

1 **Barriers to and enablers of quality improvement in**
2 **primary health care in low- and middle-income**
3 **countries: a systematic review**
4

5 Camlus Odhus^{1*}, 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

13 *Camlus Odhus

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

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**

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

42 The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) contends that “Quality improvement (QI) is
43 essential to achieving the triple aim of improving the health of the population, enhancing patient
44 experiences and outcomes, and reducing the per capita cost of care, and to improving provider
45 experience” [1].

46 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 QI in LMICs?

108 **Review approach and methods**

109 **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 CINHALL) 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**

150 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
155 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).

158

159 **Table 1. Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

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
162 showing results of the study selection process [38].

163

164 **Fig 1. PRISMA Flow Chart**

165

166 **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 yes, 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
177 studies MMAT focuses more on the appropriateness of mixing methods, whether the various
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 QI intervention itself. Concepts from these two frameworks were deductively applied to the entire
198 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, forty-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 forty-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

233 same QI intervention in Tanzania and Uganda and a further two publications [43, 44] were from the

234 same project in Nigeria.

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257 **Table 2. Characteristics of included studies**

Author	Country/ setting	Topic	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 health and family planning in public facilities in Kenya.	Descriptive qualitative exploration using semi-structured interviews.
Oduola 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).
Tibehaho 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	Newborn 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 et 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]	Southern 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 (<i>woredas</i>)	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 et 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.

258

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

329 workers' confidence in the QI initiative - and abandoned [44, 47, 48, 51, 53, 57, 58, 62, 67, 68,
330 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].

358 **Theme 2: Attributes of quality improvement intervention**

359 Component attributes of a quality improvement intervention discussed under this theme
360 include its strength and the quality of evidence underpinning it, how and whether participants
361 perceive it to be beneficial, its cost, potential to be scaled up, and perceived sustainability.
362 Other characteristics of the QI intervention that can enable or constrain its implementation
363 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, Mozambique, 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].

399 The significance of designing QI interventions in a manner that ensures that health workers
400 see alignment between the proposed QI package and their everyday work responsibilities (job
401 expectations in the PHC practice setting) while complementing participants' and health
402 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].

459 QI interventions can flourish in organizations and teams with the right norms and where
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.

472 The maturity of an organization in undertaking quality improvement (QI) was reportedly
473 facilitated by accreditation processes which inspire a virtuous cycle of QI. Organizations
474 undergoing accreditation are expected to plan for QI, allocate budgets and subsequently avail
475 resources needed to enhance the quality of PHC services over time [67]. But the presence of
476 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 unfavourable for QI, which proved detrimental to efforts to strengthen
498 PHC quality in Kaduna state in Nigeria.

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

502 asserted authority and ignored other team members' contributions. Findings in Bihar [58], still
503 in India, also highlighted the important gap left when doctors did not take up their roles as QI
504 mentors in the context of management of birth complications for newborns, with fatal
505 consequences.

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.

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

543 The first barrier to QI in LMICs concerns a dearth of health workers which pervades health
544 systems and within these, primary health care delivery structures do not appear exempt. Low
545 numbers, frequent leave of absence, and rapid turnover of staff are each associated with high
546 workload and were reported as important constraints to quality improvement [49, 60, 62-64,
547 66, 68, 75-78, 81, 85, 86, 90, 94]. Where staff are available, aligning job descriptions and
548 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,
558 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
562 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
569 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
587 fragmentation in PHC as a key systems constraint for quality improvement. Also, policies that
588 limit access to PHC budgets as part of larger health systems configuration can also bar QI in
589 LMICs. Conversely, Manisha Yapa and colleagues [69] report that availability of key guidelines
590 and tools, and according to Werner et al. [82], national policies e.g., those that give a high
591 visibility to PHC can indeed foster a supporting environment for PHC-focused quality
592 improvement.

593 Elsewhere, sub-optimal government policies and guidelines e.g., failure to integrate clinical
594 decision support systems (CDSS) across the entire health system rather than in one or few
595 vertical programmes was a key constraint contributing to non-use by trained health workers
596 [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
603 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 QI implementation in varied ways. Such structural factors are not enacted or imposed by social
609 actors intending to shape QI interventions (although they may end up doing just that) but to
610 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].

629 Strong societal norms seep into the health system, through to individual health workers and
630 managers, 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
634 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 litigious
638 society. However, in Mali, Coulibaly and colleagues [83] documented positive collaboration
639 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.

642 External pressures and incentives sometimes combined synergistically with socioeconomic
643 policies to enable quality improvement in primary health care. This was the case in Tajikistan
644 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**

672 No quality improvement intervention is going to attain the desired objective unless
673 implemented. Although this theme is being presented last, it is perhaps the most insightful,
674 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
676 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

696 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

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

700 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].

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

740 Among others, [63, 88] found that QI implementation is more successful if it includes
741 enhancements in documentation of care processes, and when stocks of key commodities are
742 tracked and reported regularly. Conversely, failure by implementers to keep track of the
743 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
765 concerned the definition of quality improvement for which there is still no consensus. A
766 second dilemma surfaced around the definition of primary health care – and subsequent
767 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 outsized 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.

785 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
792 are introduced, implemented, and thereby constrained or enabled. The Miscellaneous

793 category under MUSIQ includes considerations related to the trigger for QI and whether QI
794 tasks are strategic to the organization and were subsumed under the others in the present
795 review.

796 Accordingly, MUSIQ and CFIR proved useful for organizing the large amount of data derived
797 from 50 diverse studies from equally varied countries and PHC settings. Additions to the CFIR
798 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].

807 A more recent realist review [28] explored factors that affect the effectiveness of quality
808 improvement collaboratives (QICs), among the topics covered in the present review. Having
809 synthesized the findings of 32 research abstracts, Zamboni et al [28] reported that factors
810 inherent in external support, QI team, macro or structural aspects of implementation contexts
811 can enable or constrain QICs, resonating with this review.

812 Like most previously published systematic reviews on quality improvement that have tended
813 to focus only on hospitals, Stokes and colleagues [23] synthesized research on barriers and
814 enablers related to maternity care in LMICs. With a more limited database search covering
815 only MEDLINE and CINAHL, they included nine studies, all of which were based on sub-Saharan
816 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 *a priori*.
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**

885 This is the first review of its kind that synthesizes research on quality improvement from low-
886 and middle-income countries with a focus on primary health care. The uncovered themes
887 related to barriers and enablers at the microsystem and individual health worker level, those
888 intrinsic to the QI intervention, others that reside in the organization and team implementing
889 QI, additional ones arising out of the larger health system, external environment including the
890 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.

899 **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 1. AHRQ. Quality Improvement in Primary Care: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2023
917 [cited 2023 May 11, 2023]. Online webpage]. Available from:
918 <https://www.ahrq.gov/research/findings/factsheets/quality/qipc/index.html>.
- 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 4. Kleinert S, Horton R. From universal health coverage to right care for health. *Lancet*.
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 13. WHO. Quality of Care Online (WHO website): World Health Organization; 2023 [Available from:
945 https://www.who.int/health-topics/quality-of-care#tab=tab_1.
- 946 14. Medicine Io. Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century. Crossing
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 quality improvement, anyway?
954 <https://www.saskhealthquality.ca/blog/what-is-quality-improvement-anyway/2021> [cited 2023 June 28
955 2023]. Available from: <https://www.saskhealthquality.ca/blog/what-is-quality-improvement-anyway/>.
- 956 18. Mercuri M. The "problem(s)" with quality improvement in health care. *J Eval Clin Pract.*
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 21. Camacho-Rodriguez DE, Carrasquilla-Baza DA, Dominguez-Cancino KA, Palmieri PA. Patient
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
967 emergency care. *Reprod Health.* 2016;13(41):47-.
- 968 23. Stokes T, Shaw EJ, Camosso-Stefinovic J, Imamura M, Kanguru L, Hussein J. Barriers and enablers
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 25. Pantoja T, Grimshaw JM, Colomer N, Castanon C, Leniz Martelli J. Manually-generated
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 28. Zamboni K, Singh S, Tyagi M, Hill Z, Hanson C, Schellenberg J. Effect of collaborative quality
984 improvement on stillbirths, neonatal mortality and newborn care practices in hospitals of Telangana and
985 Andhra Pradesh, India: evidence from a quasi-experimental mixed-methods study. *Implement Sci.*
986 2021;16(1):4.
- 987 29. 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 30. Khurshid Z, De Brún A, Martin J, McAuliffe E. A Systematic Review and Narrative Synthesis:
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 33. Goldman J, Smeraglio A, Lo L, Kuper A, Wong BM. Theory in quality improvement and patient
1001 safety education: A scoping review. *Perspect Med Educ.* 2021;10(6):319-26.
- 1002 34. Whitemore R, Knaf K. Methodological Issues in Nursing Research: The integrative review-
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
1007 geographic search filter to identify studies on preterm birth prevention and management. *Res Synth*
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 39. Hong QN, Pluye P, Fabregues S, Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, et al. Mixed Methods
1015 Appraisal Tool (MMAT) Version 2018 User guide 2018 August 1st, 2018.
- 1016 40. Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Opra Widerquist MA, Lowery J. Conceptualizing outcomes for use
1017 with the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR): the CFIR Outcomes Addendum.
1018 *Implement Sci*. 2022;17(1):7.
- 1019 41. Baker U, Petro A, Marchant T, Peterson S, Manzi F, Bergström A, et al. Health workers'
1020 experiences of collaborative quality 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 42. Tancred T, Mandu R, Hanson C, Okuga M, Manzi F, Peterson S, et al. How people-centred health
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 43. Eboreime EA, Nxumalo N, Ramaswamy R, Ibisomi L, Ihebuzor N, Eyles J. Effectiveness of the
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 44. Eboreime EA, Nxumalo N, Ramaswamy R, Eyles J. Strengthening decentralized primary
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.
- 1033 45. Giessler K, Seefeld A, Montagu D, Phillips B, Mwangi J, Munson M, et al. Perspectives on
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 46. Oduola AO, Stronks K, Hendriks ME, Schultz C, Akande T, Osibogun A, et al. Enablers and
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 51. Tibeihaho H, Nkolo C, Onzima RA, Ayebare F, Henriksson DK. Continuous quality improvement
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 56. Kim C, Kirunda R, Mubiru F, Rakhmanova N, Wynne L. A process evaluation of the quality
1067 improvement collaborative for a community-based family planning learning site in Uganda. *Gates Open*
1068 *Res.* 2019;3:1481.
- 1069 57. Lokossou V, Sombie I, Some DT, Dossou CA, Awignan N. [Do quality improvement teams
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.*
1077 2018;10(1):e1-e7.
- 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 61. Jaribu J, Penfold S, Manzi F, Schellenberg J, Pfeiffer C. Improving institutional childbirth services
1081 in rural Southern Tanzania: a qualitative study of healthcare workers' perspective. *BMJ Open.*
1082 2016;6(9):e010317.
- 1083 62. Kinney MV, Ajayi G, de Graft-Johnson J, Hill K, Khadka N, Om'Iniabo A, et al. "It might be a
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 63. Ayele B, Gebretnsae H, Hadgu T, Negash D, F GS, Alemu T, et al. Maternal and perinatal death
1088 surveillance and response in Ethiopia: Achievements, challenges and prospects. *PLoS One.*
1089 2019;14(10):e0223540.
- 1090 64. Tayebwa E, Sayinzoga F, Umunyana J, Thapa K, Ajayi E, Kim YM, et al. Assessing Implementation
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).
- 1096 66. Basenero A, Neidel J, Ikeda DJ, Ashivudhi H, Mpariwa S, Kamangu JWN, et al. Integrating
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 68. Hutchinson E, Nayiga S, Nabirye C, Taaka L, Westercamp N, Rowe AK, et al. Opening the 'black
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, Dhlo-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):610-
1107 28.
- 1108 70. Limato R, Tumbelaka P, Ahmed R, Nasir S, Syafruddin D, Ormel H, et al. What factors do make
1109 quality improvement work in primary health care? Experiences of maternal health quality improvement
1110 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.
- 1121 74. Tancred T, Mandu R, Hanson C, Okuga M, Manzi F, Peterson S, et al. How people-centred health
1122 systems can reach the grassroots: experiences implementing community-level quality improvement in
1123 rural 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.
- 1134 78. Thekkur P, Fernando M, Nair D, Kumar AMV, Satyanarayana S, Chandraratne N, et al. Primary
1135 Health Care System Strengthening Project in Sri Lanka: Status and Challenges with Human Resources,
1136 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
1141 effectiveness of a community health worker managed digital health intervention in rural India. *BMJ Glob
1142 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.
- 1147 82. Werner SS, Afandiyeva G, Karimova G, Kiefer S, Abdujabborov N, Dzhamalova M, et al. Scaling
1148 up Business Plans in Tajikistan: a qualitative study of the history, barriers, facilitators and lessons learnt.
1149 *Glob Health Action.* 2021;14(1):1947552.
- 1150 83. Coulibaly A, Gautier L, Zitti T, Ridde V. Implementing performance-based financing in peripheral
1151 health centres in Mali: what can we learn from it? *Health Res Policy Syst.* 2020;18(1):54.
- 1152 84. Bradley EH, Byam P, Alpern R, Thompson JW, Zerihun A, Abebe Y, et al. A systems approach to
1153 improving rural care in Ethiopia. *PLoS One.* 2012;7(4):e35042.

- 1154 85. Sukums F, Mensah N, Mpembeni R, Massawe S, Duysburgh E, Williams A, et al. Promising
1155 adoption of an electronic clinical decision support system for antenatal and intrapartum care in rural
1156 primary healthcare facilities in sub-Saharan Africa: The QUALMAT experience. *Int J Med Inform.*
1157 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.
- 1167 89. Manzi A, Magge H, Hedt-Gauthier BL, Annie P Michaelis AP, Cyamatara FR, Nyirazinyoye L, et al.
1168 Clinical mentorship to improve pediatric quality of care at the health centers in rural Rwanda. 2014.
- 1169 90. Werdenberg J, Biziyaremye F, Nyishime M, Nahimana E, Mutaganzwa C, Tugizimana D, et al.
1170 Successful implementation of a combined learning collaborative and mentoring intervention to improve
1171 neonatal quality of care in rural Rwanda. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2018;18(1):941.
- 1172 91. Boyi Hounsou C, Agossou MCU, Bello K, Delvaux T, Benova L, Vigan Guezodje A, et al. "So hard
1173 not to feel blamed!": Assessment of implementation of Benin's Maternal and Perinatal Death
1174 Surveillance and Response strategy from 2016-2018. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet.* 2022;158 Suppl 2:6-14.
- 1175 92. Pallangyo E, Mbekenga C, Olsson P, Eriksson L, Bergstrom A. Implementation of a facilitation
1176 intervention to improve postpartum care in a low-resource suburb of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
1177 *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.
- 1182 94. Hounsou BCA, M. C. U.; Bello, K.; Delvaux, T.; Benova, L.; Vigan Guezodje, A.; Hounkpatin, H.;
1183 Dossou, J. P. "So hard not to feel blamed!": Assessment of implementation of Benin's Maternal and
1184 Perinatal Death Surveillance and Response strategy from 2016-2018. *International Journal of*
1185 *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.
- 1189 96. Sukums F, Mensah N, Mpembeni R, Massawe S, Duysburgh E, Williams A, et al. Promising
1190 adoption of an electronic clinical decision support system for antenatal and intrapartum care in rural
1191 primary healthcare facilities in sub-Saharan Africa: The QUALMAT experience. *International journal of*
1192 *medical informatics.* 2015;84(9):647-57.
- 1193 97. Pesec M, Spigel L, Granados JMM, Bitton A, Hirschhorn LR, Brizuela JAJ, et al. Strengthening
1194 data collection and use for quality improvement in primary care: the case of Costa Rica. *Health policy*
1195 *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).
- 1199 99. Werner SS, Afandiyeva G, Karimova G, Kiefer S, Abdujabborov N, Dzhamalova M, et al. Scaling
1200 up Business Plans in Tajikistan: a qualitative study of the history, barriers, facilitators and lessons learnt.
1201 *Global health action.* 2021;14(1):1947552.
- 1202 100. Manzi A. Clinical mentorship to improve pediatric quality of care at the health centers in rural
1203 Rwanda. 2014.

- 1204 101. Baker UP, A.; Marchant T.; Peterson, S.; Manzi, F.; Bergström, A.; Hanson, C. Health workers'
1205 experiences of collaborative quality improvement for maternal and newborn care in rural Tanzanian
1206 health facilities: A process evaluation using the integrated 'Promoting Action on Research
1207 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
1216 Surveillance and Response strategy from 2016-2018. *International journal of gynaecology and
1217 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.
- 1226 107. Gage A, Bauhoff S. The effects of performance-based financing on neonatal health outcomes in
1227 Burundi, 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
1229 death surveillance and response in Ethiopia: Achievements, challenges and prospects. *PloS one*.
1230 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.
- 1234