

1 **Full Title: Feasibility and acceptability of collecting dried blood spots (DBS) from children after**
2 **vaccination during Supplementary Immunization Activities to estimate measles and rubella**
3 **seroprevalence**

4 **Short Title: Feasibility and acceptability of collecting DBS during SIAs**

5 Andrea C. Carcelen*¹, Christine Prosperi*¹, Mutinta Hamahuwa**², Kelvin Kapungu**³, Gershom
6 Chongwe³, Francis D. Mwansa⁴, Phillimon Ndubani², Edgar Simulundu², Innocent C. Bwalya³, Kalumbu
7 H. Matakala², Gloria Musukwa², Irene Mutale³, Evans Betha³, Nchimunya Chaavwa², Lombe
8 Kampamba³, Japhet Matoba², Passwell Munachoonga², Webster Mufwambi³, Ken Situtu³, Philip E.
9 Thuma², Constance Sakala⁴, Princess Kayeye⁴, Shaun A. Truelove^{1,5}, Amy K. Winter⁶, Matthew J
10 Ferrari⁷, William J. Moss^{1,5}, Simon Mutembo¹

11 Affiliations:

- 12 1. Department of International Health, International Vaccine Access Center, Johns Hopkins
13 Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, Maryland, USA
- 14 2. Macha Research Trust, Choma, Zambia
- 15 3. Tropical Diseases Research Centre, Ndola, Zambia
- 16 4. Government of the Republic of Zambia, Ministry of Health, Lusaka, Zambia
- 17 5. Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore,
18 Maryland, USA
- 19 6. Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, USA
- 20 7. Center for Infectious Disease Dynamics, Pennsylvania State University, State College,
21 Pennsylvania, USA

22 *Contributed equally

23 **Contributed equally

24 Corresponding author: Andrea C. Carcelen (acarcell@jhmi.edu)

26 **Abstract**

27 Nested serosurveys within routine service delivery platforms such as planned supplemental immunization
28 activities (SIAs) provide an opportunity to collect information that can be used to answer valuable
29 questions on the effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery model to inform future activities. However,
30 integrating research data collection in SIAs is rarely done due to concerns it will negatively impact the
31 program.

32 We conducted a serosurvey nested within the November 2020 measles-rubella SIA integrated with the
33 Child Health Week activities in Zambia to evaluate this approach. In-depth interviews with the study
34 teams and vaccination campaign staff at the vaccination sites were conducted. Recorded interviews were
35 transcribed, transcripts were coded and then grouped into themes based on a process evaluation
36 framework. A multi-methods analytical approach was used to assess the feasibility and acceptability of
37 collecting dried blood spots from children during the SIA. This included a quantitative assessment of
38 participant enrollment.

39 The serosurvey successfully enrolled 90% of children from Child Health Week due to close coordination
40 and teamwork between the vaccination teams and serosurvey team, in addition to substantial social
41 mobilization efforts. Continually adjusting the sampling interval that was used to select eligible children
42 allowed us to enroll throughout the SIA and capture a representative sample of children in attendance
43 although it was challenging for the staff involved.

44 As vaccination programs aim to tailor their approaches to reach the hardest-to-reach children, embedding
45 research questions in SIAs will allow evaluation of the successes and challenges and compare alternative
46 approaches. Lessons learned from this experience collecting data during an SIA can be applicable to
47 future research activities embedded in SIAs or other delivery platforms.

49 **Introduction**

50 Serosurveys for vaccine-preventable diseases (VPD) are cross-sectional surveys that measure antibodies
51 against pathogens from a representative sample of a population to estimate immunity (1). Traditionally,
52 vaccine coverage and disease surveillance data are used to infer immunity levels, but these sources do not
53 directly measure immunity (2). Poor data quality can lead to an overestimation of immunity and population
54 groups with immunity gaps may be missed by both routine and SIA vaccination activities. Serosurveys can
55 be used to complement data from other sources, including vaccine coverage and disease surveillance. They
56 are most relevant to predict the risk of outbreaks and plan for vaccination campaigns in the specific situation
57 where longstanding immunity gaps are suspected but coverage data are not adequate to assess the risk
58 because of quality issues, migration of populations, or gaps in specific age or other sub-groups in the
59 population (3).

60 Serosurveys can use previously collected specimens from bio banks or health facilities for testing or
61 prospectively collect specimens. Specimen collection may be done through purposively designed surveys
62 or by nesting within other planned surveys, such as Demographic Health Surveys (DHS) or Post Campaign
63 Coverage Surveys (PCCS) (4, 5). New specimen collection allows for better control of data collection and
64 sampling methodologies but can be costly and logistically challenging (6, 7). Nesting within other planned
65 surveys results in cost saving compared to a standalone serosurvey (7). However, there are still considerable
66 personnel and transport costs to visit communities to conduct data and specimen collection, even in a nested
67 design. This is especially relevant for surveys using multi-stage sampling which typically require multiple
68 days to map and enumerate the community prior to enrollment (8, 9).

69 An alternative approach to save costs is to nest a survey within delivery platforms such as supplemental
70 immunization activities (SIAs) where caregivers are already bringing their under five children to receive
71 services. SIAs provide an opportunity to easily identify and collect data and specimens from children in
72 the age of interest for many VPDs. This information can be used to answer valuable questions on the

73 effectiveness and efficiency of the delivery platform to inform future activities. Integration of serosurveys
74 and other research studies in the SIA platform has been avoided due to concerns that such research
75 activities would negatively impact the success of the SIA. However, integration of other services in the
76 SIA platform, such as bed net distribution, is routinely done and recommended by the World Health
77 Organization as comprehensive approach to service delivery (9, 10).

78 Child Health Weeks (CHWs) are semi-annual, campaign-style, facility and outreach-based events that
79 were initiated in Zambia in 2003 to provide a package of high-impact preventive services to under five
80 children. These services included vitamin A supplementation, growth monitoring and promotion,
81 vaccinations, deworming and promotion of intermittent treatment of insecticide treated mosquito nets
82 (11). We nested a serosurvey in the November 2020 SIA to assess the seroprevalence of measles and
83 rubella among children attending the 2020 SIA integrated in the Child Health Week. In this manuscript
84 we evaluate the processes, feasibility, and acceptability of nesting a serosurvey in the SIA. We describe
85 the planning and implementation of the serosurvey nested in the SIA, quantitative summaries of
86 participant enrollment and survey operations, and qualitative summaries from in-depth interviews with
87 data collectors, supervisors, and vaccinators. The vaccination coverage and seroprevalence findings are
88 presented in a separate manuscript (12).

89

90 **Materials and Methods**

91 We conducted a serosurvey nested within the November 2020 measles-rubella SIA integrated with the
92 Child Health Week activities in Zambia which targeted children 9 to 59 months of age (12). We
93 implemented this serosurvey in two districts in Zambia: Ndola District, Copperbelt Province (primarily
94 urban), and Choma District, Southern Province (primarily rural). We included 15 vaccination sites in each
95 district. At each site there were two teams: the vaccination team and the serosurvey study team. When a

96 caregiver arrived at the site, they went to the vaccination table. There was a study staff stationed near the
97 vaccination team who systematically sampled children as they left the vaccination table. The selected
98 child and their caregiver were then directed to the survey team table. If the caregiver consented to take
99 part in the serosurvey, a questionnaire was administered, and a Dried Blood Spot (DBS) sample was
100 collected from the child by finger prick onto a well-labeled card. The sample was then dried, stored, and
101 transported to the central laboratory for testing. Additional details regarding implementation, sampling
102 and tracking are provided in the Supplemental Methods (S1 Appendix).

103
104 We used a multi-methods analytical approach to assess the feasibility and acceptability of collecting dried
105 blood spots from children at the point of vaccination during a vaccination campaign. This included a
106 quantitative assessment of how many children were expected to attend, how many ended up being eligible
107 and how many were enrolled and provided specimens. To evaluate the process of integrating specimen
108 collection during the campaign, we conducted in-depth interviews with both the study teams and
109 vaccination campaign staff at the vaccination sites where DBS was collected.

110 All study staff and vaccination campaign staff at sites where specimens were collected were eligible to be
111 interviewed. Purposive sampling was used to identify respondents. Co-investigators at Macha Research
112 Trust and Tropical Diseases Research Centre conducted data collection. Interviews were conducted using
113 a semi-structured interview guide in English and were audio recorded and transcribed. Recruitment was
114 based on availability and interest of staff and included all 3 study supervisors, 10 of the 30 study team
115 staff and 10 of the 30 vaccination campaign staff. All data collection occurred at the end of the day after
116 campaign activities were completed or in the days immediately following the campaign. The recruitment
117 period for the interviews was from November 23 to December 8, 2020. Forty-two respondents were
118 interviewed between the two districts, including 18 serosurvey staff, 6 serosurvey supervisors, and 18 SIA
119 vaccinators (S1 Table).

120 All transcripts were coded initially by one research team member in Dedoose v9.4, and 20% of transcripts
121 were double coded by the principal investigator. A codebook was developed based on previous
122 acceptability of serosurvey work conducted in Zambia but was updated with additional codes as needed
123 (13). Disagreements were resolved by consensus. Initial codes were grouped into axial codes and
124 subsequently themes based on programmatic aspects addressed using a process evaluation framework
125 (14). We used constant comparison to assess any differences by study team member or vaccinator and
126 barriers or facilitators to the program.

127 Ethical approval was obtained from the Tropical Diseases Research Centre ethics review committee, and
128 Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health Institutional Review Board. Further regulatory
129 approval was given by the Zambia National Health Research Authority. Written consent was obtained
130 from caregivers before enrolment in the serosurvey, and for in-depth interviews of health workers verbal
131 consent was obtained from serosurvey staff and vaccinators.

132 **Results**

133 Below we present details on the steps followed to operationalize the serosurvey nested in the SIA, including
134 a qualitative evaluation of the serosurvey planning, staffing and training, social mobilization, enrollment,
135 sampling, and implementation. Quantitative summaries of sampling and serosurvey enrollment
136 contextualize the qualitative findings on perceptions.

137 **Stakeholder engagement and planning**

138 During the planning phase of the serosurvey we used the district SIA microplans and input from district
139 health management teams to estimate the number of children to be vaccinated in each fixed and outreach
140 vaccination site. We inflated the target number of children to be vaccinated at each serosurvey location by
141 5% then estimated the number to be vaccinated on each of the five or six days of the SIA. We planned to

142 enroll between 70-85 children per survey location, aiming for 10-15 children per day to distribute
143 enrollment across all days of the SIA. We set a daily maximum to prevent over enrolling on a given day if
144 the volume of children was larger than anticipated. Using the estimated number of children to be
145 vaccinated per day and the overall and daily target enrollment numbers we proposed an initial sampling
146 interval for each location.

147 Respondents highlighted the importance of engaging with Ministry of Health through the district health
148 office, specifically Maternal and Child Health staff, from planning and training through
149 implementation. Engagement at these higher levels was critical to facilitate engagement with staff at the
150 selected health facilities, as noted by a supervisor.

151 *“So we had to work with the district health office, we worked with the matron who supervises the mother*
152 *to child health unit and they put us in touch with the sisters in charge for every site that was selected*
153 *through the DHO, then that is where the teams were reconstituted” -T_SUPER_1*

154

155 **Staffing and training**

156 The nurses in-charge at the selected health facilities played a key role in the survey by identifying staff to
157 conduct the serosurvey without compromising the needs of Child Health Week, which required rearranging
158 staff schedules or requesting that staff on leave return to work. Staff were experienced nurses, including
159 some with prior survey experience, who were familiar with the community where the survey was conducted,
160 which was a substantial strength for the survey. All staff were trained on all activities, such as obtaining
161 informed consent, entering data in the tablet, and collecting dried blood spots. Staff noted they felt equipped
162 to address questions from caregivers during the SIA, and appreciated the experience gained with regards to
163 social mobilization and speaking to caregivers, conducting research, and the collection of dried blood spots.
164 However, some serosurvey staff and supervisors noted the training period was insufficient and too fast-

165 paced. Supervisors leading training sessions also noted additional time was needed to review materials in
166 advance of the training. Prior to the SIA, serosurvey staff conducted a pilot exercise at health facilities
167 where they practiced sampling children, introducing the survey, obtaining consent, and conducting the
168 interviews with families attending routine immunization (RI). While many highlighted the value of the
169 piloting exercise, some also noted additional piloting experiences were needed. Both serosurvey staff and
170 vaccinators mentioned that including the vaccinators in the training would have been valuable to make them
171 aware of the survey activities and motivate them to support the survey staff in sensitizing parents leading
172 up to and during Child Health Week. This was reported to have happened in some sites, but not others. As
173 one supervisor noted, staff should include *"incorporating a lot of people, community health workers as*
174 *well, because those help very much in social mobilization. Imagine we bought a bicycle for each one of*
175 *them, social mobilization was going to be very easy."*- T_SUPER_3

176

177 **Community mobilization**

178 Prior to field work, the survey team worked closely with the maternal and child health (MCH)
179 coordinators and health promotion officers at the district office to conduct community sensitization for the
180 serosurvey, which in many locations was closely linked to the sensitization for the SIA. Staff said this
181 included home visitations, megaphone, and radio advertisement, distribution of information, education,
182 and communications (IEC) materials such as leaflets and posters at clinics, and in-person meetings held at
183 churches to inform people about the upcoming serosurvey. However, during data collection, staff
184 mentioned that in some areas sensitization was done well while in others it was insufficient. Staff reported
185 that some parents or caregivers only learned about the serosurvey when they visited the health facility
186 during child health week. Throughout the week, the community health workers and health promotion
187 officers intensified community outreach activities due to low turnout. Having health facility staff actively
188 involved in sensitizing parents or caregivers who brought their children for routine immunization, made

189 parents receptive to the serosurvey. Some staff recommended that community sensitization should be
190 done earlier so that people are well informed about the survey to avoid misconceptions, as noted by a
191 serosurvey data collector.

192 *“Maybe just prolonging the period for community sensitization, so that facilities are with the information*
193 *for a longer period so that as they talk to the community members who are coming for each and every*
194 *service be it out patient department or during the maternal and child health clinics they are able to talk to*
195 *them” - MK-Sero-1*

196 **Enrollment**

197 In total 2,942 children attending the campaign at the selected locations were approached by the survey
198 team, out of an approximate 25,088 children vaccinated. Ninety percent of children approached at
199 campaign sites in Ndola District were enrolled, but there was lower participation in Choma District (74%
200 (Fig 1). Refusals in Choma District were concentrated in three campaign sites, where participation ranged
201 from 31% to 61%. Approximately three to four percent of children approached in each district could not
202 be enrolled because no caregiver was available to provide consent. While the daily enrollment target at a
203 site was intended to be 10-15 children, the number enrolled on a given day ranged from 2 to 49 (S1 Fig),
204 varying as we adjusted the daily maximum.

205 **Fig 1. Participant cascade by district at selected health facilities where serosurvey was conducted.**

206 Legend: Number of children vaccinated at the select serosurvey locations was estimated based on
207 serosurvey staff observations and discussions with the health facility staff.

208 Survey staff recorded the number of children vaccinated each day based on their observations as they
209 were sampling children or from the nurses in-charge. We summarized the number of children vaccinated
210 at each survey location and compared it to the number expected based on the microplan and
211 communications with health facilities during the planning phase (Fig 2). In Choma District, we observed

212 fewer children vaccinated than we had expected in 12 of the 15 campaign sites where the serosurvey was
213 conducted, including 6 with fewer than half of what was anticipated. The opposite occurred in Ndola
214 District, where 12 of the 15 campaign sites had more children vaccinated than expected, including four
215 with more than double what was anticipated. Overall, we observed approximately 35% fewer children and
216 22% more children vaccinated in Choma and Ndola districts, respectively, compared to expected based on
217 the information used in planning. This discordance in the number expected versus observed resulted in
218 shifts to the sampling interval to ensure we met the overall targets and distributed enrollments throughout
219 the SIA, without overburdening the survey staff on any given day.

220 **Fig 2. Ratio of number of children vaccinated to number expected by campaign site.**

221 Legend: Number of children expected to be vaccinated at a given campaign site was obtained from the
222 microplans with input from local research and health facility staff. Range for number of children expected
223 per site: Ndola District 99-2828; Choma District 110-2193. Range for number of children vaccinated per
224 site: Ndola District: 324-1924; Choma District: 158-1004.

225 **Sampling interval**

226 While we assumed the same number of children vaccinated per day for planning purposes, we observed
227 the volume of children varied day to day. Therefore, the sampling intervals were changed during the
228 campaign, ranging from every child to every 30th child, depending on the facility and day (S2 Fig). Nine
229 of the thirty facilities used the same sampling interval on all days. Five facilities began with a very high
230 sampling interval (e.g., every 20th child) then needed to reduce on subsequent days to increase the
231 numbers enrolled. Other facilities had less extreme but more frequent changes throughout the week. Each
232 evening after teams uploaded data and reported progress on WhatsApp, the central study team reviewed
233 and proposed changes to the sampling interval based on input from the supervisors and survey teams.
234 Changes were made based on how many children had been enrolled that day and reasons for differences
235 in observed enrollment compared to planned enrollment, expected attendance in the coming days at a

236 given SIA site, and study approved sample size and the by-site enrollment goals to avoid any issues with
237 considerable under or over-enrollment overall or at a given site and maintaining a balance between fixed
238 and outreach sites. Operational factors that affected observed enrollment included the number of
239 serosurvey staff relative to the volume of children; issues or events that impacted the volume of children
240 attending the SIA (e.g., weather, when routine immunization services are usually provided, visits by
241 dignitaries), or issues impacting ability of the serosurvey staff to conduct enrollment (e.g., lack of
242 transport, SIA site closed for the day or opened late, SIA site extending vaccination activities in Choma
243 District). Changes to the sampling interval were communicated to the site coordinators who disseminated
244 it to the survey staff, however due to the time required to review and propose changes the survey teams
245 typically were not notified of changes until the following morning as they were beginning that day's
246 work.

247 **Perceptions of the sampling interval**

248 During interviews survey staff described how they implemented the systematic sampling procedures.
249 Descriptions of how they communicated with caregivers about the sampling procedures included
250 mentioning the survey is conducted on a subset of the population representing others and that a system is
251 in place to select those children. Some referred to the process as based on 'luck' or being 'done
252 randomly', rather than systematic sampling. There were also a few deviations from standard practice
253 described in the interviews, such as skipping certain children who were sampled if the staff perceived that
254 the caregiver would refuse or would not be able to provide consent for the child (e.g., maid or
255 grandparent). Survey staff mentioned questions they received from caregivers related to selection, such as
256 why only one sibling was selected. One supervisor described below how explanations were provided.

257 *"We are just sampling, your child is representing part of the community around so it's not that we are*
258 *going to get blood from each and every child no, but what we are going to ...the results that we are going*
259 *to get from each child will have a representation of this same area or community" -T_SUPER_2*

260 Many staff noted challenges they faced during the survey due to the discrepancy between the volume of
261 children observed relative to what was expected and was used to inform the sampling interval. There was
262 mention of some outreach locations being overflowed and locations with low numbers on initial days
263 which ramped up as additional sensitization occurred. Changes to the sampling intervals made by the
264 central team led to confusion for the staff on the ground who needed to adapt procedures. It also led to
265 confusion for community members who learned about the survey and every nth child being selected from
266 a neighbor who attended Child Health Week on a prior day. One serosurvey staff member suggested
267 autonomy in terms of selecting the sampling interval based on the daily situation since it may change day
268 to day and even within a day. Despite these challenges, staff generally reported it was easy to meet their
269 enrollment targets.

270 **Facilitators and barriers to enrollment**

271 **Perceived benefits**

272 Survey staff used different ways to describe the value of the serosurvey and community-level benefits to
273 caregivers. Many highlighted how the findings will be valuable to the community, stating that the study
274 was being conducted to learn how children develop antibodies against measles and to ensure children in
275 that area are fully protected. Most only mentioned measles in their descriptions, but a handful also
276 mentioned rubella. Some noted how these findings would be used to guide future interventions, such as
277 repeating vaccinations, targeting certain areas with lower immunity or investigating if there were issues
278 with vaccine storage. Some staff members incorrectly described the serosurvey as informing development
279 of a stronger vaccine. The descriptions of community-level benefits were generally positive; however,
280 one staff member encountered a caregiver who was accepting of vaccines but began to question the
281 vaccine in response to how the benefits were described. As noted by one serosurvey data collector, “*We*

282 *want to see how efficient the vaccines are and see what the government can work on to ensure that the*
283 *children are fully vaccinated.” - TH_SERO_1*

284 In terms of individual-level benefits, staff discussed how caregivers appreciated the refreshments, and
285 masks to a lesser degree. Some staff mentioned that caregivers at the campaign site who were not selected
286 asked to participate to receive these incentives. Staff described how this led to frustration from caregivers
287 whose children were not selected to participate. Some staff mentioned they asked participants not to tell
288 others about the incentives to avoid issues and overcrowding. There were also concerns raised about the
289 incentives representing a payment for the blood leading to suspicions. One vaccinator described how the
290 benefits were well-received: *“When a child has recruited in the system there is a packet of sugar which is*
291 *given to appreciate the mother, I think that way it has really made the whole process very good and I*
292 *have seen even the mother goes out smiling.” - MH_Vac_1*

293 A common issue raised by participants was caregivers’ expectation to receive their child’s test
294 result. Staff reported explaining that test results will not be provided but the findings will be summarized
295 at the facility- and district-levels to benefit the broader community. One supervisor correctly highlighted
296 how the test results only reflect immunity from prior vaccinations and the child’s immunity will change
297 due to the vaccine they received during Child Health Week.

298 *“You know people when you are doing a test they expect a result, so they were asking: “when are we*
299 *getting the result?” but then when you explain that the result won’t really affect you, we want to see if the*
300 *injections that were given earlier on has built the immunity with the kid, this injection that they gave*
301 *today will only build immunity uhmmm weeks from now and it won’t change any... you know anything*
302 *with the child, the result is not necessary at this point. They accepted it.” -T_SUPER_1*

303 **Misconceptions and reasons for refusal**

304 Respondents cited several reasons why caregivers refused to participate in the serosurvey. For example,
305 some caregivers were concerned about pricking the child again after they had just received the vaccine or
306 reported a lack of time. There were also several misconceptions, mostly related to blood collection and
307 confusion about the survey and its purpose. These included concerns the survey staff were witches or
308 Satanists, and the blood was being used as a sacrifice for rituals. Staff believed that since the community
309 is familiar with finger prick blood collection for HIV and malaria testing, caregivers questioned if their
310 children were being selected for the serosurvey due to perceived illness of the child. One participant
311 reported that finger/ thumb printing the consent form, used in place of a signature for illiterate caregivers,
312 was a cult initiation. The survey was also mistakenly linked to a political party due to community
313 members misinterpreting a label on supplies. Staff revealed that these misconceptions were spread by
314 caregivers who attended the SIA then misinformed other community members, as a result, some potential
315 participants refused to participate. As described by a serosurvey data collector, community members were
316 also concerned that the blood was being tested for COVID-19.

317 *“And went to explain to the other mothers that the blood they are collecting on those cards is for Covid*
318 *so because of that, the community hearing about Covid they all shunned away saying you want to test us*
319 *for Covid.” - TL-SERRO-1*

320 **Interpersonal influences**

321 Staff also discussed how male partner involvement could be a motivator if the partner was supportive, or
322 a barrier if mothers could not agree to participate in the survey without permission from their
323 husbands. One participant described a situation where a mother enrolled a child in the serosurvey without
324 consent from her husband, and he chased her from their home. Participants noted that sensitizing the
325 community well in advance of the serosurvey would have allowed women time to consult with their
326 husbands prior to the SIA.

327

328 **Implementation of the serosurvey**

329 **Supervision and logistics**

330 The vaccination and survey staff felt that the survey was well organized. There was a supervisor at each
331 site on the first day; and daily supervision at fixed and outreach sites was facilitated by supervisors having
332 designated vehicles. There was also constant communication through the phone to answer any questions
333 from the teams. The supervisors were also in constant communication with study principal investigators
334 (PIs) and central laboratory teams, providing brief daily updates on each site. Summary reports were
335 prepared by the central team to rapidly review data and provide feedback (S1 Appendix). Study staff
336 mentioned there were no stock outs of study supplies, and there was efficient specimen transportation to
337 the central laboratory.

338 Although the respondents felt the survey was a success there were a few challenges. For instance, some
339 outreach sites did not have shelter in case of rain. There were a few difficulties in collecting blood and this
340 led to having to do a second prick, children running away, fighting, fidgeting, crying, or having small
341 fingers.

342 **Coordination**

343 Generally, the vaccination and serosurvey staff described working well together throughout the campaign,
344 often mentioning that they worked “hand in hand”. A couple of staff members mentioned some
345 difficulties on the first day due to logistical issues but were able to smooth these out thereafter. There
346 were also some limitations noted by staff who were involved in vaccination. They explained that they
347 learned of the survey when it was too close to implementation date, therefore they were denied an
348 opportunity to participate in the planning meetings. A few vaccination staff felt that there was more work
349 to be done during the current child health week compared to the past ones.

350 Overall, respondents agreed that nesting the serosurvey in the child health week was a
351 success. Coordination between the vaccination and serosurvey staff was commonly mentioned by both as
352 key to that success. Recruiting children attending the campaign was viewed as a good entry point, since
353 other services are often provided there, and no detrimental effects on the vaccination campaign were
354 mentioned. They also pointed to mothers' willingness to bring and enroll their children, demonstrating the
355 success of the program. One vaccinator mentioned there was no negative effect:

356 *"I: what effect do you think the serosurvey had on vaccination campaign?"*

357 *R: "...there was no any negative effect at all, all was excellent, the whole process the whole program is*
358 *excellent" -MH_Vac_1*

359 Discussion

360 We successfully integrated a serosurvey into Child Health Week, enrolling 82% of children invited to
361 participate. As highlighted by the qualitative interviews, much of the success was attributable to close
362 coordination and teamwork between the vaccination teams and serosurvey teams. This began during the
363 planning phase by working with the district health offices in the two districts and health facilities staff.
364 Engaging local staff for the serosurvey who were already familiar with the community facilitated close
365 coordination for implementation. We believe this heavy level of involvement of the Ministry of Health
366 allowed for smooth integration of a research project into service delivery and should be the standard for
367 research using a programmatic platform. In this paper we summarized the lessons learned of collecting
368 dried blood spots from children attending an integrated Child Health Week based on the qualitative
369 interviews (Table 1).

370 Table 1. Key findings and lessons learned on implementation

SIAAs can serve as a platform to integrate research activities including serosurveys.

Engagement with district health staff was essential to facilitate links with health facilities.
Coordination between survey staff, mostly local nurses, and SIA vaccinators was key to recruiting and enrolling children.
Sensitization about the survey should be more closely tied to campaign sensitization efforts and start early.
Misinformation was the primary driver of refusal to participate. For this survey it was typically misinformation related to blood collection; therefore, clearer messaging about what will be done with the blood collected is needed.
The number of children seeking vaccination at sites frequently differed substantially from target numbers from the microplans.
Daily sampling interval adjustment was necessary to maintain a representative sample across the SIA. Having survey staff determine the sampling interval may enable more efficient and effective adjustment throughout the week.

371

372 Another key aspect was to ensure sufficient social mobilization not only for the vaccination campaign to
373 ensure children attend, but also for the blood collection. Because one of the biggest concerns for
374 collection of blood during the campaign was that it had the potential to negatively impact the campaign,
375 blood was collected after the child had already received their vaccine and misconceptions and refusals
376 were closely tracked. There were no reports of parents refusing to vaccinate their children because blood
377 might be collected from them. According to the post-campaign coverage survey, vaccination coverage for
378 the campaign in Copperbelt Province, where Ndola District is located, was 79%, higher than the national
379 coverage of 68%. Southern Province, where Choma District is located, was comparable to the national
380 average (65%) (15).

381 While there were misconceptions about the reasons for blood collection, staff believed these could be
382 overcome with dissemination of more information. The reasons for confusion about blood collection

383 could have been due to incorrect explanations provided by staff. The concept that blood being taken
384 during the campaign would provide seroprevalence estimates from before vaccination seemed difficult to
385 explain, with only one data collector providing a correct interpretation. Additionally, the concerns about
386 COVID testing could have resulted from the questionnaire asking about COVID vaccine acceptance (16).
387 It was recommended that social mobilization for the survey be done far in advance, include all staff at the
388 health facility rather than just those involved in the research, and be paired with mobilization about the
389 campaign. Combined messaging of the research with the campaign could capitalize on social mobilization
390 resources and avoid confusion in the community about separate planned activities occurring
391 simultaneously.

392 Although it created logistical challenges, changing the sampling interval allowed us to enroll across all 6
393 days of the campaign and throughout the entire day. We relied on the district microplans for a baseline
394 estimate of the number of children to be vaccinated at each survey location. In our experience, accuracy
395 of the microplans varied by health facility, as we observed both over- and underestimates. Issues with
396 microplans have been demonstrated for other campaigns in other settings (17). Earlier and more frequent
397 engagement with the district health staff involved in planning the SIA may have helped to provide
398 additional clarity on the microplans.

399 Although estimates from the microplans were used to inform initial sampling intervals, survey
400 coordinators and staff worked closely during the week to adjust the sampling interval based on observed
401 SIA volume and community settings (e.g., weather, weekly RI). However, this required survey staff to
402 quickly modify their sampling procedures each day, which was confusing for staff and led to some
403 situations where the changes were not implemented correctly or not at all. In a few situations the survey
404 staff hit their maximum by midday, so afternoon SIA attendees were excluded from sampling, or the bulk
405 of children enrolled at a site were from the first few days of the SIA. In the future we recommend local
406 survey staff have more ownership over sampling intervals, with guidance for when and how to adjust the
407 sampling interval and feedback loops to the survey coordinators.

408 Some of the limitations of this analysis are that we interviewed serosurvey and vaccination campaign
409 staff, but we did not directly interview caregivers about the reasons for their refusals. Refusals,
410 particularly at certain sites in Choma District, may have impacted representativeness of our study
411 population. We acknowledge that high enrollment in the serosurvey may be due to targeting a health
412 seeking population bringing their children for a health campaign. Therefore, results obtained from this
413 sampling design may not be generalizable to participants who do not attend health campaigns. While we
414 did not find evidence of the blood collection affecting vaccination campaign uptake, there was lower
415 vaccination coverage for the 2020 November SIA compared to 2016. However, this was seen nationally
416 and believed to be due to the COVID-19 pandemic (15).

417 Because this was the first experience conducting a serosurvey during a vaccination campaign, it was
418 important to evaluate the implementation. Using a program evaluation perspective, we were able to
419 ascertain the successes, challenges, and lessons learned of collecting dried blood spots from children
420 attending an integrated Child Health Week (Table 1). We believe this platform provides an opportunity to
421 integrate other services and research questions amongst children attending the campaign and can be
422 implemented without disrupting vaccination efforts.

423

424

425

426

427 **Acknowledgments**

428 We would like to acknowledge all the children and their parents who agreed to take part in this study. We
429 would also like to acknowledge the Ministry of Health and all the serosurvey staff, vaccinators, nurse in-
430 charges, and district health staff who contributed to the successful implementation of the project. Finally,
431 we acknowledge Monica Pilewskie for her support coding the transcripts from the interviews.

432 **Data availability**

433 The individual survey data were collected under data sharing agreements from Zambia Ministry of Health
434 and the Zambia National Health Research Authority. As per the Zambia Health Research Act, access to
435 data requires approval from the Zambian National Health Regulatory Authority. To obtain this access,
436 please contact Dr Victor Chalwe, Acting Director of the Zambia National Health Research Authority
437 (victor.chalwe@nhra.org.zm).

438

439 Reference

- 440 1. Wilson SE, Deeks SL, Hatchette TF, Crowcroft NS. The role of seroepidemiology in the
441 comprehensive surveillance of vaccine-preventable diseases. *CMAJ*. 2012;184(1):E70-6.
- 442 2. Winter AK, Martinez ME, Cutts FT, Moss WJ, Ferrari MJ, McKee A, et al. Benefits and Challenges
443 in Using Seroprevalence Data to Inform Models for Measles and Rubella Elimination. *J Infect Dis*.
444 2018;218(3):355-64.
- 445 3. Ariyarajah A, Crowcroft NS. Measles Serosurveys: A Solution in Search of the Right Problem.
446 *Front Public Health*. 2021;9:539325.
- 447 4. Travassos MA, Beyene B, Adam Z, Campbell JD, Mulholland N, Diarra SS, et al. Strategies for
448 Coordination of a Serosurvey in Parallel with an Immunization Coverage Survey. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*.
449 2015;93(2):416-24.
- 450 5. MacNeil A, Lee CW, Dietz V. Issues and considerations in the use of serologic biomarkers for
451 classifying vaccination history in household surveys. *Vaccine*. 2014;32(39):4893-900.
- 452 6. Metcalf CJ, Farrar J, Cutts FT, Basta NE, Graham AL, Lessler J, et al. Use of serological surveys to
453 generate key insights into the changing global landscape of infectious disease. *Lancet*.
454 2016;388(10045):728-30.
- 455 7. Carcelen AC, Hayford K, Moss WJ, Book C, Thuma PE, Mwansa FD, et al. How much does it cost
456 to measure immunity? A costing analysis of a measles and rubella serosurvey in southern Zambia. *PLoS*
457 *One*. 2020;15(10):e0240734.
- 458 8. Hasan AZ, Kumar MS, Prospero C, Thangaraj JWV, Sabarinathan R, Saravanakumar V, et al.
459 Implementing serosurveys in India: experiences, lessons learned, and recommendations. *Am J Trop Med*
460 *Hyg*. 2021;105(6):1608-17.
- 461 9. World Health Organization. World Health Organization vaccination coverage cluster surveys:
462 reference manual. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018.
- 463 10. Halwindi H, Magnussen P, Meyrowitsch D, Handema R, Siziya S, Olsen A. Effect on treatment
464 coverage of adding community-directed treatment to the health facility-based approach of delivering
465 anthelmintic drugs to under-five children during child health week in Mazabuka District, Zambia. *Int*
466 *Health*. 2010;2(4):253-61.
- 467 11. Fiedler JL, Mubanga F, Siamusantu W, Musonda M, Kabwe KF, Zulu C. Child Health Week in
468 Zambia: costs, efficiency, coverage and a reassessment of need. *Health Policy Plan*. 2014;29(1):12-29.
- 469 12. Prospero C, Truelove S, Carcelen A, Chongwe G, Mwansa FD, Ndubani P, et al. High measles and
470 rubella vaccine coverage and seroprevalence among Zambian children participating in a measles and
471 rubella supplementary immunization activity. Unpublished.

- 472 13. Carcelen AC, Limaye RJ, Mutembo S, Hamahuwa M, Thuma PE, Moss WJ, et al. Acceptability of
473 serosurveys in southern Zambia: data collector and caregiver perspectives. *Discov Soc Sci Health*.
474 2023;3(1):3.
- 475 14. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, et al. Process evaluation of
476 complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. 2015;350:h1258.
- 477 15. Yang Y, Kostandova N, Mwansa FD, Nakazwe C, Namukoko H, Sakala C, et al. Challenges
478 Addressing Inequalities in Measles Vaccine Coverage in Zambia through a Measles-Rubella
479 Supplementary Immunization Activity during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2023;11(3).
- 480 16. Carcelen AC, Prospero C, Mutembo S, Chongwe G, Mwansa FD, Ndubani P, et al. COVID-19
481 vaccine hesitancy in Zambia: a glimpse at the possible challenges ahead for COVID-19 vaccination rollout
482 in sub-Saharan Africa. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*. 2022;18(1):1-6.
- 483 17. Camber Collective, Task Force for Global Health. Promising Practices in Health Campaign
484 Microplanning. 2020.

485

486

487 **Supporting information captions**

488 **S1 Table. Characteristics of staff participating in qualitative interviews.** In recruitment of
489 participants, we tried to ensure a mix of fixed and outreach vaccination sites were represented, no overlap
490 in team members (both team members from the same study team not included) and included study team
491 staff and vaccination campaign team staff working at the same health facility.

492 **S1 Fig. Number of children enrolled by campaign day and site**

493 **S2 Fig. Sampling interval by campaign day and site.** Data on the sampling interval was missing at
494 some timepoints.

495 **S1 Appendix. Supplemental methods**

496

497




Figure 1




Figure 2