

1 **Title: Factors Affecting Integration of an Early Warning System for Antimalarial Drug Resistance within**  
2 **a Routine Surveillance System in a Pre-elimination Setting in Sub-Saharan Africa.**

3 *(Factors affecting integration of an antimalarial drug resistance early warning system within routine*  
4 *surveillance)*

5  
6 **Authors:**

7  
8 Frank M. Kagoro <sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>, Elizabeth Allen <sup>1,3,4</sup>, Jaishree Raman <sup>6,7,8</sup>, Aaron Mabuza <sup>1,3</sup>, Ray Magagula <sup>9</sup>,  
9 Gerdalize Kok <sup>9</sup>, Gillian Malatje <sup>9</sup>, Philippe J Guerin <sup>3,4,5</sup>, Mehul Dhorda <sup>2,3,4,5</sup>, Richard J Maude <sup>2,5,11,12</sup>, Karen  
10 I Barnes <sup>1,3,4</sup>

11  
12 <sup>1</sup>*Collaborating Centre for Optimising Antimalarial Therapy (CCOAT), Division of Clinical Pharmacology, Department*  
13 *of Medicine, University of Cape Town (UCT), Cape Town, South Africa*

14  
15 <sup>2</sup>*Mahidol Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit (MORU), Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University,*  
16 *Bangkok, Thailand*

17  
18 <sup>3</sup>*WorldWide Antimalarial Resistance Network (WWARN), South-East African Regional Hub, UCT, South Africa*

19  
20 <sup>4</sup>*Infectious Diseases Data Observatory (IDDO), Oxford, UK*

21  
22 <sup>5</sup>*Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK*

23  
24 <sup>6</sup>*Centre for Emerging Zoonotic and Parasitic Diseases, National Institute for Communicable Disease, Sandringham,*  
25 *Gauteng, South Africa*

26  
27 <sup>7</sup>*Wits Research Institute for Malaria, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South*  
28 *Africa*

29  
30 <sup>8</sup>*UP Institute for Sustainable Malaria Control, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa*

31  
32 <sup>9</sup>*Mpumalanga Provincial Malaria Elimination Programme, Mpumalanga, South Africa*

33  
34 <sup>10</sup>*Malaria Programme, Clinton Health Access Initiative, Pretoria, South Africa.*

35  
36 <sup>11</sup>*School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong*

37  
38 <sup>12</sup>*The Open University, Milton Keynes, UK*

39 **Corresponding Author:**

40 Dr Karen I. Barnes ([karen.barnes@uct.ac.za](mailto:karen.barnes@uct.ac.za))

41 Professor: Division of Clinical Pharmacology | University of Cape Town (UCT)

42 Founding Director | MRC Collaborating Centre for Optimising Antimalarial Therapy (CCOAT)

43 Director: Pharmacology | WorldWide Antimalarial Resistance Network (WWARN)

44  
45  
46  
47  
48 **Keywords:** Early-warning system, Surveillance, Health Information System, Antimalarial resistance,  
49 *Plasmodium falciparum*, Pre-elimination, Africa, Malaria.

## 50 1. Abstract

51 To address the current threat of antimalarial resistance, countries need innovative solutions for timely  
52 and informed decision-making. Integrating molecular resistance marker surveillance into routine malaria  
53 surveillance in pre-elimination contexts offers a potential early warning mechanism to identify  
54 resistance signals and target areas for further investigation, including therapeutic efficacy studies.  
55 However, there is limited evidence on what influences the performance of such a system in resource-  
56 limited settings.

57  
58 From March 2018 to February 2020, a sequential mixed-methods study was conducted in primary healthcare  
59 facilities in a South African pre-elimination setting to explore factors influencing the flow, quality and  
60 linkage of malaria case notification and antimalarial molecular resistance marker data. Using a process-  
61 oriented framework, we undertook monthly and quarterly data linkage and consistency analysis at  
62 different levels of the health system, as well as a survey, focus group discussions and interviews to identify  
63 potential barriers to, and enhancers of, the roll-out and uptake of this integrated information system.

64  
65 Over two years, 4,787 confirmed malaria cases were notified from 42 primary healthcare facilities in the  
66 Nkomazi sub-district, Mpumalanga, South Africa. Of the notified cases, 78.5% (n=3,758) were  
67 investigated, and 55.1% (n=2,636) were successfully linked to their *Plasmodium falciparum* molecular  
68 resistance marker profiles. Five tangible processes—malaria case detection and notification, sample  
69 collection, case investigation, analysis and reporting—were identified within the process-oriented logic  
70 model. Workload, training, ease of use, supervision, leadership, and resources were recognized as cross-  
71 cutting influencers affecting the program's performance.

72  
73 Approaching malaria elimination, linking molecular markers of antimalarial resistance to routine malaria  
74 surveillance is feasible. However, cross-cutting barriers inherent in the healthcare system can determine  
75 its success in a resource-limited setting.

## 76 2. Introduction

77 Sub-Saharan Africa bears the largest burden of malaria, with 94% and 95% of the global cases and deaths,  
78 respectively.[1] Malaria-endemic countries in Sub-Saharan Africa are now also facing the looming threat  
79 of antimalarial drug resistance. Malaria parasites with reduced susceptibility to artemisinin-derivatives

80 are emerging and rapidly spreading, threatening the continent's control and elimination goals,  
81 heightening the need for novel tools and strategies to effectively tackle this threat.[2–8] Such innovations  
82 need to be timely, relevant and tailored to existing health systems, particularly in resource-limited  
83 settings.

84  
85 In its strategy to respond to antimalarial drug resistance in Africa, the World Health Organization (WHO)  
86 emphasised the need for robust and agile surveillance systems capable of promptly detecting and  
87 responding to antimalarial drug resistance and recommends that this surveillance be integrated into  
88 routine malaria surveillance systems.[9,10] This integration is particularly important in pre-elimination  
89 areas, where the risk of drug-resistant parasites emerging may be heightened by higher drug pressure and  
90 lack of partial immunity.[11] In these settings, the WHO also recommends monitoring the prevalence of  
91 molecular markers of antimalarial drug resistance, as an early warning system to identify resistance signals  
92 and areas requiring further investigation, including therapeutic efficacy studies (TES). Despite TES being  
93 the cornerstone of antimalarial drug efficacy monitoring, they are not conducted regularly and do not  
94 provide a timely spatial representation of the distribution of antimalarial resistance. Previous evidence  
95 has shown that integrating antimalarial molecular markers using a routine malaria notification system is  
96 feasible in sub-Saharan African settings.[12] However, little is known about the barriers and enhancers to  
97 integrating molecular markers of resistance within the routine malaria surveillance system.  
98 Understanding such factors is needed by countries adopting or expanding molecular surveillance, for  
99 which recent laboratory investments have been extensive.[13,14]

100  
101 In 2018, the South African National Malaria Programme (NMP) piloted a novel technology to consolidate  
102 and enhance malaria surveillance activities and treatment approaches fundamental to achieving malaria  
103 elimination. Through the Smart Surveillance for Malaria Elimination (SS4ME) initiative, antimalarial drug  
104 resistance molecular marker data were linked to malaria case notifications in near real-time in Nkomazi,  
105 Mpumalanga, a pre-elimination setting.[15] SS4ME included the collection of malaria rapid diagnostic  
106 tests (mRDTs) and, wherever possible, dried blood spots (DBS) on filter papers for assaying molecular  
107 markers of antimalarial resistance that can be linked by unique barcodes to individual case notifications.

108  
109 Developing and evaluating the integration of molecular markers of antimalarial resistance into routine  
110 malaria surveillance required an assessment of the surveillance system's performance, both  
111 independently and together with other routine notification components, making for a complex

112 intervention.[16] As per national malaria treatment guidelines, all suspected malaria cases presenting to  
113 health facilities should be confirmed by a mRDT or microscopy (passive case detection) before treatment  
114 is administered.[17] Additionally, in pre-elimination areas of South Africa, the NMP screens high-risk  
115 groups, such as migrant and mobile populations (proactive case detection), and households surrounding  
116 the residence of index cases (reactive case detection).[6,7] Therefore, integration of molecular resistance  
117 markers into routine malaria surveillance system involved adopting several technologies, activities, and  
118 processes into the existing malaria notification system, with regular monitoring and adaptations. For  
119 SS4ME, a conceptual framework was developed to explore and guide how the roll-out, adoption and  
120 utilisation of new and existing technologies would inform malaria elimination goals. This laid a foundation  
121 for benchmarking how SS4ME was received and understood by potential key stakeholders. As with other  
122 such conceptual theories, this framework lacked a mechanism to explore the interaction between the  
123 different determinants of success and how these interact with the users or beneficiaries. Therefore, this  
124 approach needed to be revised and expanded to identify internal, external and interactive factors that  
125 could affect the implementation and impact of the intervention. Through the step-by-step depiction of  
126 how a program operates and how it leads to the desired outcomes, process-oriented logic models have  
127 been used in programme planning and evaluation to understand its key elements.[18]

128  
129 ‘Making Data Mapworthy’ was a quantitative sub-study linked to the SS4ME pilot that evaluated the  
130 feasibility of integrating molecular resistance markers into the routine malaria surveillance system using  
131 coverage, accuracy and linkage of malaria cases in near real-time.[12] However, these metrics alone could  
132 not fully examine the flow of data, or users’ practices and perceptions. Here, factors influencing the flow,  
133 quality and linkage of malaria notification data and associated molecular resistance markers from  
134 different reporting levels are investigated to inform the enhancement and sustainability of this integrated  
135 early warning system for antimalarial resistance.

136

### 137 3. Materials and Methods

138 This SS4ME sub-study used an iterative sequential mixed-methods design and included: 1) monthly and  
139 quarterly quantitative descriptive analyses, 2) a healthcare facility staff survey, and 3) focus group  
140 discussions (FGDs) and in-depth interviews (IDIs) with healthcare facility staff involved in malaria case  
141 management and NMP staff in Nkomazi Sub-District, a pre-elimination area in Mpumalanga province,  
142 South Africa. Individuals identified through proactive, reactive, or passive case detection were screened

143 for malaria using a falciparum-specific histidine-rich protein 2 (HRP2)-based mRDT. Both symptomatic and  
144 asymptomatic positive cases were treated following national guidelines with the WHO-recommended 3-  
145 day artemether-lumefantrine regimen, used in the area since 2007. For molecular surveillance, DBS filter  
146 papers were to be collected from all patients with positive mRDTs. Demographic and case data were  
147 collected through the Notifiable Medical Condition form or app, and verified for quality within 24 hours  
148 at the sub-district NMP office. Case investigators conducted household visits within 24-72 hours of  
149 notification, recording Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates and assessing malaria risk factors. All  
150 notifications were quality-checked and electronically captured into the routine District Health Information  
151 System II (DHIS2) at the sub-district NMP office.[17]

152

153 Three levels of notification data were examined: healthcare facilities, the sub-district NMP office serving  
154 as a data collection / capturing centre and provincially through DHIS2 submissions. All SS4ME-participating  
155 healthcare facilities were enrolled for malaria case data analysis at monthly and quarterly intervals, to  
156 gauge coverage and consistency as performance metrics. The facilities were then categorised as low- or  
157 high-performing on the overall data linkage, and two from each level were purposively selected for  
158 enhanced data quality assessment.

159

160 A paper-based survey (*Tool S1*) was administered between 01 March and 30 June 2020 to primary  
161 healthcare facility staff treating malaria patients to evaluate their practice, perception, and experience of  
162 the integration of molecular resistance markers into routine malaria surveillance system activities. For  
163 FGDs and IDIs, various cadres of staff involved in malaria case management at healthcare facilities and in  
164 the NMP were invited to participate by email or phone call. At least one staff member performing any  
165 malaria-related activities was invited per healthcare facility. After obtaining verbal and written consent  
166 using *Tools S2 (b) and (c)*, FGDs and IDIs were conducted in English from 3 – 6 June 2020 using pre-  
167 prepared interview guides (*Tools S3 and S4*) to maintain consistency and quality. The audio recordings  
168 were securely stored on the password-controlled study computer and later transcribed. Two study  
169 investigators listened to audio recordings with reference to the transcribed scripts and resolved any  
170 interpretation conflicts or transcription errors by consensus.

171

172 This study was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Health Sciences at  
173 the University of Cape Town (HREC REF Number: 698/2019 and 038/2020 (*Document, S1 and S2*), including  
174 for data obtained in the SS4ME study (HREC REF Number: 519/2017 [*Document S3*]). SS4ME was also

175 endorsed by the South African Department of Health, the National Institute for Communicable Diseases  
176 (NICD) and the Mpumalanga Malaria Programme. All partners were notified, and their staff were informed  
177 of the study, including NMP staff, information officers, clinicians and data clerks.

178  
179 The descriptive analysis focused on staff survey data and monthly and quarterly DHIS2 data evaluations.  
180 The latter summarised notified and investigated cases, mRDT / DBS samples analysed, their linkage, as  
181 well as spatiotemporal trends in molecular markers and usability assessments. All quantitative data  
182 analyses were conducted using R programming language (versions 3.6 and 4.0). Further quantitative  
183 methods used have been explained elsewhere.[12] For consistency, quarterly aggregates of notified cases  
184 and investigated cases from each healthcare facility sampled were compared at three levels (healthcare  
185 facility, sub-district data capture centre and provincial DHIS2 records) and the median difference was  
186 computed. Consistency was defined as an equal number of cases being reported at different levels, with  
187 a difference of +/- 5 cases allowed to account for delayed reporting. Since a consistency benchmark for  
188 integrating molecular resistance data into malaria case data had not been described before, this was  
189 established by adapting the internal consistency benchmark proposed by the WHO Data Quality  
190 Assurance guideline.[19] Data were then explored quantitatively and qualitatively to identify possible  
191 causes of inconsistency.

192  
193 For the qualitative data, each audio recording was transcribed and imported to NVivo 12 before being  
194 coded deductively, based on the conceptual framework and interview guides, and inductively from other  
195 observations. The first coding cycle assigned labels to text excerpts in the transcripts as lowest level  
196 'nodes'. These were then explored for repeated ideas and patterns, which were grouped, organised and  
197 categorised as higher-level themes, based on the interview guide sections and new concepts emerging.  
198 The prevailing themes and their theories were extracted and further analysed through the framework  
199 matrix, and the analytical outputs were evaluated across the range of participants and stakeholder groups.

200  
201 As a complex intervention, the study used a process-oriented logic model to link the overall qualitative  
202 and quantitative data to determine the enablers and barriers that would explain the changing trends. To  
203 do so, results were further categorised into processes and logically analysed to identify inputs and  
204 activities, intended and unintended outputs, and outcomes. A matrix was constructed to explore the level  
205 of influence and performance for each key feature identified from the process logic model.

## 206 4. Results

207 A total of 4,787 malaria cases were notified in Nkomazi, Mpumalanga with 78.5% (n=3,758) investigated  
208 by the NMP (*Fig. 1*) from March 2018 to February 2020. Of the notified cases, 55.1% (n=2,636) were linked  
209 to their *Plasmodium falciparum* molecular marker resistance profiles, with 85% (n=2,240) of the linked  
210 cases mapped to healthcare facility, ward and locality levels. Further quantitative results are reported  
211 elsewhere.[12]

212

**Figure 1.** Summary of cases notified, investigated, and linked to molecular resistance markers and locality from March 2018 to February 2020 in Nkomazi sub-district, Mpumalanga.

213 A total of 46 healthcare workers participated in five separate FGDs, with group sizes ranging from 8 – 12  
214 participants. Of the participants, 32 were nurses (including professional nurses, occupational nurses, and  
215 assistant nurses), and 14 were environmental health officers who worked as health promoters or malaria  
216 case investigators, data clerks, data capturers and surveillance officers. The majority of the participants  
217 were women (n=31). Four IDIs were conducted with staff at the supervisory and decision-making levels  
218 performing infection control coordination, district and provincial NMP management, primary healthcare  
219 management and malaria surveillance supervision.

220

221 The 50 participants involved in the FGDs and IDIs had between 1 and 31 years of experience working with  
222 the NMP and were involved in the surveillance data reporting chain. Their responsibilities included field  
223 and clinical diagnostics, care of patients, case notification, case investigation, data capture, sample  
224 collection, labelling and transport, supervisory and reporting roles and decision-making. Several themes  
225 emerged from discussions on the integration of molecular resistance markers into the routine malaria  
226 surveillance system, which included malaria case notification, sample collection, packaging and  
227 transportation, case investigation, data capture and reporting.

228

229 A total of 64 nurses from 21 of the 42 healthcare facilities participated in the survey. Respondents were  
230 registered / professional nurses (67.1%), enrolled nurses (22%) and occupational nurses (6%). Two  
231 respondents did not mention their job titles. Five quarterly assessments were conducted for three  
232 healthcare facilities for the consistency evaluation. Due to logistical challenges, the team did not manage  
233 to enroll the fourth health facility.

234



235 In *Fig. 2* below, prevalent themes in the FGDs and IDIs included ease of use, perceived usefulness of  
236 surveillance, staff members' reluctance to adopt new activities, contradictions in best practice definitions,  
237 workload, and system support. These themes converged into sub-themes: work commitment, agency and  
238 ownership, challenging processes, compromise, staffing needs, training, leadership, and supervision.  
239

**Figure 2.** *The illustration of factors discovered during focus group discussions and in-depth interviews influencing the implementation of molecular resistance markers into the routine malaria surveillance system in the Nkomazi sub-district.*

*Several themes and sub-themes surfaced from these discussions. Initially, participants voiced reluctance and contradictions, leading to confusion over roles. This uncertainty spawned a challenging start and negatively impinged on the work. To counter these issues, more intensive training, stauncher leadership, and consistent supervision were recommended. In instances where confusion persisted, a supportive system was seen as beneficial to harmonise tasks and provide necessary training and quality control. This tactic successfully alleviated immediate challenges. Lastly, even though the integration process demanded an increased workload, healthcare staff who were willing to learn and perceived the benefits of this integration displayed a heightened commitment to their work. This level of dedication indicates a need for increased staffing or a reorganised work system to provide adequate support.*

240  
241 Five key processes (*Table S1*) emerged: malaria case detection and notification, sample collection, case  
242 investigation, data capture, analysis and reporting. These themes are described below using the process-  
243 oriented logic model outlined in *Table S1*, linking them to processes, inputs, outputs, and outcomes.

## 244 4.1 Process I: Malaria case detection and notification

245 The change introduced during the integration of molecular resistance markers into the routine malaria  
246 surveillance system was the inclusion of barcode stickers on the case notification forms during passive,  
247 proactive and reactive case detection. The study also developed activities to enhance the collection of all  
248 required malaria case details in the reporting notification form (e.g. contact information and household  
249 address / directions). This was to support the linkage of demographic and location data to the molecular  
250 markers of resistance. This also resulted in additional workload, which was aggravated by the multiple  
251 notification reporting systems. As shown in *Fig. S1*, the NMP introduced two new malaria notification  
252 systems, leading to three malaria notification systems running concurrently during the study period,  
253 namely a) the Notifiable Medical Condition (NMC) book / forms, b) the Malaria Connect mobile application  
254 and c) NMC mobile application.



255

256 The surveillance team supervisors mentioned that healthcare workers routinely used the Malaria  
257 Notification Book for notification, and only notified cases using other systems as an additional option. This  
258 was corroborated by healthcare workers themselves who reported using the notification book first and  
259 other notification methods depending on the workload, as quoted below:

260

261 *'We do the paper first, the notification book first, the remaining depends on their time or*  
262 *workload'. [Nurse, IDI06].*

263

264 However, in responding to the survey question on which systems are used frequently for notification,  
265 61/64 participants reported using these interchangeably: Malaria Connect (36, 59%), NMC Notification  
266 Book (15, 25%) and NMC Mobile Phone Application (3, 5%). Of those who reported using more than one  
267 system, only one (2%) reported using all three, while five (8%) used Malaria Connect and NMC Notification  
268 Book only, and one (2%) used both Malaria Connect and NMC Phone App (Figure 3).

269

**Figure 3:** Malaria notification systems used by 61 staff working in 21/42 healthcare facilities in Nkomazi, Mpumalanga, South Africa. NMC: Notifiable Medical Condition.

270

271 Participants reported that the parallel reporting systems introduced an additional burden to their daily  
272 work, particularly in the community health centres (CHC) operating 24-hours per day, 7 days a week,  
273 where a high number of patients present. For example, one of the nurses from a CHC in the FGDs said:

274

275 *'But the volume you can look at the CHCs [Community Health Centres] and eight-hour [clinics],*  
276 *there are more people coming in because day and night we are working.' [Nurse FGD03].*

277

## 278 4.2 Process II: Sample collection

279 The project introduced the collection of DBS filter papers, with related SOPs at all participating healthcare  
280 facilities. Participants expressed reluctance about collecting DBS and capturing patient information on  
281 mRDTs. This called for increased programmatic support and training, and with time, the study observed  
282 improvement of barcoded mRDT samples received at the NICD laboratory from 19% in the first quarter to  
283 85% in the final quarter, reflecting gradual acceptance and adaptability. [12]

284

285 *'Basically, at first it was quite a daunting task because now [I] remember we had facilities that*  
286 *recently introduced the new NMC form and also Malaria Connect and all of that. So when we went*  
287 *to train the health facilities [about notification and DBS sample collection] they were resistant*  
288 *because they feel that it is extra work on their behalf...'* **[Environmental Health Officer, FGD01].**

289 Not all healthcare workers grasped the procedure for blood collection immediately. Due to difficulty in  
290 obtaining enough blood from the initial finger prick, they occasionally had to prick the patient's finger a  
291 second time. This caused some resistance among patients, according to the staff:

292

293 *'Yes, there is not enough [blood from one finger prick]. There is a little, but it is not enough. So,*  
294 *most of the time they [nurses] have to prick maybe twice, or three times sometimes.'* **[Case**  
295 **investigator, FGD01].**

296

297 However, this also encouraged the healthcare workers to understand the rationale behind filter paper  
298 sample collection, to be able to explain this to the patients who were hesitant:

299

300 *'These activities have helped us to know what we are doing and to help the patients; if they ask*  
301 *me now why we are taking another blood sample, it is for monitoring drug resistance and making*  
302 *sure you are cured. So, it's a very good thing'* **[Nurse, FGD04].**

303

304 After DBS sample collection, healthcare workers were asked to label and package samples, ready to be  
305 collected and transported each week by the NMP to the national laboratory. The intended output was to  
306 obtain accurately barcoded filter papers for molecular analysis and linkage to individual case notifications.  
307 However, this again meant an additional workload for the healthcare staff, which might have a negative  
308 impact on their other activities. In the first quarter, poor sample collection, packaging and recording of  
309 the required patient details, large numbers of samples / notification forms without barcodes and a low  
310 number of quality samples shipped to the central lab for molecular analysis were observed. This  
311 necessitated frequent refresher training, quality checks and supportive supervision. Despite the slow  
312 start, the overall outcomes of the number and quality of samples for molecular marking increased, for  
313 instance, the overall linkage of the molecular resistance markers and case notification rose from 51% in  
314 the first quarter to the highest of 75.1% in the third quarter, with participants noting how the activities  
315 strengthened the routine antimalarial resistance surveillance.[12]

316

317 *'... remember we went with the supervisor to a couple of clinics when we identified that problem*  
 318 *(positive mRDT sample with insufficient or missing DBS) and then we went back and told them*  
 319 *that now we no longer just take the RDT. We also need to take the dry blood spots, so we need*  
 320 *enough blood for the dry blood because sometimes we find that the dry blood is just a tiny bit of*  
 321 *the blood and it really cannot be used. So we had to make sure that we go back to them and tell*  
 322 *and train them that when you prick, make sure you prick enough just in case it is a positive you*  
 323 *can also get more blood. They are currently a lot better' [Nurse, FGD03].*

324

325 As shown in *Table 1*, among the 64 survey participants who performed these tasks, the majority reported  
 326 that overall, it is easy for them to collect, label, package and ship DBS samples (55.1%). However, 29.5%  
 327 found it difficult sometimes, and 9.4% found it always difficult.

328

	Not part of my work (%)	Easy for me (%)	Sometimes difficult (%)	Always difficult (%)
Labelling individual mRDTs	7.8	43.8	39.1	9.4
Collecting and labelling individual filter paper samples (blood spots)	4.7	51.6	34.4	9.4
Packaging positive and negative mRDTs for shipping	4.7	65.6	17.2	12.5
Packaging and shipping DBS samples?	6.3	60.9	26.6	6.3
Overall, how did you feel about the activities?	5.9	55.1	29.5	9.4

*Table 1: Experience in collecting, labelling, packaging and shipping dried blood spots (DBS) as reported by 64 staff working in healthcare facilities in Nkomazi, Mpumalanga, South Africa.*

329

### 330 4.3 Process III: Case investigation

331 Malaria case investigators aim to trace all confirmed malaria cases, obtain their residential GPS  
 332 coordinates, identify malaria risk factors and actively screen nearby contacts for malaria (reactive case  
 333 detection). The additional intended output for the integration of molecular resistance markers into the  
 334 routine malaria surveillance system was to enhance residential GPS coordinate data quality using *eTrex -*  
 335 *10* GPS devices or Samsung tablets, with training and related SOPs.[20] Overall, 78.5% of malaria cases  
 336 were successfully investigated (*Fig. 1*), with the accuracy of GPS coordinates increasing from 48% in the  
 337 first quarter to 89% in the last quarter.[12] The poor accuracy in the first two quarters was associated with  
 338 device-related (non-uniform settings, device malfunctioning, lack of enough battery) and human-related

339 (transcription errors, incomplete patient addresses) and system and resource-related factors (lack of  
340 enough battery or backup devices, increased workload, formatting during file transfers).

341  
342 While discussing the issue of missing contact details, participants in FGDs mentioned that many of their  
343 patients are immigrants who lack phone numbers, travel far to seek healthcare or do not know how to  
344 clearly describe the locations of their recently acquired residences. Additionally, due to their foreign and,  
345 at times, undocumented migrant status, many patients are often hesitant to share their contact details.  
346 These missing details lead to case investigation failure, resulting in more missing data.

347  
348 The case investigators occasionally reach out to the notifying healthcare staff when faced with a case  
349 lacking contact information, aiming to gather additional details about the patient. This additional follow-  
350 up was received both positively and negatively. Positively, this would reduce the cost of case investigation  
351 since they travel substantial distances for case investigation, and a few more details can assist in finding  
352 the index case's location more directly.

353  
354 *'We drive almost 40 km or more to find a case, then the phone number is wrong and there is only*  
355 *one line for the address. Just looking for one case, you take the whole day while other notifications*  
356 *are waiting.'* [**Case investigator, FGD01**].

357  
358 However, the practice of case investigators contacting clinic staff on their mobile phones was met  
359 negatively by some clinic staff, who perceived it as an invasion to their privacy, potentially threatening  
360 their working relationship. During a FGD a nurse stated:

361  
362 *'Yes, they do so [call] because in the notification book we also write our phone numbers when we*  
363 *notify a patient; if there is something missing they can call. Even if we are not on duty, yah,*  
364 *threatening our working relationship.'* [**Nurse, FGD03**]

365  
366 On the other hand, some clinic staff and case investigators reported that calling each other is not a  
367 problem, even after-hours calls, mentioning that it's useful and gives them a sense of duty. They have  
368 developed trust, and without phone calls, investigators would be travelling long distances to look for  
369 cases. One participant in an FGD with the nurses said:

370

371 *'...it is fine because they want information, and they want to know if we have referred the patient*  
372 *[to hospital] or if the patient is going home.'* **[Nurse, FGD03]**

373  
374 Another challenge raised by the NMP staff was administrative inefficiencies resulting in multiple  
375 notification books at health facilities. These contribute to some tension. For instance, case investigators  
376 reported having collected the notification papers from the wrong notification book (outdated book / not  
377 currently in use) at some larger facilities, where several notification books may be used simultaneously.  
378 Others failed to access the notification book during the facility visit due to it being misplaced. This is  
379 usually resolved by removing the outdated books and leaving the facility with only one notification book  
380 and informing the supervisors.

381  
382 To help address these gaps, the study identified the need for regular refresher training on malaria  
383 surveillance with guidance on malaria notification and capturing of case information at the facility level,  
384 supported with new SoPs and facility guidebooks. The additional hours spent on refresher training and  
385 learning the new SoPs were rewarded when the interviews revealed that these activities resulted not only  
386 in an increase in the accuracy of coordinates as stated above, but also in an overall improvement of the  
387 NMP's surveillance system functioning. An information officer in a FGD said:

388  
389 *'The ownership thing you know when you understand exactly what it is you are capturing and how*  
390 *important it is, then it makes all the difference in terms of making sure it is on file, because how*  
391 *these things usually get presented ... it is always just another study that we do not know how it is*  
392 *going to end up, who it is going to benefit. So, I think also that approach of you [the study team]*  
393 *is excellent as we know what this is ... and what this is for. This is how important it is, it is ours*  
394 *only.* **[Information officer, FG02]**

395

## 396 4.4 Process IV: Data capture

397 Routinely, malaria-related data are captured at the sub-district data capture centre daily. Malaria case  
398 investigators submit case report forms from both the healthcare facilities and their case investigation  
399 visits. The additional data input for the integration of molecular resistance markers into the routine  
400 malaria surveillance system was the capturing of the barcode number into the DHIS2 system. A barcode  
401 scanner was introduced to reduce workload and avoid transcription errors. Even after being trained, data

402 clerks experienced challenges using the scanners, leading to inconsistencies in barcode capturing with  
403 both manual capturing and scanner use. The barcode scanning was also affected by internet connectivity,  
404 as any drop in WiFi signal disconnected the DHIS2 system. Overall, the process increased the workload  
405 and affected the perceived usefulness of the scanner, quoting a data clerk interviewed:

406

407 *'Typing is easier than using a barcode scanner'. [Data clerk, FGD01].*

408

409 Furthermore, delays in data capturing could last a few days to weeks. This delay was caused by an  
410 interruption in network connectivity, increased caseloads, and staff turnover:

411

412 *'When it is the rainy days and the cases increase, sometimes it's only two of us capturing data.*  
413 *Therefore, we would be late to capture... Late for a few days to one or two weeks.' [Data clerk,*  
414 *FGD01].*

415

416 In the first two quarters, there would be significant missing details on the notification forms. For instance,  
417 not all forms had barcodes, coordinates or patients' addresses. Data clerks would identify patterns of  
418 missing barcodes and help identify whether facilities were underperforming or ran out of barcodes. This  
419 would be communicated to the case investigation supervisors. Supervisory staff reported that it is still  
420 common to find paper notification forms, mRDTs or DBS without barcode stickers due to forgetfulness,  
421 increased workload or reluctance from the clinic staff. Unidentifiable sample forms without barcodes  
422 would get discarded as no information was provided for identification or linkage. Quoting one of the  
423 participants in an FGD:

424

425 *'Yes, that are missing, maybe the facility code or anything like that, then maybe three or four times*  
426 *we have experience that the RDT [referring to mRDT] came alone like just the RDT without the*  
427 *filter paper, without a barcode. So, most of the time we just discard because there is nothing we*  
428 *can do or go back and find this person and do the thing again' [Surveillance supervisor, FGD02]*

429

430 This resulted in low linkability of samples because of inadequately barcoded samples, transcription errors  
431 and slow data-capturing processes. However, in the longer term, due to supportive supervision and re-  
432 training, cases linked at the household level increased with an increase in willingness and uptake of the  
433 programme.[12]

434

## 435 4.5 Process V: Analysis and reporting

436 Routinely, the NMP collates and analysis malaria data at the provincial level each month and shares the  
437 reports with the healthcare facility, district, provincial and national teams. For the integration of molecular  
438 resistance markers into the routine malaria surveillance system, the additional analyses included malaria  
439 case distribution and linkage of individual notifications to their molecular resistance markers. The NMP  
440 information officers and molecular laboratory team downloaded data from the DHIS2 each month and  
441 shared it with the research team for further analysis and reporting 1) maps of the distribution of malaria  
442 cases; 2) linkage of residential locality and health facilities with molecular resistance markers and 3) data  
443 quality. If any gaps were identified, activities were formulated for further enhancing resistance  
444 surveillance.

445

446 A total of 4,787 malaria cases were notified and 78.5% (n = 3,758) of cases were investigated in the study  
447 period. However, data wouldn't always match, and since this data came from separate files within the  
448 DHIS2 system, it needed to be merged outside the DHIS2 environment, leading to extra workload for  
449 information officers with a risk of non-matching, duplication, or deletions of some cases, variables or  
450 values. Commenting about the workload and how the DHIS2 framework could lead to non-matching of  
451 data and hence linkage failure, an NMP officer said:

452

453 *'...I need to merge the NMC form together with the case investigation form and to take it outside*  
454 *the computer and merge; even if it is Excel, it is prone to changing formats and that could introduce*  
455 *issues that could lead to non-matching within the DHIS2 framework.'* **[Information officer, KI103].**

456

457 *Fig. S2(a), (b) and (c)* compare data from DHIS2 and the two lower levels (health facility and sub-district  
458 data capture centre); the notified case counts were only consistent in 40% (6/15) of the notifications and  
459 20% (3/15) for cases investigated. Most of the matching evaluations occurred in the final two study  
460 quarters. Looking at the discrepancies, the two secondary levels (reports at the data collection centre vs  
461 data in the DHIS2) had less data variability compared to their primary source (health facility). Although  
462 the study's quantitative analysis identified substantial duplication, the malaria team did data cleaning  
463 before sharing the datasets, as explained by one of the interviewees:

464



465 *'Once notifications were submitted and paper forms were captured in the DHIS2 system, ideally,*  
466 *all cases were merged and duplicates removed. In our analysis and feedback, some cases had*  
467 *duplicates that required further cleaning.'* **[Information officer, KII03].**

468  
469 Analysis and reporting activities were part of routine practice before the integration of molecular  
470 resistance markers into the routine malaria surveillance system. However, due to the expansion of  
471 reported variables and the monthly downloads, merging and reporting required, this process became  
472 more complex and increased workload, especially in the first quarter. However, these extra activities were  
473 perceived as useful to the programme. The research team and the programme co-developed a training  
474 programme and data curation tools, engaging all involved in identifying gaps and improvements that  
475 further simplified the data analysis and reporting and improved the overall notification system.[20] This  
476 improvement reflected beyond the study and supported improvement for the programme reporting,  
477 quoting an IDI participant:

478  
479 *'I think another thing that is good, our case investigation has also improved because I remember,*  
480 *when we started our baseline was 35% [for] 48 hours [time between case notification and*  
481 *investigation] and [for] 72 hours it was around 48%. So now on third quarter we reported above*  
482 *65 (%) which was even above the target we set for this financial year. I think with them making*  
483 *the follow ups, having to go to the facilities to check on the stocks and everything has made them*  
484 *also be involved in going there and investigating the cases because the thing was XXXX and XXXX*  
485 *[SS4ME pilot programme staff names] would be analysing and supporting with feedback'*  
486 **[Supervisory staff, KII02]**

## 487 5. Discussion

488 This study identified factors affecting data quality, linkage, and consistency for integrating antimalarial  
489 resistance monitoring into routine malaria notification in a pre-elimination malaria setting in sub-Saharan  
490 Africa. Healthcare facilities, district and provincial level healthcare staff in Nkomazi Sub-district,  
491 Mpumalanga, South Africa were key beneficiaries, and their perspectives spearheaded this integration.  
492 Applying a process-oriented logic model, an iterative process for comprehensively analysing various  
493 factors that either facilitate or hinder successful integration was established, with end-to-end data flow  
494 and interaction with various users, beneficiaries, the existing systems and newly adopted technology. The  
495 programme's overall performance was influenced by cross-cutting factors such as workload, training,

496 perception, supervision, leadership and resources – acting as enablers or barriers based on their  
497 availability, adequacy and perception.

498  
499 Increased workload was identified as a cross-cutting factor for all processes. Adequately trained staff who  
500 perceived the activity as useful maintained high performance levels, delivering better-quality outcomes  
501 even during months with a high malaria caseload, reduced staff and multiple reporting systems. In  
502 contrast, if staff did not perceive the activity as useful, data quality remained low, irrespective of resources  
503 and training provided. Previous studies have shown that a negative perception affects overall  
504 performance as well as the adoption and implementation of new technologies.[21,22] Low morale could  
505 lead to reluctance and the other activities being prioritised, contributing to poor data quality.

506  
507 The impact of devices (GPS devices, tablets, barcode scanners) introduced or updated for the integration  
508 of molecular resistance markers into the routine malaria surveillance system depended on the healthcare  
509 workers' skills and perception of the devices' usefulness and ease of use. Optimal functionality of devices  
510 coupled with adequate training enhanced performance, leading to observable improvements in data  
511 quality, especially during and immediately post-training and supervision periods.[12] Conversely,  
512 malfunctions in devices, such as internet disruptions, barcode scanner failure to connect to the DHIS2,  
513 depleted GPS device batteries, or clinic-level shortages of barcode stickers, significantly impacted team  
514 performance, morale, and data quality. Other studies exploring technological adoption in the health  
515 sector highlight the crucial need to fully understand end-users' needs and potential useful functionalities  
516 to facilitate usage and enhance quality. These studies stress the importance of user-friendly functionalities  
517 and overall device performance.[22,23]

518  
519 This study found adequate supportive supervision and quality assurance tools to be influential in  
520 improving performance. This includes adequate financing, such as having long-term appointments  
521 without interruptions of contracts, a manageable workload and good collaboration among and between  
522 both government and non-governmental organisation staff. On the other hand, multiple parallel reporting  
523 systems, communication challenges, inadequate supervision, lack of quality control tools, unmanageable  
524 workload, and poor collaboration negatively impacted intervention implementation.

525  
526 The study highlighted challenges at different operational levels, specifically in the malaria notification and  
527 case investigation processes. Although the NMC Notification Book served as the gold standard for

528 reporting malaria cases, the survey results revealed parallel and occasionally interchangeable use of  
529 reporting systems. A 2019 review assessing the strengths and challenges of implementing DHIS2 across  
530 11 Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs) highlighted pervasive data quality issues, notably  
531 demonstrated in a Nigerian study where reported data in DHIS2 remained incomplete at least 40% of the  
532 time.[24,25] Despite encountering such data quality challenges in this study, more than half of the cases  
533 could be linked to resistance molecular marker data, with clear improvements in data quality observed  
534 over the study period.[12]

535  
536 Contrasting responses were observed regarding follow-up phone calls for additional information —some  
537 healthcare workers felt it assisted with case investigations while others felt it strained the working  
538 relationships, negatively impacting staff morale and performance. This challenge relied primarily on staff  
539 perceptions and relationships. However, effective leadership, including the establishment of conducive  
540 communication channels, procedural guides, and efficient documentation systems, has successfully  
541 addressed similar challenges in comparable contexts.[23] This demonstrated the pivotal role of leadership  
542 and management in optimising communication and operations. Previous studies in similar settings have  
543 shown similar factors impacting the general adoption and implementation of information systems in  
544 health care.[21,26–29] A high level of perceived workload, data tools not being used as intended, and  
545 data quality issues were previously identified as challenges facing DHIS roll-out in Uganda and South  
546 Africa.[30,31]

547  
548 Our study acknowledges some limitations in evaluation methodology, participant selection, and the  
549 analytical approach used for combining qualitative and quantitative data. No single framework was  
550 comprehensive enough for the evaluation of the integration of molecular resistance markers into a  
551 routine malaria notification system. Incorporating diverse technologies such as barcode stickers, filter  
552 papers, GPS protocols, and scanners introduced complexity to the evaluation process. The 2021 MRC  
553 framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions offers a comprehensive evaluation  
554 spanning a study's lifecycle, from conception to implementation. However, it lacks detailed guidance on  
555 assessing individual components independently and primarily serves as a guiding framework without  
556 providing specific granularity for evaluation.[32] For the integration of molecular resistance markers into  
557 the routine malaria surveillance system, immediate end users are the healthcare staff and malaria case  
558 investigators. However, most determinant frameworks do not include end-users, and research has been

559 scarce for improving the evaluation of how various end-users influence implementation effectiveness.  
560 Thus, our study employed an iterative process-oriented logic model.

561  
562 Our results may be biased as only 42 staff members from the participating healthcare facilities consented  
563 to participate in the FGDs and IDIs, while 64 participated in the survey. The study results might not fully  
564 reflect the view of all staff in Nkomazi sub-district. However, the study team ensured diversity during  
565 participant recruitment to allow for different views and experiences. Most healthcare staff have multiple  
566 commitments, and their time is very limited. Hence, this might limit the study's generalisability. More  
567 studies might be needed to establish the extent to which the results from this setting may be applicable  
568 in other pre-elimination contexts.

569

## 570 6. Conclusion and Recommendation

571 Overall, the factors influencing the integration of molecular resistance markers into the routine malaria  
572 surveillance system in this sub-Saharan pre-elimination setting were rooted in challenges inherent to the  
573 surveillance system itself, and were not specific to the integration of molecular resistance markers. This  
574 study underscores the intricate interplay of factors influencing malaria notification data quality and the  
575 integration of drug resistance markers within the routine surveillance system. It emphasizes the pivotal  
576 role of aligned perceptions, adequate resources, and supportive supervision in bolstering data quality,  
577 while also revealing the vulnerabilities stemming from device malfunctions, conflicting guidance, and  
578 disparate reporting systems. The evaluation frameworks used highlighted the need for more  
579 comprehensive models that consider the holistic healthcare environment, user perceptions, and nuanced  
580 interactions, particularly for complex interventions such as this. To enhance the implementation of such  
581 multifaceted interventions, future evaluations should include multiple countries to capture various  
582 healthcare settings, individual perceptions, and contextual nuances, enabling a more generalisable  
583 assessment and refinement of these interventions within routine healthcare systems.

584

## 585 7. Acknowledgements

586 We would like to acknowledge the Mpumalanga Provincial and Nkomazi Sub-district Malaria Control  
587 Programmes of the National Department of Health of South Africa, Laboratory for Antimalarial Resistance  
588 Monitoring and Malaria Operational Research, Centre for Emerging Zoonotic and Parasitic Diseases,

589 National Institute for Communicable Disease, Clinton Health Access Initiative, South Africa, Humana  
590 People to People (HPP), South Africa, all NMP personnel and healthcare facility staff who collaborated in  
591 this study for all their support.

592

## 593 8. Funding

594

595 The Smart Surveillance for Malaria Elimination Pilot in Mpumalanga, South Africa, was co-funded by the  
596 South African MRC and the Worldwide Antimalarial Resistance Network (WWARN). WWARN is funded by  
597 the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the ExxonMobil Foundation. This research was also, in part,  
598 funded by the Wellcome Trust [Grant Number 220211]. For the purpose of open access, the author has  
599 applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this  
600 submission. Funders did not have any influence in the design of the study, data collection, analysis,  
601 interpretation of data and or writing the manuscript.

602

603

## 604 9. References:

- 605 1. World Health Organization. World Malaria Report 2023. World Health Organization. Geneva;  
606 2023. Available at [https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-](https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2023)  
607 [malaria-report-2023](https://www.who.int/teams/global-malaria-programme/reports/world-malaria-report-2023)
- 608 2. Casanova D, Baptista V, Costa M, Freitas B, Pereira M, Calçada C, et al. Artemisinin resistance-  
609 associated gene mutations in *Plasmodium falciparum*: A case study of severe malaria from  
610 Mozambique. *Travel Med Infect Dis.* 2023;57:102684.
- 611 3. Mesia Kahunu G, Wellmann Thomsen S, Wellmann Thomsen L, Muhindo Mavoko H, Mitashi  
612 Mulopo P, Filtenborg Hocke E, et al. Identification of the Pfk13 mutations R561H and P441L  
613 in the Democratic Republic of Congo. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2023;139:41–9.
- 614 4. Fola AA, Feleke SM, Mohammed H, Brhane BG, Hennelly CM, Assefa A, et al. *Plasmodium*  
615 *falciparum* resistant to artemisinin and diagnostics have emerged in Ethiopia. *Nat Microbiol.*  
616 2023;8:1911.
- 617 5. Uwimana A, Umulisa N, Venkatesan M, Szigel SS, Zhou Z, Munyaneza T, et al. Association of  
618 *Plasmodium falciparum* kelch13 R561H genotypes with delayed parasite clearance in Rwanda:  
619 an open-label, single-arm, multicentre, therapeutic efficacy study. *Lancet Infect Dis.*  
620 2021;21:1120–8.
- 621 6. Uwimana A, Legrand E, Stokes BH, Mangala Ndikumana J-L, Warsame M, Umulisa N, et al.  
622 Emergence and clonal expansion of in vitro artemisinin-resistant *Plasmodium falciparum*  
623 kelch13 R561H mutant parasites in Rwanda. *Nat Med.* 2020;26:1602–8.
- 624 7. Bwire GM, Ngasala B, Mikomangwa WP, Kilonzi M, Kamuhabwa AAR. Detection of mutations  
625 associated with artemisinin resistance at k13-propeller gene and a near complete return of  
626 chloroquine susceptible *falciparum* malaria in Southeast of Tanzania. *Sci Rep.* 2020;10.
- 627 8. Balikagala B, Fukuda N, Ikeda M, Katuru OT, Tachibana S-I, Yamauchi M, et al. Evidence of  
628 Artemisinin-Resistant Malaria in Africa. *NEJM.* 2021;385:1163–71.
- 629 9. World Health Organization. Strategy to respond to antimalarial drug resistance in Africa.  
630 Geneva; 2022. Available at [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240060265)  
631 [redirect/9789240060265](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240060265)
- 632 10. World Health Organization. Malaria Surveillance, Monitoring & Evaluation: a reference  
633 manual. Geneva; 2018. Available at [https://www.who.int/publications-detail-](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241565578)  
634 [redirect/9789241565578](https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241565578)
- 635 11. Rosenthal PJ. The interplay between drug resistance and fitness in malaria parasites. *Mol*  
636 *Microbiol.* 2013;89:1025.
- 637 12. Kagoro FM, Allen E, Mabuza A, Workman L, Magagula R, et al. Making data map-worthy—  
638 enhancing routine malaria data to support surveillance and mapping of *Plasmodium*  
639 *falciparum* anti-malarial resistance in a pre-elimination sub-Saharan African setting: a  
640 molecular and spatiotemporal epidemiology study. *Malar J.* 2022 Dec 1;21(1):1–19.
- 641 13. Christoffels A, Mboowa G, van Heusden P, Makhubela S, Githinji G, Mwangi S, et al. A pan-  
642 African pathogen genomics data sharing platform to support disease outbreaks. *Nat Med.*  
643 2023;29:1052–5.
- 644 14. Tanui CK, Tessema SK, Tegegne MA, Tebeje YK, Kaseya J. Unlocking the power of molecular  
645 and genomics tools to enhance cholera surveillance in Africa. *Nature Medicine* 2023 29:10.  
646 2023;29:2387–8.

- 647 15. Barnes K, Mabuza A, Freaun PJ, Magagula R, Bridget M, et al. Smart surveillance towards  
648 malaria elimination in Mpumalanga, South Africa (SS4ME ): novel approaches for mapping  
649 antimalarial resistance (Protocol). 2017 (Unpublished)
- 650 16. National Department of Health South Africa. Malaria Elimination Strategic Plan for South  
651 Africa 2019 - 2023. Pretoria; 2019. Available at [https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/MALARIA-ELIMINATION-STRATEGIC-PLAN-FOR-SOUTH-AFRICA-2019-2023-MALARIA-ELIMINATION-STRATEGIC-PLAN-2019-2023.pdf)  
652 [content/uploads/2019/10/MALARIA-ELIMINATION-STRATEGIC-PLAN-FOR-SOUTH-AFRICA-](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/MALARIA-ELIMINATION-STRATEGIC-PLAN-FOR-SOUTH-AFRICA-2019-2023-MALARIA-ELIMINATION-STRATEGIC-PLAN-2019-2023.pdf)  
653 [2019-2023-MALARIA-ELIMINATION-STRATEGIC-PLAN-2019-2023.pdf](https://www.nicd.ac.za/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/MALARIA-ELIMINATION-STRATEGIC-PLAN-FOR-SOUTH-AFRICA-2019-2023-MALARIA-ELIMINATION-STRATEGIC-PLAN-2019-2023.pdf)
- 654 17. National Institute for Communicable Diseases. National guidelines for the treatment of  
655 malaria, South Africa 2018 (Updated January 2019). Pretoria; 2019 Available at  
656 <https://knowledgehub.health.gov.za/elibrary/national-guidelines-treatment-malaria-2019>
- 657 18. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Mitchie S, Nazareth I, et al. Developing and evaluating complex  
658 interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *Br Med J*. 2008 Oct  
659 25;337(7676):979–83.
- 660 19. Rehfuess EA, Booth A, Brereton L, Burns J, Gerhardus A, et al. Towards a taxonomy of logic  
661 models in systematic reviews and health technology assessments: A priori, staged, and  
662 iterative approaches. *Res Synth Methods*. 2018 Mar 1;9(1):13–24.
- 663 20. Training materials for obtaining accurate malaria case GPS coordinates | Worldwide  
664 Antimalarial Resistance Network. Available from: [https://www.wwarn.org/tools-](https://www.wwarn.org/tools-resources/training-materials-obtaining-accurate-malaria-case-gps-coordinates)  
665 [resources/training-materials-obtaining-accurate-malaria-case-gps-coordinates](https://www.wwarn.org/tools-resources/training-materials-obtaining-accurate-malaria-case-gps-coordinates)
- 666 21. Odendaal WA, Anstey Watkins J, Leon N, Goudge J, Griffiths F, et al. Health workers’  
667 perceptions and experiences of using mHealth technologies to deliver primary healthcare  
668 services: a qualitative evidence synthesis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2020 Mar 26;2020(3).
- 669 22. Kijisanayotin B, Pannarunothai S, Speedie SM. Factors influencing health information  
670 technology adoption in Thailand’s community health centers: applying the UTAUT model. *Int*  
671 *J Med Inform*. 2009 Jun;78(6):404–16.
- 672 23. Kim S, Lee K-H, Hwang H, Yoo S. Analysis of the factors influencing healthcare professionals’  
673 adoption of mobile electronic medical record (EMR) using the unified theory of acceptance  
674 and use of technology (UTAUT) in a tertiary hospital. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2016  
675 Dec;16(1).
- 676 24. Dehnavieh R, Haghdoost A, Khosravi A, Hoseinabadi F, Rahimi H, et al. The District Health  
677 Information System (DHIS2): A literature review and meta-synthesis of its strengths and  
678 operational challenges based on the experiences of 11 countries. *Health Information*  
679 *Management Journal*. 2019 May 13;48(2):62–75.
- 680 25. Bhattacharya AA, Umar N, Audu A, Allen E, Schellenberg JRM, et al. Quality of routine facility  
681 data for monitoring priority maternal and newborn indicators in DHIS2: A case study from  
682 Gombe State, Nigeria. *PLoS One*. 2019 Jan 1;14(1):e0211265.
- 683 26. Githinji S, Oyando R, Malinga J, Ejersa W, Soti D, et al. Completeness of malaria indicator data  
684 reporting via the District Health Information Software 2 in Kenya, 2011-2015. *Malar J*. 2017  
685 Aug 17;16(1):1–11.
- 686 27. Dehnavieh R, Haghdoost AA, Khosravi A, Hoseinabadi F, Rahimi H, et al. The District Health  
687 Information System (DHIS2): A literature review and meta-synthesis of its strengths and  
688 operational challenges based on the experiences of 11 countries. Vol. 48, *Health Information*  
689 *Management Journal*. SAGE Publications Inc.; 2019. p. 62–75.
- 690 28. Kiberu VM, Matovu JK, Makumbi F, Kyozira C, Mukooyo E, et al. Strengthening district-based  
691 health reporting through the district health management information software system: the  
692 Ugandan experience. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2014 Dec 13;14(1):40.
- 693 29. Diallo CO, Schiøler KL, Drabo KM, Samuelsen H. Stakeholder’s perception of the health  
694 information system performance in Burkina Faso. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2023;44(155):155.



- 695 30. Garrib A, Stoops N, Mckenzie A, Dlamini L, Govender T, et al. An evaluation of the District  
696 Health Information System in rural South Africa. South African Medical Journal. 2008;98(7).  
697 31. Kiberu VM, Matovu JK, Makumbi F, Kyoziira C, Mukooyo E, et al. Strengthening district-based  
698 health reporting through the district health management information software system: the  
699 Ugandan experience. BMC Med Inform Decis Making. 2014 May 13;14(1):40.  
700 32. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, et al. A new framework for developing  
701 and evaluating complex interventions: update of Medical Research Council guidance. BMJ.  
702 2021 Sep 30;374.




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3