral1151health centres in Mali: what can we learn from it? Health Res Policy Syst. 2020;18(1):54.

115284.Bradley EH, Byam P, Alpern R, Thompson JW, Zerihun A, Abebe Y, et al. A systems approach to1153improving rural care in Ethiopia. PLoS One. 2012;7(4):e35042.

Sukums F, Mensah N, Mpembeni R, Massawe S, Duysburgh E, Williams A, et al. Promising
adoption of an electronic clinical decision support system for antenatal and intrapartum care in rural
primary healthcare facilities in sub-Saharan Africa: The QUALMAT experience. Int J Med Inform.
2015;84(9):647-57.

1158 86. Nahimana E, Magge H, Bizimana F, Nyishime M, Lively CT, Gilbert H, et al. Sustainability
1159 Assessment of a District-Wide Quality Improvement on Newborn Care Program in Rural Rwanda: A
1160 Mixed-Method Study. Ann Glob Health. 2021;87(1):40.

1161 87. Quaife M, Estafinos AS, Keraga DW, Lohmann J, Hill Z, Kiflie A, et al. Changes in health worker
1162 knowledge and motivation in the context of a quality improvement programme in Ethiopia. Health
1163 Policy Plan. 2021;36(10):1508-20.

1164 88. Olaniran AA, Oludipe M, Hill Z, Ogunyemi A, Umar N, Ohiri K, et al. From Theory to
1165 Implementation: Adaptations to a Quality Improvement Initiative According to Implementation Context.
1166 Qual Health Res. 2022;32(4):646-55.

116789.Manzi A, Magge H, Hedt-Gauthier BL, Annie P Michaelis AP, Cyamatare FR, Nyirazinyoye L, et al.1168Clinical mentorship to improve pediatric quality of care at the health centers in rural Rwanda. 2014.

Werdenberg J, Biziyaremye F, Nyishime M, Nahimana E, Mutaganzwa C, Tugizimana D, et al.
Successful implementation of a combined learning collaborative and mentoring intervention to improve
neonatal quality of care in rural Rwanda. BMC Health Serv Res. 2018;18(1):941.

117291.Boyi Hounsou C, Agossou MCU, Bello K, Delvaux T, Benova L, Vigan Guezodje A, et al. "So hard1173not to feel blamed!": Assessment of implementation of Benin's Maternal and Perinatal Death

Surveillance and Response strategy from 2016-2018. Int J Gynaecol Obstet. 2022;158 Suppl 2:6-14.
Pallangyo E, Mbekenga C, Olsson P, Eriksson L, Bergstrom A. Implementation of a facilitation intervention to improve postpartum care in a low-resource suburb of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
Implement Sci. 2018;13(1):102.

1178 93. Djellouli NM, S.; Nambiar, B.; Meireles, P.; Miranda, D.; Barros,, H.; Colbourn, T. Final
1179 Evaluation of the MOMI Project in Burkina Faso, Kenya, Malawi and Mozambique. Final Report.:
1180 Institute for Global Health, University College London (UCL) and Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade
1181 do Porto (FMUP); 2016.

Hounsou BCA, M. C. U.; Bello, K.; Delvaux, T.; Benova, L.; Vigan Guezodje, A.; Hounkpatin, H.;
Dossou, J. P. "So hard not to feel blamed!": Assessment of implementation of Benin's Maternal and
Perinatal Death Surveillance and Response strategy from 2016-2018. International Journal of
Gynaecology and Obstetrics. 2022;158 Suppl 2:6-14.

1186 95. Yapa HMea. A Continuous Quality Improvement Intervention to Improve Antenatal HIV Care
1187 Testing in Rural South Africa: Evaluation of Implementation in a Real-World Setting. Int J Health Policy
1188 Manag. 2022;11(5):610-28.

Sukums F, Mensah N, Mpembeni R, Massawe S, Duysburgh E, Williams A, et al. Promising
adoption of an electronic clinical decision support system for antenatal and intrapartum care in rural
primary healthcare facilities in sub-Saharan Africa: The QUALMAT experience. International journal of
medical informatics. 2015;84(9):647-57.

Pesec M, Spigel L, Granados JMM, Bitton A, Hirschhorn LR, Brizuela JAJ, et al. Strengthening
data collection and use for quality improvement in primary care: the case of Costa Rica. Health policy
and planning. 2021;36(5):740-53.

1196 98. Thekkur P, Fernando M, Nair D, Kumar AMV, Satyanarayana S, Chandraratne N, et al. Primary
1197 Health Care System Strengthening Project in Sri Lanka: Status and Challenges with Human Resources,
1198 Information Systems, Drugs and Laboratory Services. Healthcare (Basel, Switzerland). 2022;10(11).

99. Werner SS, Afandiyeva G, Karimova G, Kiefer S, Abdujabborov N, Dzhamalova M, et al. Scaling
up Business Plans in Tajikistan: a qualitative study of the history, barriers, facilitators and lessons learnt.
Global health action. 2021;14(1):1947552.

1202 100. Manzi A. Clinical mentorship to improve pediatric quality of care at the health centers in rural1203 Rwanda. 2014.

101. Baker UP, A.; Marchant T.;, Peterson, S.; Manzi, F.; Bergstro¨m, A.; Hanson, C. Health workers'
experiences of collaborative quality improvement for maternal and newborn care in rural Tanzanian
health facilities: A process evaluation using the integrated 'Promoting Action on Research
Implementation in Health Services' framework. PLoS One. 2018;13(12).

1208 102. Tiono AB, Nebie I, Anagnostou N, Coulibaly AS, Bowyer G, Lame E, et al. First field efficacy trial 1209 of the ChAd63 MVA ME-TRAP vectored malaria vaccine candidate in 5-17 months old infants and 1210 children. Plos One. 2018;13(12).

1211 103. Umunyana J, Sayinzoga F, Ricca J, Favero R, Manariyo M, Kayinamura A, et al. A practice 1212 improvement package at scale to improve management of birth asphyxia in Rwanda: a before-after 1213 mixed methods evaluation. BMC pregnancy and childbirth. 2020;20(1):583.

1214 104. Boyi Hounsou C, Agossou MCU, Bello K, Delvaux T, Benova L, Vigan Guézodjè A, et al. "So hard 1215 not to feel blamed!": Assessment of implementation of Benin's Maternal and Perinatal Death

not to feel blamed!": Assessment of implementation of Benin's Maternal and Perinatal Death Surveillance and Response strategy from 2016-2018. International journal of gynaecology and

obstetrics: the official organ of the International Federation of Gynaecology and Obstetrics. 2022;158:6 1218 14.

1219 105. Hounsou BC, Agossou MCU, Bello K, Delvaux T, Benova L, Vigan Guezodje A, et al. "So hard not 1220 to feel blamed!": Assessment of implementation of Benin's Maternal and Perinatal Death Surveillance 1221 and Response strategy from 2016-2018. International Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics. 2022;158

1222 Suppl 2:6-14.

1223 106. Coulibaly S, Desplats D, Kone Y, Nimaga K, Dugas S, Farnarier G, et al. [Neighbourhood rural 1224 medicine: an experience of rural doctors in Mali]. Education for health (Abingdon, England).

1225 2007;20(2):47.

1226107.Gage A, Bauhoff S. The effects of performance-based financing on neonatal health outcomes in1227Burundi, Lesotho, Senegal, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Health Policy Plan. 2021;36(3):332-40.

1228 108. Ayele B, Gebretnsae H, Hadgu T, Negash D, G/Silassie F, Alemu T, et al. Maternal and perinatal

death surveillance and response in Ethiopia: Achievements, challenges and prospects. PloS one.2019;14(10):e0223540.

1231 109. Means AR, Kemp CG, Gwayi-Chore MC, Gimbel S, Soi C, Sherr K, et al. Evaluating and optimizing

1232 the consolidated framework for implementation research (CFIR) for use in low- and middle-income

1233 countries: a systematic review. Implement Sci. 2020;15(1):17.