

1 **Using a Quality Improvement Approach to improve reporting of malaria deaths in**
2 **Namutumba District, Eastern Uganda, 2022–2023**

3 Marie Gorreti Zalwango^{1*}, Richard Migisha¹, Benon Kwesiga¹, Lilian Bulage¹, Daniel Kadobera¹,
4 Alex Riolexus Ario¹

5 **Institutional Affiliation:** ¹Uganda Public Health Fellowship Program, Uganda National Institute
6 of Public Health, Kampala, Uganda

7 ***Correspondence:** Tel: +256752610802, Email: gzalwango@uniph.go.ug

8 **Abstract**

9 **Background**

10 Reporting malaria deaths is critical for assessing prevention and case management
11 interventions. In Uganda, malaria mortality is recorded in inpatient registers and reported
12 through weekly and monthly surveillance reports. During a data quality assessment in
13 Namutumba District in October 2022, we found more malaria deaths in health facility registers
14 than were reported. We conducted a continuous quality improvement initiative to improve the
15 accuracy of reported malaria deaths in Namutumba District.

16 **Methods:** We purposively selected 2 high-level health centers (HC) in Namutumba District that
17 reported malaria deaths during September 2021–October 2022. We formed quality
18 improvement teams (QIT) comprising clinical and statistical staff at the HC. We held focus group
19 discussions with QITs to identify challenges with reporting malaria deaths, prioritized areas for
20 improvement, and conducted root cause analysis. Using the plan, do, study, act (PDSA) cycle,
21 we identified change ideas to address root causes.

22 **Interventions:** Challenges included knowledge gaps on malaria death definitions, lack of
23 consequences for failing to document deaths, and unclear guidance on how to document
24 deaths. Sustainable interventions identified included continuous medical education on malaria
25 death definition, one-on-one mentorship of staff on documentation in inpatient registers, and
26 weekly verification of inpatient register data, all implemented during November 2022–February
27 2023.

28 **Results:** Of the 36 malaria deaths that occurred during the baseline period (September 2021–
29 October 2022), 25 (69%) were included in the weekly report, and four (11%) in the monthly
30 report. Following the intervention implementation, all 7 malaria deaths recorded at the 2
31 health facilities during November 2022–February 2023 were reported in the weekly and
32 monthly reports.

33 **Conclusion:** Continuous medical education, supervision and mentoring of HC staff, and clear
34 and comprehensive guidance on documenting malaria deaths could facilitate improved malaria
35 death reporting from HC in Uganda, enabling more accurate resource allocation for malaria
36 control.

37 **Keywords:** Malaria deaths, Malaria, Quality improvement, Reporting, Namutumba, Uganda

38

39 Introduction

40 Malaria is one of the leading causes of mortality globally, responsible for 608,000 deaths in
41 2022. The vast majority (96%) of the reported deaths occur in 29 sub-Saharan Africa countries
42 Uganda inclusive. Uganda ranks eighth globally among countries with the highest burden of
43 malaria deaths. It causes 20-30 deaths weekly and around 1,300 annually, as per the Uganda
44 Health Management Information System (HMIS) [1]. Due to challenges in reporting malaria
45 deaths, the HMIS-reported numbers have been adjusted for underreporting, resulting in an
46 estimated 19,600 deaths annually, according to the World Malaria Report [2].

47 Based on findings from a community study conducted in Namutumba District, several
48 community malaria deaths were documented at health facilities but not recorded in the health
49 information system due to deaths occurring before reaching high-level facilities [3].
50 Subsequently, we conducted a data quality assessment (DQA) from September 2021 to October
51 2022 with the aim of determining the accuracy of health facility malaria deaths data. By
52 comparing registers and client cards to surveillance reports (HMIS 033b and HMIS 108) through
53 the District Health Information System version 2 (DHIS2), the DQA revealed a discrepancy. Out
54 of 36 malaria deaths recorded, 25 (69%) were included in the weekly report, and 4 (11%) in the
55 monthly report, indicating an inconsistency in reporting between registers and surveillance
56 reports.

57 The low reporting of actual numbers of malaria as the cause of deaths due to various challenges
58 contribute to underestimation of the true magnitude of malaria deaths. Without accurate
59 reporting of malaria mortality data at the district and national levels, planning for effective
60 interventions to prevent malaria deaths remains insufficient, posing a challenge to the goal of
61 malaria eradication by 2030. This initiative focused on improving the accuracy of reported
62 malaria deaths in selected health facilities in Namutumba District during September 2021–
63 October 2022, to provide a case study for improvement in other health facilities and districts in
64 Uganda.

65

66 Methods

67 Project implementation setting

68 We conducted the quality improvement project in Namutumba District based on the previous
69 low number of malaria deaths reported as per findings from the DQA. Namutumba District is
70 located in the eastern part of Uganda, a region highly endemic for malaria [4, 5]. The district is
71 made up of 2 constituencies and 20 sub-counties and has a total population of approximately
72 320,000 people. The population is served by 2 private hospitals, 1 public health center (HC) IV,
73 seven HC IIIs, and 25 HC IIs [6]. However, due to the low economic status of the residents in the
74 district, majority of the patients utilize services at the HC IV which serves as the district referral
75 health unit beyond which patients are referred to higher facilities outside the district for further
76 management. We conducted the project in two high-level HCs in Namutumba District because

77 of their high capacity for severe malaria admissions and the high likelihood for malaria deaths.
78 These were Namutumba HC III and Nsinze HC IV.

79 **Project implementation design**

80 The quality improvement model used for our project focuses on 3 fundamental questions.
81 What are we trying to accomplish? How will we know if a change is an improvement? and what
82 changes can we make that will result in an improvement? Building on this information, we
83 rejuvenated the Quality Improvement Team(QIT) for the selected facilities. This step was
84 followed by collection of baseline data and we supported the teams to identify their problems
85 and define their improvement objective. We further identified measures and changes to be
86 made for improvement and implemented them using the Plan Do Study Act (PDSA) model.

87 **Continuous quality improvement team formation**

88 We reconstituted the QIT at each facility to coordinate the implementation of project activities.
89 The teams constituted included the malaria focal person, in-charge, health facility QI focal
90 person, records assistant, and two clinicians at the outpatient clinic and inpatient ward. The
91 roles of the QIT were as follows: 1) Team lead – responsible for assigning roles and adding a
92 voice where it was required. Members on the project were asked to appoint their own leader
93 and change when need arise. 2) Mentor – responsible for guiding the team in carrying out
94 certain roles, and provided mentorship to the team members. 3) Data person – responsible for
95 data collection and analysis of the collected data. 4) Support personnel – provided information
96 or any additional assistance required to conduct the project.

97 **Baseline data collection**

98 We analyzed health facility data for Nsinze HC IV and Namutumba HC III for the period of
99 September 2021 to October 2022 to serve as our baseline for malaria deaths reporting. This
100 involved review of the HMIS data for the HMIS 033b weekly surveillance report and the HMIS
101 105 monthly report, review of client cards for all admitted patients, review of the inpatient
102 register and the outpatient register for cases that might have died before admission. This
103 information helped the team to identify gaps in data capture and reporting. Using a score of 0-5
104 on the spider graph (5 being the highest ranking), the identified gaps were prioritized for
105 problem analysis.

106 **Process mapping and gap identification**

107 We reviewed the process of data capture in the primary data tools, data collection and data
108 entry into the electronic HMIS system through focus group discussions with the facility teams.
109 This was done to identify the step in the process with the most challenges affecting reporting
110 for malaria deaths. Using the spider graph, gaps under each step of the process were charted
111 for prioritization of the step with the most gaps.

112 **Problem analysis and root cause identification**

113 Following prioritization of the problem, the QIT did problem analysis for the identified gaps to
114 identify the root causes for low reporting for malaria deaths using the ‘five whys’ technique. For

115 each of the problems, the team exhausted the possible causes until when the root cause was
116 reached. These findings were displayed using a fish bone diagram.

117 **Goal refinement and change idea identification**

118 Following problem identification, the QIT refined the goal for the project which was a clear
119 statement of the intended improvement and how it would be measured. The goal had the
120 following attributes: specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time bound. The QIT
121 proposed changes/interventions to the identified problems. Teams identified the different
122 change ideas that would bring about the desired change. These change ideas were organized
123 into groups, each of which represents a similar notion or approach to change, or change
124 concept. We then ranked the proposed changes.

125 **Intervention tools**

126 Based on the proposed changes, we identified tools required to implement the suggested
127 changes. We focused on tools that were cheap and readily available to ensure sustainability of
128 the project.

129 **Intervention monitoring and evaluation**

130 We used the PDSA cycles to plan and test the identified interventions. Through the weekly and
131 monthly data collection, analysis and interpretation, the team was able to assess each
132 implemented intervention for a positive change. The plan was to maintain interventions that
133 improved reporting for malaria deaths, while interventions that did not cause change were
134 dropped. The final evaluation was done in March 2023 to ascertain whether there was an
135 improvement in the reporting rates of malaria deaths.

136 **Ethical considerations**

137 We obtained administrative clearance from Namutumba District Health Office and the health
138 facility in charges for the selected health facilities. We further obtained verbal consent from the
139 health facility staff that participated in the focus group discussions to generate existing gaps
140 and required change ideas for improvement. Additional data was obtained from routinely
141 collected malaria surveillance data in the health facility registers and the DHIS2 that is publicly
142 available for analysis and use to inform public health interventions. The data was aggregated
143 with no individual identifiers. This activity was reviewed by US Centers for Disease Control and
144 Prevention (CDC) and was conducted consistent with applicable federal law and CDC
145 policy. § See e.g., 45 C.F.R. part 46, 21 C.F.R. part 56; 42 U.S.C. §241(d); 5 U.S.C. §552a; 44
146 U.S.C. §3501 et seq. This determination was made because the project aimed to address a
147 public health problem and had the primary intent of public health practice.

148
149

150 RESULTS

151 Baseline findings

152 During the baseline period reviewed, Namutumba HC III recorded 4 malaria deaths. Only 50%
153 (2/4) of the confirmed malaria deaths were reported in the monthly HMIS 108 report while
154 100% (4/4) were reported in the weekly surveillance report. For Nsinze HC IV, 32 malaria deaths
155 were recorded in the period of September 2021-October 2022. Findings from the baseline data
156 collection revealed that only 19% (6/32) confirmed malaria deaths were reported as in the
157 monthly surveillance report while 81% (26/32) were reported in the weekly surveillance
158 reports. We noted that HMIS 033b was collected from both out-patient and in-patient registers
159 while the HMIS 108 report was collected from only the in-patient register for both health
160 facilities as opposed to utilization of the inpatient register as the official data source for malaria
161 mortality.

162

163 Process mapping and gap identification

164 Following review of the reporting system for malaria deaths, gaps were identified at the steps
165 of data entry in the primary registers and data compilation from the registers. Other steps like
166 data entry on hard copy reports and entry of data in the electronic HMIS had no gaps identified
167 (Figure 1). This informed our choice to focus on data entry into the inpatient register for root
168 cause analysis since this is the primary source document for malaria deaths data.

169

170 Root causes affecting entry of malaria deaths data in the in-patient registers for Namutumba 171 District, September 2021–October 2022

172 As depicted in figure 2 below, the root cause of failure to enter malaria death data included:

173 **Lack of continuous medical education on malaria deaths definition and documentation:** Insufficient
174 continuous medical education (CMEs) on the definition and documentation of malaria deaths led to
175 health workers documenting complications rather than malaria as the cause of death in primary
176 registers, despite malaria being the primary diagnosis. The knowledge gap resulting from the lack of
177 CMEs contributed to low documentation and reporting of malaria deaths.

178 **Absence of consequences for non-reporting of malaria deaths:** The absence of consequences
179 for non-reporting of malaria deaths led to reluctance among health workers to document such
180 deaths, as it involved additional paperwork, including filling out medical certificates of cause of
181 death and entering data into the DHIS2.

182 **Limited supervision and monitoring performance:** Limited supervision and monitoring
183 performance of health workers contributed to staff reluctance in accurately documenting and
184 reporting malaria deaths.

185 **Unclear guidance on malaria death documentation:** Severe malaria deaths are expected to be
186 recorded in the in-patient register; however, deaths occurring at health facility gates,
187 outpatient department, and on the facility premises after referral were often not documented

188 or recorded in the outpatient register. This inconsistency resulted in discrepancies between
189 weekly and monthly reports, as the monthly report relies on both inpatient and outpatient
190 registers. Similar challenges arose for deaths occurring on the way to the health facility or at
191 home, as there was no clear guidance on documenting such deaths happening outside the
192 inpatient wards and in the community.

193 Following the brainstorming exercise, a range of change interventions were identified for
194 improving reporting of malaria death data. These included:

- 195 a) Conducting regular CMEs on malaria death definition, recording, and reporting
- 196 b) Conducting CMEs to guide on the documentation of death on arrival and after referral
- 197 c) Conducting one on one mentorship on malaria deaths documentation
- 198 d) Establishment of focal persons to ensure timely update of malaria deaths in the IPD
199 register
- 200 e) Conducting weekly malaria death data reviews
- 201 f) Strengthening the system of support supervision and monitoring

202 The change interventions were then turned into activities with clear indicators and means of
203 verification and responsible persons identified for each activity (Table 1)

Table 1. Quality improvement interventions and indicators

Intervention	Activity Description	Responsible Person	Indicator	Means of verification
Conducting regular CMEs on malaria death definition, recording, and reporting	Bi-monthly CMEs on malaria deaths definition, documentation and reporting. Using a CME schedule, notification was made to all health facility team by in charges to ensure attendance.	Clinician responsible for CMEs	Proportion of health facility staff with knowledge of malaria death definition, recording, and reporting	Inpatient register
Conducting CMEs to guide on the documentation of death on arrival and after referral	The QIT discussed and agreed on the best way to document malaria death on arrival and after referral. Since there was no clear guidance, the team agreed that malaria deaths on arrival with positive malaria results and those dying in the resuscitation room would be documented in a special way in the inpatient register clearly indicating the place of deaths in the comment section. Patients dying on the health facility premises following referral would have their outcome changed from referred to Died and captured as a health facility death. These resolutions were provided to the rest of the team during the bi-weekly CMEs to ensure implementation by every staff member.	Clinician responsible for CMEs	Proportion of malaria deaths at the facility documented in the inpatient register.	Inpatient register

Conducting one on one mentorship on malaria deaths documentation	Mentorship of clinicians (medical officers, nurses and midwives) and medical records staff on required data parameters for malaria deaths documentation	Clinician responsible for CMEs	% of health workers with competency to document malaria deaths completely and accurately	Inpatient register
Establishment of focal persons to ensure timely update of malaria deaths in the IPD register	Assigned focal persons reviewed the registers after recording a death to ensure completeness and accurateness of documentation	Malaria Focal Person	Proportion of malaria deaths at the facility documented completely and accurately in the inpatient register.	Inpatient register
Conducting weekly malaria death data reviews	Weekly review of inpatient client cards and Outpatient registers to ensure that all malaria deaths were documented in the inpatient register.	Quality Improvement Team	Proportion of malaria deaths at the facility documented in the inpatient register.	Inpatient register
Strengthening the system of support supervision and monitoring	Weekly review of the inpatient registers to ensure that all malaria deaths recorded have medical certificates of cause of death filled and filed	Health Facility In charges	% malaria deaths reported in HMIS033b	HMIS 033b report Inpatient register

205

206

207

208

209

210 **Final evaluation of the quality improvement project**

211 Following implementation of QI project in Namutumba District, there was an improvement in
212 the reporting of malaria deaths from 69% for the weekly report and 11% for the monthly report
213 to 100% during the period of November 2022 to March 2023 with all the seven malaria deaths
214 recorded and reported in the weekly and monthly reports. All the seven malaria deaths that
215 happened in the health facilities were appropriately documented in the primary source
216 document (inpatient register) and reported in the weekly surveillance and monthly reports for
217 all the 5 months of project implementation.

218

219 **Discussion**

220 The project identified gaps and challenges in reporting malaria deaths, leading to low rates in
221 both weekly and monthly surveillance reports. Contributing factors included the absence of
222 Continuous Medical Education (CME) on malaria deaths, limited supervision, lack of
223 consequences for non-reporting, and unclear guidance on documenting deaths in specific
224 scenarios. After implementing proposed changes, there was an improvement in reporting
225 malaria deaths, enhancing data quality at health facility, district, and national levels. This
226 improvement could positively impact planning efforts by various stakeholders.

227 The study revealed a knowledge gap among health workers regarding the definition of malaria
228 death due to the lack of CME on this topic. This knowledge gap resulted in misclassification and
229 the subsequent underestimation of the burden of malaria deaths. According to the district
230 health information system version 2 (DHIS2), a malaria death is defined as any death with a
231 positive malaria test in a reporting health facility or community [7, 8]. Severe malaria that
232 causes deaths presents with numerous complications like anaemia, respiratory failure, impaired
233 consciousness and renal failure [9]. This complexity contributes to potential misclassification,
234 particularly in the presence of a knowledge gap on the case definition of malaria death. Similar
235 challenges have been observed in India, where a study highlighted the difficulty in defining and
236 recording malaria deaths, because individuals with malaria may also suffer from other illnesses
237 concurrently or in quick succession [10]. Regular CMEs are essential to ensure that all attending
238 clinicians comprehend the accurate case definition for malaria deaths, facilitating accurate
239 documentation and reporting.

240 Our study highlighted the lack of clear guidance on the documentation of malaria deaths upon
241 arrival at the facility and deaths at the health facility premises after referral. As data on malaria
242 deaths is extracted from the inpatient register (HMIS 075) and reported in the HMIS 108 report
243 (Inpatient report), cases that do not reach the inpatient unit are often missed. Deaths on arrival
244 might be recorded in the outpatient registers and included in the weekly surveillance report
245 from the outpatient register, leading to inconsistencies between the HMIS 033b and HMIS 108
246 reports. The US Presidential Malaria Initiative (PMI), Roll Back Malaria (RBM) and Measure
247 Evaluation have provided guidance for Evaluating the Impact of National Malaria Control

248 Programs in Highly Endemic Countries. They highlight challenges in malaria-specific mortality
249 surveillance and recommend using multiple data sources to compliment limitation from each
250 method. Recommended sources in addition to the health information system include use of
251 verbal autopsies, health and demographic surveillance systems (HDSS), civil registration and
252 vital statistics systems and lastly the use of all child mortality as an impact indicator [11].

253 The study further revealed unclear guidance on documentation and recording of community
254 malaria deaths. According to the NMCD, community/village health teams (VHTs) should follow
255 up cases at home to ensure treatment compliance and recovery and to report any deaths due
256 to malaria at home[7]. VHTs are required to report their data to health facilities quarterly;
257 however, very few of them do report citing numerous challenges, including lack of transport,
258 since in Uganda they are volunteers with no pay and with little supervision[12-14]. Scholars
259 from other countries have suggested monetary facilitation and supervision to ensure they
260 execute their roles[12, 15]. Moreover, the quarterly reporting system lacks timeliness for
261 informing interventions. As such, exploring more frequent reporting mechanisms could
262 enhance the capture of accurate and up-to-date information. Establishing clear guidance on the
263 optimal reporting of community malaria deaths and issuing an official memo to all districts on
264 this matter could ensure that reported malaria death numbers accurately reflect the burden of
265 malaria deaths, and facilitating effective planning.

266 Our study revealed staff reluctance to document malaria deaths due to the additional workload
267 involved in reporting, such as completing the medical certificate of cause of death. In a study to
268 evaluate the impact of system failures on health workers, researchers noted that a failure in the
269 complex system health workers work from causes physical and emotional burnout which may
270 manifests as decreased production and lack of motivation. A system approach to existing
271 challenges affecting health workers was proposed for improved performance[16]. Similarly, in
272 our setting, addressing workload challenges by encouraging teamwork coupled with enhanced
273 supervision and mentorship, could improve health worker productivity and ensure accurate
274 reporting for effective planning of required interventions

275 **Study limitations**

276 Our study faced limitations regarding the timely reporting of community malaria deaths due to
277 a lack of guidance from the Ministry of Health on capturing these data at health facilities on a
278 weekly and monthly basis. This limitation could have led to an underestimation of malaria
279 deaths in Namutumba District. However, we minimized this limitation by strengthening the
280 documentation of all malaria deaths occurring on arrival and immediately after referral from
281 the health facility.

282

283

284

285 **Conclusion**

286 There was improvement in malaria mortality reporting attributed to continuous medical
287 education, supervision and monitoring performance of health facility staff, clear and
288 comprehensive guidance on documentation of malaria deaths and weekly data reviews.
289 Ensuring regular CMEs, data review, support supervision, and comprehensive guidance on
290 documenting malaria deaths could enhance reporting, aiding planning, and reinforcing efforts
291 to achieve the malaria eradication target by 2030.

292

293 **List of Abbreviations**

294 **CQI**: Continuous Quality Improvement; **DHI**: Division for Health Information; **DHIS2**: District
295 Health Information System 2; **DHT**: District Health Team; **HMIS**: Health Management
296 Information System; **IPD**: In-patient Department; **MOH**: Ministry of Health; **NMCD**: National
297 Malaria Control Division; **OPD**: Out-patient Department; **PDSA**: Plan Do Study Act; **VHT**: Village
298 Health Team

299 **Declarations**

300 **Availability of data and materials**

301 The datasets upon which our findings are based belong to the Uganda Public Health Fellowship
302 Program. For confidentiality reasons the datasets are not publicly available. However, the data
303 sets can be availed upon reasonable request from the corresponding author and with
304 permission from the Uganda Public Health Fellowship Program.

305 **Conflict of Interest**

306 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

307 **Consent for publication**

308 Not applicable.

309 **Funding and Disclaimer**

310 This project was supported by the United States Agency for International Development
311 (USAID)/President's Malaria Initiative (PMI) through the US Centers for Disease Control and
312 Prevention Cooperative Agreement number GH001353 through Makerere University School of
313 Public Health. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily
314 represent the official views of the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the
315 Department of Health and Human Services, Makerere University School of Public Health, or the
316 MoH. The staff of the funding body provided technical guidance in the design of the study,
317 ethical clearance and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, and in writing the
318 manuscript.

319

320 Authors contribution

321 GMZ collected data under technical guidance and supervision of RM, BK, DK, LB and ARA. GMZ
322 analyzed and interpreted the data. GMZ drafted the manuscript. GMZ, RM, LB, ARA, critically
323 reviewed the manuscript for intellectual content. All co-authors read and approved the final
324 manuscript. GMZ is the guarantor of the paper.


325 Acknowledgements

326 We appreciate the Nsinze HC IV and Namutumba HC III health facility staff for their active
327 participation and implementation of the project. More appreciation to the Namutumba District
328 health Office for their leadership and guidance most especially the District Malaria Focal
329 Person.

330 References

- 331 1. National Malaria Control Program, M.o.H.U., *Weekly Malaria Reports*. 2022: Ministry of Health
332 Uganda - Knowledge management Portal.
- 333 2. Organisation, W.H., *World Malaria Report 2022*. 2022: Geneva.
- 334 3. Zalwango, M.G., *Risk factors for death among children with severe malaria in Namutumba*
335 *District, Uganda, September 2021-February 2022*. Uganda National Institute of Public Health
336 Bulletin, 2022. **7**(4).
- 337 4. Kigozi, S.P., et al., *Spatial-temporal patterns of malaria incidence in Uganda using HMIS data*
338 *from 2015 to 2019*. BMC public health, 2020. **20**(1): p. 1-14.
- 339 5. Mpimbaza, A., et al., *Adherence to malaria management guidelines by health care workers in the*
340 *Busoga sub-region, eastern Uganda*. Malaria Journal, 2022. **21**(1): p. 1-15.
- 341 6. Namutumba District Local Government, U. *Namutumba District*. 2022; Available from:
342 <https://namutumba.go.ug/lg/district-location-and-its-neighbors>.
- 343 7. National Malaria Control Program, M.o.H.U., *Guidelines for Prevention, Preparedness and*
344 *Response for Malaria Epidemics*. 2019. p. 19-20.
- 345 8. National Malaria Control Program, M.o.H.U., *THE UGANDA MALARIA REDUCTION AND*
346 *ELIMINATION STRATEGIC PLAN 2021-2025*. 2020, Ministry of Health Uganda: Kampala.
- 347 9. National Malaria Control Program, M.o.H.U., *Uganda National Malaria Control Policy*. . 2011. p.
348 Pg 8.
- 349 10. Shah, N.K., *Defining & counting malaria deaths*. The Indian Journal of Medical Research, 2012.
350 **135**(3): p. 270.
- 351 11. Malaria, R.B., *Guidance for Evaluating the Impact of National Malaria Control Programs in Highly*
352 *Endemic Countries*. 2014.
- 353 12. O'Donovan, J., et al., *'We are the people whose opinions don't matter'. A photovoice study*
354 *exploring challenges faced by community health workers in Uganda*. Global public health, 2020.
355 **15**(3): p. 384-401.
- 356 13. O'Donovan, J., et al., *Potential challenges of implementing the Community Health Extension*
357 *Worker programme in Uganda*. BMJ global health, 2018. **3**(4): p. e000960.
- 358 14. Brunie, A., et al., *Keeping community health workers in Uganda motivated: key challenges,*
359 *facilitators, and preferred program inputs*. Global Health: Science and Practice, 2014. **2**(1): p.
360 103-116.
- 361 15. Hill, Z., et al., *Supervising community health workers in low-income countries—a review of impact*
362 *and implementation issues*. Global health action, 2014. **7**(1): p. 24085.
- 363 16. Zangaro, G. *Impact of System Failures on Healthcare Workers*. 2023.

Figure 1: Number of gaps identified during the process mapping activity, Namutumba District, Eastern Uganda, September 2021–October 2022



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24807657>; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 2: Root causes for the gaps identified during the problem identification at the health facilities in Namutumba District, Eastern Uganda, September 2021—October 2022





Figure 3: Changes in malaria mortality reporting for the health facilities in Namutumba District, Eastern Uganda, November 2022—March 2023



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24307657>; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).