

Title: A Methodological Review of Patient Healthcare-Seeking Journeys from Symptom Onset to Receipt of Care

Authors:

Charity Oga-Omenka^{1,2}, Angelina Sassi^{2,3}, Nathaly Aguilera Vasquez², Namrata Rana^{2,4}, Mohammad Yasir Essar^{2,4}, Darryl Ku¹, Hanna Diploma¹, Lavanya Huria^{2,3}, Kiran Saqib¹, Rishav Das², Guy Stallworthy⁵, Madhukar Pai^{2,3}

Affiliations:

1. School of Public Health Sciences, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada
2. McGill International TB Centre, Montreal, Canada
3. School of Population and Global Health, McGill University, Montreal, Canada
4. Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University
5. Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

Key Questions

What is already known about this subject?

- Accessing healthcare is challenging for half of the world's population.
- Understanding healthcare-seeking obstacles can help to expose bottlenecks in healthcare delivery and improve access.

What does this study add?

- We synthesized the different methodologies used by researchers to portray healthcare-seeking trajectories.
- We also provide a conceptual framework and recommendations for patient journey analyses.

How do the new findings imply?

- Our analysis revealed a lack of consistency in how patient journeys to care are represented and a notable complexity in generating insightful depictions of journeys to care.
- The use of our conceptual framework, namely the data points and indicators, could increase the reliability and generalisability patient journey analyses.

2 **Abstract**

3 **Background:** For many diseases, early diagnosis and treatment are more cost-effective,
4 reduce community spread of infectious diseases, and result in better patient outcomes.
5 However, healthcare-seeking and diagnoses for several diseases are unnecessarily delayed.
6 For example, in 2022, 3 million and 5.6 million people living with TB and HIV respectively
7 were undiagnosed. Many patients never access appropriate testing, remain undiagnosed after
8 testing or drop out shortly after treatment initiation. This underscores challenges in accessing
9 healthcare for many individuals. Understanding healthcare-seeking obstacles can expose
10 bottlenecks in healthcare delivery and promote equity of access. We aimed to synthesize
11 methodologies used to portray healthcare-seeking trajectories and provide a conceptual
12 framework for patient journey analyses.

13 **Design/Methods:** We conducted a literature search using keywords related to “patient/care
14 healthcare-seeking/journey/pathway analysis” AND “TB” OR “infectious/pulmonary
15 diseases” in PubMed, CINAHL, Web of Science and Global Health (OVID). From a
16 preliminary scoping search and expert consultation, we developed a conceptual framework
17 and honed the key data points necessary to understand patients’ healthcare-seeking journeys,
18 which then served as our inclusion criteria for the subsequent expanded review. Retained
19 papers included at least three of these data points.

20 **Results:** Our conceptual framework included 5 data points and 7 related indicators that
21 contribute to understanding patients’ experiences during healthcare-seeking. We retained 66
22 studies that met our eligibility criteria. Most studies (56.3%) were in Central and Southeast
23 Asia, explored TB healthcare-seeking experiences (76.6%), were quantitative (67.2%), used
24 in-depth, semi-structured, or structured questionnaires for data collection (73.4%).
25 Healthcare-seeking journeys were explored, measured and portrayed in different ways, with
26 no consistency in included information.

27 **Conclusions:** We synthesized various methodologies in exploring patient healthcare-seeking
28 journeys and found crucial data points necessary to understand challenges patients encounter
29 when interacting with health systems. and offer insights to researchers and healthcare
30 practitioners. Our framework proposes a standardized approach to patient journey research.

31 **Introduction**

32 In 2021, 4.5 billion people or more than half of the world's population lacked access to the
33 healthcare they needed.¹ Diagnoses for several diseases are unnecessarily delayed,
34 contributing to prolonged suffering and avoidable deaths. For example, in 2022, an estimated
35 3 million and 5.6 million people living with TB and HIV respectively were undiagnosed.^{2,3}
36 A significant number of individuals with life-threatening illnesses never access appropriate
37 testing, remain undiagnosed after testing or drop out before or shortly after treatment
38 initiation.⁴⁻⁷ Some reasons for these gaps in testing, diagnosis, and treatment include
39 individual and interpersonal dynamics like lack of information about the disease and
40 available resources, stigma, financial and cultural factors, symptom minimization, self-
41 medication and mistrust of public sector healthcare⁸⁻¹³; as well as health system factors like
42 poor coverage of services, low index of suspicion among providers, lengthy procedures,
43 misdiagnosis, and poor referral mechanisms between the public and private sectors.^{10,14-16}
44 These numbers underscore the substantial public health challenge that accessing healthcare
45 poses for many individuals. Despite these barriers, early diagnosis and treatment remain
46 critical for significantly improving clinical outcomes and reducing costs for both patients and
47 the healthcare system, especially for infectious diseases like TB and HIV where early
48 intervention is the most practical method to interrupt transmission.^{10,17}

49 The World Health Organization (WHO) adopted the integrated people-centered health
50 services framework in 2016 to prioritize people's needs and expectations by engaging
51 communities, reorienting models of care, coordinating services across sectors and
52 strengthening governance and accountability.¹⁸⁻²⁰ Person-centered care emphasizes treating
53 patients as individuals and focuses on providing integrated care, patient information and
54 support, and responding to patients' values and preferences.^{21,22} To improve person-centered
55 care, it is important to understand current patient journeys to care²³. These studies shed light
56 on the obstacles patients encounter during healthcare-seeking, expose healthcare delivery
57 bottlenecks and promote equitable access.²⁴⁻²⁶ Understanding patient journeys is critical for
58 making services more patient focused, by identifying gaps in service delivery to ensure
59 quality care is accessible early in the healthcare-seeking process.^{12,27-29} While patient
60 pathways analyses are emerging, lack of consistency in methods, or shared terms and
61 frameworks makes it difficult to interpret across settings. Our review aimed to synthesize
62 methodologies used to portray patients' healthcare-seeking trajectories and provide a clear

63 conceptual framework for patient journey analyses. In this review, we have explored
64 methodologies used to highlight patient healthcare-seeking experiences from various disease
65 contexts, including TB.

66 While also commonly referred to as patient pathways in literature, the healthcare-seeking
67 journey analysis emphasized in this paper differs from the process analytics used to map and
68 improve integration for in-hospital processes between the different departments³⁰⁻³³ or the
69 pathway analysis to determine alignment between population health needs and available
70 services.^{34,35} Patient journey analyses characterize and quantify the pathways to care of
71 specific patients, detailing not only the total delays between key milestones³⁶⁻³⁹ but also the
72 number and sequence of visits to healthcare providers.^{27-29,40}

73 Current literature has yet to explore the advantages and limitations of different methods of
74 depicting healthcare-seeking trajectories and identifying the key variables that highlight these
75 obstacles. The combination of conceptual and methodological reviews has been used widely
76 in literature to critically appraise different research methods.⁴¹⁻⁴³ A conceptual review is
77 focused on key data points or variables and their relationships, with the goal of categorizing
78 and describing them relevant to a particular topic.⁴⁴⁻⁴⁶ Methodological reviews differ from a
79 traditional systematic review by prioritizing *methods* over *results*,⁴⁷⁻⁵⁰ synthesizing study
80 quality by examining design, data collection and analysis.^{47,48} This review aims to synthesize
81 methods for portraying patients' trajectories for TB and other diseases and propose a
82 conceptual framework for analyzing these journeys.

83 **Methods**

84 **Review Objectives**

85 The primary aim of our review was to assess relevant current practices, methodologies and
86 relevant data points used to map patient care trajectories for TB and related diseases, focusing
87 on the patient healthcare-seeking journey from symptom onset to care outcome across diverse
88 healthcare settings and conditions. The research question was: 'How do the methodologies
89 employed for patient journey analysis (PJA) differ, what are their strengths and limitations?'.
90

90 **Review Approach**

91 We use the conceptual and methodological review approaches, which adapt their scope and
92 methods during the process.^{48,50} We used an iterative approach, using literature review and
93 expert consultations to understand the patient healthcare-seeking journey. This entailed

94 extensive database searches and consultations with experts in tuberculosis care and social
95 science, and refining review findings based on iterative feedback.

96 **Search Strategy and Framework Development**

97 Our process comprised of three steps: (1) A scoping literature search to identify relevant data
98 points and methods; (2) Expert consultation to identify conceptual papers and recommended
99 measures, followed by the development of conceptual map; and (3) An updated literature
100 search targeting papers that included identified data points.

101 *Initial scoping literature search*

102 We performed a scoping search on PubMed, Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar
103 for publications on healthcare-seeking trajectories and delays related to TB diagnosis or
104 treatment. The initial search was run in November 2021 (updated later, see below) and was
105 restricted to peer-reviewed publications in the English language with no date restrictions. We
106 also consulted with TB care experts to identify additional papers.

107 *Development of the conceptual framework*

108 Our conceptual framework was derived from the initial literature search followed by expert
109 consultations. The lead author reviewed the literature and identified multiple criteria—
110 variables, factors, and themes—that describe and influence patients’ journeys to care. The
111 research team had several meetings to discuss, clarify, and define the key features to be
112 included in the framework, culminating in developing the first draft. To validate the
113 framework, the team sought expert consultation from experienced researchers and healthcare
114 professionals in the field of TB and HIV care in several meetings, workshops, and
115 conferences to identify additional data points, and ensure a comprehensive understanding of
116 key methodological considerations. The conceptual framework, identifying key variables or
117 themes for two care outcomes – diagnosis and treatment, was refined based on feedback from
118 these interactions and used to define the inclusion criteria. As a result of this process, we
119 decided to expand our initial literature search to cover methodologies used to describe patient
120 healthcare-seeking journeys for infectious or pulmonary diseases, or diseases with non-
121 specific symptoms or lengthy diagnostic procedures – including HIV, COVID, malaria and
122 cancer, to strengthen the insights gained from this methodological review beyond what could
123 be inferred from TB research alone. Defining the conceptual framework helped with the rest
124 of the methodological review to identify the lack of consistency in methods and analytic
125 approaches.

126 *Updated literature search and inclusion criteria*

127 We systematically searched PubMed, CINAHL, Web of Science, Global Health (OVID), and
128 Scopus for publications on healthcare-seeking trajectories, delays to diagnosis or treatment,
129 and access to diagnosis or treatment, for TB, HIV, malaria, COVID-19, and other respiratory
130 and lung disorders. The initial search of November 2021 was updated in April 2022 and
131 searched again in May 2023. Our search strategy can be found in *Supplement 1*.

132 To be included in our review, studies had to include at least three of the identified data points
133 for assessing patient journeys within the healthcare system in low- and middle-income
134 countries (*Table 1*). We excluded case studies of individuals; non-scientific publications such
135 as opinions or editorials; systematic reviews and meta-analyses; studies on extrapulmonary
136 tuberculosis (EPTB), latent TB, and pediatric TB (children under 15 years); studies focusing
137 solely on the cascade of care; articles written in languages other than English or French; and
138 articles that did not provide a full report of the results of an experimental study (abstract,
139 reviews, commentaries, proposals, methodology papers, or case study).

140 References retrieved from all databases were imported into Covidence. Title and abstract
141 screening were carried out by five members of the team (NAV, COO, DK, AS, and MYE)
142 and full-text screening by four members of the team (COO, LH, NAV, and MYE), meeting
143 regularly to review progress and resolve conflicts. Agreement on inclusion between two
144 reviewers was required for inclusion into the study. Conflicts were resolved by a third
145 reviewer when necessary.

146 There are no clear guidelines for appraising the quality and risk of bias for methodological
147 reviews.^{47,48} The focus of the appraisal process for this type of review should be on
148 distinguishing between papers stemming from flawed empirical studies and those presenting
149 well-argued theories.⁴⁷ We used the JBI Critical Appraisal Checklists⁵¹ for each applicable
150 study type (qualitative, cross-sectional, cohort, or prevalence study) and the Mixed Methods
151 Appraisal Tool⁵² for mixed-methods studies to evaluate the methodological rigor and
152 reliability of the included studies and identify potential biases and limitations within the
153 studies. Quality assessment was carried out by six members of the team (AS, NAV, RD, DK,
154 MYE, and KS) using an electronic form which was piloted by AS and NR (*Supplement 3*).
155 Quality assessment for each paper was done by two independent reviewers and answers were
156 finalized during a consensus meeting led by AS and MYE.

157 **Data extraction**

158 Data extraction was done by six members of the team (AS, MYE, NR, DK, HD, and CO)
159 using an electronic data extraction form hosted on Covidence (*Supplement 2*). The data
160 extraction form was piloted by CO, NAV, LH, and NR prior to data extraction. The data
161 extraction form aimed to collect general information (author name, publication year,
162 country/setting, disease type, study design/data sources, study type and sample size), the
163 journey criteria included for diagnosis and treatment, a general description of the
164 methodology and analysis for each study, as well as strengths and limitations. Data extraction
165 for each paper was done by two independent reviewers, and answers were finalized during a
166 consensus meeting led by AS and MYE.

167 **Ethical considerations**

168 No human participants were involved in this review.

169 **Funding and conflicts of interest**

170 This work was supported by the McGill International TB Centre with funding from the Bill &
171 Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF) [grant number INV-022420], and by the School of
172 Public Health Sciences, University of Waterloo. MP was also supported by a Canada
173 Research Chair award from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR). The CIHR
174 did not have any role in the conceptualization or writing of the manuscript or in the decision
175 to submit it for publication. GS, a co-author of this manuscript and an employee of the
176 BMGF provided valuable inputs on the study design, analysis, and revision of the
177 manuscript. MP serves as an advisor to several non-profit organizations including Bill &
178 Melinda Gates Foundation, WHO, Stop TB Partnership and FIND. He has no financial or
179 industry conflicts. All other authors declare no conflicts of interest. The authors were not
180 precluded from accessing data in the study and accept responsibility to submit for
181 publication.

182 **Results**

183 **Definition of Key Data points and the Conceptual Map**

184 The care continuum describes the sequence of activities needed to be fully engaged in clinical
185 care for diseases like TB and HIV that requiring lengthy health system procedures to achieve
186 an outcome.⁵³⁻⁵⁵ Our patient journey framework, developed after the initial review of
187 literature, highlights the patient healthcare-seeking trajectory across three reference points:
188 symptom recognition, diagnosis, and treatment initiation. Our review illustrates how patients
189 consult various types of providers in differing numbers as they seek care between these

190 reference points. To characterize each visit within a patient's journey, we identified five key
191 data points: (1) the date of the first visit relative to symptom onset, (2) the type of provider or
192 facility visited (e.g., chemist, general practitioner, specialist, laboratory, hospital), (3) the
193 sector of the provider or facility (for-profit, non-profit, public), (4) the sequence of the visit
194 (first visit, second visit, etc.), and (5) the outcome of the visit (no outcome, diagnosis,
195 treatment initiation). Using these data points, we can compute various indicators for both
196 individual patients and aggregated patient populations. These measures include (1) the
197 number of days and (2) visits until care outcome (diagnosis or treatment initiation), (3) the
198 proportion of visits to different types of providers, (4) the contribution of various provider
199 types to care outcome (diagnosis or treatment) as well as to (6) delays or missed
200 opportunities, and (7) the number of patients exhibiting different patterns or sequences of
201 provider visits. This comprehensive analysis can inform strategies to optimize patient care
202 experiences and reduce delays in diagnosis and treatment.

203

204 *Figure 1: Conceptual framework of healthcare-seeking journeys*

205

206 Our conceptual framework (*Figure 1*) illustrates the steps in a patient journey and the time
207 delays between key milestones of symptom recognition, diagnosis, and treatment. Starting
208 with symptom recognition, factors like symptom minimization and lack of knowledge of
209 services have been shown to influence healthcare-seeking delays, while the type and sector of
210 first provider have been shown to influence number of subsequent encounters before and
211 timeliness of diagnosis.^{10,11,56,57} Several health system factors have been shown to influence
212 the timing and number of encounters between the reference points of diagnosis and
213 treatment.^{10,11,58} Delays are conceptualized as healthcare-seeking, provider and treatment
214 delays, with diagnostic delays being the sum of healthcare-seeking and provider delays, and
215 health system delays representing the sum of provider and treatment delays.^{27,29}

216

217 *Table 1 – The key data points of patient healthcare-seeking journey*

218

219

220 **Characteristics of Included Studies**

221 The PRISMA flow diagram (*Figure 2*) shows search results from the five main databases.
222 Out of the 12160 studies whose titles and abstracts were initially screened from those
223 databases, 297 studies were assessed for retrieval and eligibility, 231 were excluded through
224 full-text review, and 66 studies were retained that met our eligibility criteria. Each of these 66
225 studies (our unit of analysis) was a patient journey analysis publication.

226 Out of the 66 retained studies, we assessed 21 to be of high quality, 37 to be medium quality,
227 and 8 to be of low quality. There were no major differences in the methods for the studies
228 assessed with different qualities.

229

230 *Figure 2 – Prisma diagram of study selection process*

231

232 *Table 2* summarizes journey methodology characteristics of included studies. Many studies
233 were quantitative (82%), were conducted in lower middle-income countries (56%), in Asia
234 (59%), and covered TB care journeys (67%). Other diseases include the following: cancer
235 (6.1%), acute febrile illnesses (4.5%), malaria (4.5%), chest symptomatic (3.0%), multiple
236 infectious diseases (3.0%), non-communicable diseases (3.0%), sexually transmitted
237 infections (3.0%), under-five mortality (3.0%), and COVID-19 (1.5%).

238

239 **Table 2: Characteristics of included manuscripts**

240

241 *Figure 3a* summarizes the distribution of patient healthcare-seeking data points aggregated
242 across all included studies. The majority included information on location/provider where
243 treatment was initiated (67%), sector of the providers visited (61%), time to diagnosis (56%),
244 location/provider where a diagnosis was made (55%), number of provider encounters to
245 diagnosis (53%), and type of the providers visited (50%). Proportions of patients per number
246 of encounters to diagnosis (33%) and treatment (20%), and number of provider encounters to
247 treatment (30%) were less commonly explored in the included papers. *Figure 3b* shows that
248 most of the patient healthcare-seeking data points were reported within studies the four
249 disease groups. Type of facility/provider where treatment was started is more frequently
250 found in articles focused on malaria and fevers and other infectious diseases compared to

251 other disease types. Most categories of data were available in all types of study design
252 (*Figure 3b*).

253 *Figure 3: Distribution of journey data points across all included studies, by disease types and*
254 *study designs*

255

256 *Table 3* details the depictions of healthcare-seeking journeys and statistical methods used in
257 the included studies. The most common forms of depicting patient healthcare-seeking
258 journeys were tables quantifying delays and/or journeys (48%) and flowcharts (48%).
259 Descriptive statistics (88%), multivariate regressions (45%), chi-squared test (45%), and
260 logistic regression (36%) were the most frequently used statistical methods.

261

262 **Table 3: Journey depictions and statistical methodologies**

263

264 Table 4 depicts the outcome measures and independent variables used in the included
265 articles. Overall, patient delay (58%) was the most common outcome measure for the 66
266 included studies. Over one-third (42%) of included articles did not report all possible delays
267 that could have been reported in the manuscript; for example, if the authors reported
268 diagnostic delay (defined^{27,29} as the number of days between the onset of symptoms and the
269 date of diagnosis and composed of patient delay and provider delay) but did not also report
270 both patient and provider delay. Other than overall delay, the most reported outcome
271 measures of patient journeys were number of visits to diagnosis (36%), sector of facility and
272 type of provider for all instances of healthcare-seeking (36% and 33%, respectively), and
273 type of provider for initial healthcare-seeking visit (32%). Time to initial healthcare-seeking
274 was reported in 29% of included studies. Patient age (97%) and sex or gender (92%) were the
275 two most used independent variables among the 66 included studies, followed by level of
276 education (62%) and occupation (59%). Among patient health status and patient behavior
277 variables, type of disease (30%), presence of any comorbidities (27%), and HIV status (27%)
278 were often included as independent variables. Some patient healthcare-seeking journey
279 characteristics were used as independent variables in analyses of delays, for example, number
280 of visits (30%), sector of facility (39%) and type of provider (38%) of initial healthcare-
281 seeking visit.

282

283 **Table 4 – Outcome measures and independent variables used.**

284 **Discussions**

285 In our review, we aimed to understand and characterize methodologies used to assess patient
286 journeys to care. Understanding patient journeys helps pinpoint bottlenecks and interventions
287 to minimize missed diagnostic and treatment opportunities among various types of healthcare
288 providers, improve hospital coordination and reduce overall delays in care. Moreover,
289 accurately characterizing aggregate patient journeys between different locations or across
290 different times enhances progress monitoring and policymaking. This requires developing
291 better, consistent metrics and more insightful data visualizations.

292 Our analysis revealed a lack of consistency in how patient journeys to care are represented
293 and a notable complexity in generating insightful depictions of journeys to care, indicating
294 the challenges in using data to guide healthcare interventions effectively. The scarcity of
295 tools and clear guidelines for analyzing and presenting such complex data further complicates
296 this task, highlighting an urgent need for simple, open-access tools and standardized
297 analytical methods to improve our understanding of patient healthcare-seeking journeys.

298 We posit that our proposed conceptual framework, identified data points and indicators
299 address this knowledge gap effectively, offering guidance to improve consistency in the
300 analysis of patient journey or healthcare-seeking experiences.

301 The reviewed papers typically addressed an average of four identified key data points, with
302 patient delays, and the type or sector of facility where the patient was diagnosed or treated
303 being the most often examined. We also noted that the number of provider visits needed for
304 diagnosis or treatment were only reported in 24% and 12% respectively. In our view, the
305 number of visits to diagnosis and treatment are among the most important data points for
306 understanding patient care barriers, as both give us an insight into delays as well as the direct
307 and indirect costs of care. Overall, as none of these factors alone fully characterize patient
308 experiences, or highlight missed diagnostic and treatment opportunities, reporting all data
309 points relevant to the outcome under review (diagnosis or treatment) is crucial for a
310 comprehensive view of patient care journeys. Thus, our methodological review highlighted
311 the key features of patient trajectories (*Table 1*) that offer insights into the missed
312 opportunities. Additionally, we recommend additional statistical analyses to identify risk
313 factors for having more provider visits or longer delays in the patient care continuum using

314 patients' sociodemographic characteristics and health status (*Table 4*). We propose the need
315 for an open source analysis package for Patient Journey Analyses.

316 **Strengths and limitations of study designs**

317 We assessed the strengths and limitations for each study design. Cross-sectional studies
318 provide overview of patient proportions and care-seeking behaviours and quantify patient
319 proportions between visits or delays. Still, varying tools and measures across studies can
320 make collating results challenging and lead to inconsistencies. Cohort studies excel in
321 examining care-seeking behaviors over time and identifying risk factors for delays, providing
322 insights into temporal relationships and complex journeys, though they require large sample
323 sizes and are also vulnerable to recall bias, especially in studies of diseases with low
324 prevalence.

325 Despite being more resource-intensive, mixed methods research combines quantitative data
326 with rich qualitative insights from key informants. Qualitative research delves deep into the
327 experiences and obstacles within patient journeys, offering flexibility in adapting to different
328 contexts, but is similarly limited by recall bias, high costs, and small sample sizes.

329

330 **Implications for Future Research**

331 Patient journey analyses are prone to potential inconsistencies in data collection, particularly
332 regarding sampling of patients, measuring encounters by number of providers or visits, and
333 the measurement of time reference points (symptom onset, diagnosis, and treatment). Future
334 research should focus on developing clear, practical recommendations for conducting patient
335 journey analyses and creating open-access tools to overcome methodological and resource
336 limitations. These advancements are crucial for researchers and teams aiming to analyze
337 patient journeys effectively to identify and address care bottlenecks. Learning from our
338 experiences and adopting these strategies will improve the reliability and comparability of
339 patient journey analyses in future studies.

340 To mitigate recall bias, researchers need to pilot test study instruments, train data collection
341 teams, employ specific sampling strategies (e.g., recruiting patients diagnosed within the last
342 six months), and utilize data triangulation, including mixed methods and comparison to
343 earlier studies where possible. Additionally, data collectors need to be creative in helping
344 patients recall key dates, e.g. with use of local or national events, and/or use clinical records
345 to verify patient-reported dates, where feasible.

346 Conceptually, incorporating patient cost surveys into journey analyses is another opportunity
347 for a comprehensive understanding of patient care barriers, particularly where these include
348 incurred costs for all healthcare provider visits. Cost surveys are often conducted by
349 economists with a primary focus on cost analysis, and rarely provide detailed insights into the
350 nuances of patient journeys. Conversely, patient journeys analyses rarely include cost data.
351 This disconnect between cost analysis and journey mapping presents a significant gap in the
352 literature and integrating both aspects could provide a more holistic view of patient
353 experiences and economic impacts. To address this gap, we recommend that future patient
354 cost surveys be designed to enable rigorous analysis of patient journeys, and vice versa. Such
355 an approach would facilitate a better understanding of both the financial and experiential data
356 points of patient care-seeking behaviours. Ultimately, this dual-focus approach could
357 significantly enhance the quality of insights derived from patient surveys, leading to
358 improved patient-centric service delivery and better-informed healthcare policy decisions.

359 **Conclusions**


360 Our findings underscore the critical need for better approaches to compare patient journeys
361 and develop interventions, emphasizing the importance of clear guidelines and accessible
362 tools to facilitate this analysis. This work lays the groundwork for future efforts to enhance
363 access, quality, and equity in healthcare service provision.

364

369 Table 1 – The key data points of patient healthcare-seeking journey

Reference points	Data points	Purpose	How to measure (quantitatively and qualitatively)	Studies
Symptoms recognition	Date symptoms started	To determine the time when symptoms started or when patients recognized their symptoms	This is a date variable. Can also be expressed in time increments (e.g., weeks, months, etc.).	28,59-91
	Type of provider first visited after symptom onset	To identify the first healthcare provider that patients sought for their symptoms until diagnosis after recognition	E.g. physician, nurse, pharmacist, laboratory technician, medicine vendor	28,60-65,68,69,79,82,84-88,90-106
	Sector of facility first visited	To specify type of facility for that encounter	E.g. private sector, public sector, or informal sector	28,60-65,68,79,84-88,90-106
Symptom recognition to Diagnosis	Date of (or time to) diagnosis	To determine how long it took for patients to get diagnosed	This is a date variable. Can also be expressed in time increments (e.g., weeks, months, etc.).	28,59-91,93,96
	Number of provider encounters to diagnosis	To identify the number of visits it took for patients to go from the first encounter until diagnosis	1st encounter, 2nd encounter, etc.	28,40,59-64,67,69,71-73,77,79,81,83,84,86,88,90-93,96-98,102,103,105,107-110
	Type of provider for each encounter to diagnosis	To specify the type of provider the patients saw at each encounter	E.g. physician, nurse, pharmacist, laboratory technician, medicine vendor	28,60,63-65,68,69,79,82,84-88,90-106,111
	Sector of facility for each encounter	To specify type of facility for where patients were diagnosed	E.g. private sector, public sector, or informal sector	28,60,63-65,68,79,84-88,90-106,111
	Proportions of patients per number of encounters to diagnosis	To determine the proportion of patients who had that many encounters. Also helps to identify missed opportunities for that provider	Expressed as % of 1st encounter, 2nd encounter, etc.; or number of patients at each reference point, e.g. "20% of patients had 1-2 encounters, 30% had 3 encounters..."	28,60,62,63,66,73,77,79,83,87,88,91,92,95,98,102,103,108,110,112
Diagnosis to treatment	Date of (or time to) treatment initiation	To determine how long it took for patients to start treatment once diagnosed	This is a date variable. Can also be expressed in time increments (e.g., weeks, months, etc.).	28,60-66,68-73,75-77,80,81,85-87,89,93-96,103,105,112-118

Number of provider encounters to treatment initiation	To identify the number of visits to a provider that it took for patients to start treatment after diagnosis.	1st encounter, 2nd encounter, etc.	60,63,72,75-77,81,85,87,93,94,96,99,101,103,105,110,114,115,117
Type of provider for each encounter to treatment initiation	To specify the type of provider the patients saw at each encounter	E.g. physician, nurse, pharmacist, laboratory technician, medicine vendor	60-63,85,87,88,90,91,93,94,96,99,101,103,105,111,113,119-121
Sector of facility for each encounter to treatment initiation	To specify type of facility where patients were started on treatment	E.g. private sector, public sector, or informal sector	60,63,85,87,88,90,91,93,94,96,99,101,103,105,119-121
Proportions of patients per number of encounters to treatment initiation	To determine the proportion of patients who had that many encounters. Also helps to identify missed opportunities for that provider	Expressed as % of 1st encounter, 2nd encounter, etc.; or number of patients at each reference point, e.g. "20% of patients had 1-2 encounters, 30% had 3 encounters..."	62,63,76,83,85,87,93,95,105,110,112,120



370

371 *Figure 2 – Prisma diagram of study selection process*

372

373 **Table 2: Characteristics of included manuscripts**

Characteristic	N = 66 ^I
Year of publication	2017 (1997 – 2022)
Region	
Asia (Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Singapore, Syrian Arab Republic, Taiwan, Tajikistan, Thailand)	39 (59%)
Africa (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Gambia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Uganda, Zimbabwe)	19 (29%)
Oceania (Australia, Vanuatu)	3 (4.5%)
Americas (Brazil, Canada)	2 (3.0%)
Europe (Switzerland, UK)	2 (3.0%)
Multi-country (France, Germany, Japan, United States)	1 (1.5%)
Income level	

Characteristic	N = 66¹
Low income	10 (15%)
Lower middle income	37 (56%)
Upper middle income	11 (17%)
High income	8 (12%)
Low to middle income (multi-country)	0 (0%)
Disease	
Tuberculosis	44 (67%)
Cancer	4 (6.1%)
Acute febrile illnesses	3 (4.5%)
Malaria	3 (4.5%)
Non-communicable diseases	3 (4.5%)
Chest symptomatic	2 (3.0%)
Multiple infectious diseases	2 (3.0%)
Sexually transmitted infections	2 (3.0%)
Under-five mortality	2 (3.0%)
COVID-19	1 (1.5%)
Study design	
Cross-sectional study	51 (77%)
Qualitative Research	7 (11%)
Mixed Methods	5 (7.6%)
Cohort Study	3 (4.6%)
Data type	
Quantitative	54 (82%)
Qualitative	7 (11%)
Mixed	5 (7.6%)
Quality appraisal	
Low quality	8 (12%)
Medium quality	37 (56%)
High quality	21 (32%)
Total sample size	283 (26 – 23,961)
Number of male participants^{2,3}	186 (2 – 12,987)
Number of female participants^{2,4}	100 (12 – 10,974)
¹ Median (Range); n (%)	
² Sex of participants unspecified (n=4)	
³ Only women included (n=1)	
⁴ Only men included (n=1)	

374




Figure 3a: Distribution of patient healthcare-seeking journey data points




Figure 3b: Coverage of patient journey data points by disease studied




Figure 3c: Coverage of patient journey data points by study design

375 Figure 3: Distribution of journey data points across all included studies, by disease types and
 376 study designs

377
 378

Table 3: Journey depictions and statistical methodologies

Characteristic	N = 66 [†]
Depictions of patient journeys to care	
Tables quantifying delays/journeys	32 (48%)
Flow chart	32 (48%)
Bar chart	12 (18%)
Authors' own depiction (other)	9 (14%)
Matrix representing patient journeys	6 (9.1%)
Diagram summarizing types of delays	5 (7.6%)
Sankey chart	3 (4.5%)
Scatter plot	1 (1.5%)
Statistical methodologies used	
Main statistical method used per article	
Logistic regression only	18 (27%)
Chi-square test only	7 (11%)
Independent T-test and Chi-square test only	7 (11%)
More than one regression method	7 (11%)
Thematic analysis only	7 (11%)
Descriptive statistics only	5 (7.6%)
Independent T-test only	5 (7.6%)
Mixed methods	4 (6.1%)
Linear regression only	3 (4.5%)
Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test only	1 (1.5%)
Quantile regression only	1 (1.5%)

Survival analysis only	1 (1.5%)
Descriptive statistics	58 (88%)
Chi-squared test	30 (45%)
Independent T-test	22 (33%)
Fisher's exact test	8 (12%)
Mann-Whitney test	8 (12%)
Kruskal-Wallis test	4 (6.1%)
Analysis of variance (ANOVA)	3 (4.5%)
Multivariate regression (all types)	30 (45%)
Logistic regression	24 (36%)
Linear regression	8 (12%)
Survival analysis	3 (4.5%)
Poisson regression	2 (3.0%)
Quantile (median) regression	2 (3.0%)
Thematic analysis of qualitative data	11 (17%)
^l n (%)	

379

380

381

Table 4 – Outcome measures and independent variables used

Type	Variable	N = 66 ^l
Outcome measures	Delays	
	Healthcare-seeking or patient delay	38 (58%)
	Provider delay	15 (23%)
	Treatment delay	16 (24%)
	Diagnostic delay	18 (27%)
	Health system delay	14 (21%)
	Total delay	18 (27%)
	Manuscript did not report all possible delay components	28 (42%)
	Manuscript reported "durations" and defined "delays" as durations above a given threshold	11 (17%)
	Patient journey data points	
	Number of visits to diagnosis	24 (36%)
	Number of visits to treatment initiation	12 (18%)
	Type of provider for all instances of healthcare-seeking	22 (33%)
	Sector of facility for all instances of healthcare-seeking	24 (36%)
	Type of provider for initial healthcare-seeking visit	21 (32%)
	Sector of facility for initial healthcare-seeking visit	15 (23%)
	Type of provider for place of diagnosis	5 (7.6%)
	Sector of facility for place of diagnosis	8 (12%)
	Type of provider for place of treatment	4 (6.1%)
	Sector of facility for place of treatment	6 (9.1%)
Patient sought care for their symptoms	3 (4.5%)	
Number of visits (in general)	4 (6.1%)	

Type	Variable	N = 66 ^l
	Time and date measures	
	Time to initial healthcare-seeking	19 (29%)
	Time to diagnosis	17 (26%)
	Time to treatment	11 (17%)
	Date of symptom onset	5 (7.6%)
	Date of initial healthcare-seeking	6 (9.1%)
	Date of diagnosis	5 (7.6%)
	Date of referral for treatment	3 (4.5%)
	Date of treatment initiation	3 (4.5%)
	Date of treatment completion	2 (3.0%)
	Survival analysis (time to event/death)	2 (3.0%)
	Others	
	Costs of care (at any point)	11 (17%)
	Reasons for seeking care	5 (7.6%)
	Disease prevalence	3 (4.5%)
	Patient knowledge of disease	2 (3.0%)
Qualitative study	4 (6.1%)	
Independent variables	Demographic characteristics	
	Age	64 (97%)
	Sex/Gender	61 (92%)
	Level of education	41 (62%)
	Occupation	39 (59%)
	Income level	30 (45%)
	Literacy	21 (32%)
	Urban/rural	19 (29%)
	Marital status	18 (27%)
	Distance from nearest health facility	13 (20%)
	Place of residence	11 (17%)
	Household size	11 (17%)
	Socioeconomic status	10 (15%)
	Race/Ethnicity	6 (9.1%)
	Health insurance status	5 (7.6%)
	Family structure	5 (7.6%)
	Religious status	4 (6.1%)
	Type of house	4 (6.1%)
Patient health status/behavior		
Type of illness	20 (30%)	

Type	Variable	N = 66 ^l
	Comorbidities	18 (27%)
	HIV status	18 (27%)
	Knowledge of disease	16 (24%)
	Symptoms experienced	15 (23%)
	Diabetes	15 (23%)
	Smoking status	14 (21%)
	Alcohol use	11 (17%)
	History of TB	9 (14%)
	Severity of illness	8 (12%)
	Type of TB (sputum smear positive/negative)	7 (11%)
	Heart disease, cardiovascular disease, or hypertension	7 (11%)
	Duration of symptoms	5 (7.6%)
	Lung disease	4 (6.1%)
	Asthma	4 (6.1%)
	Stigma experienced	4 (6.1%)
	Height/weight/BMI	4 (6.1%)
	Other drug use	3 (4.5%)
	Contact with person with TB	3 (4.5%)
	Patient journey data points	
	Number of visits	20 (30%)
	Type of provider for all instances of healthcare-seeking	15 (23%)
	Sector of facility for all instances of healthcare-seeking	17 (26%)
	Type of provider for initial healthcare-seeking visit	25 (38%)
	Sector of facility for initial healthcare-seeking visit	26 (39%)
	Type of provider for place of diagnosis	5 (7.6%)
	Sector of facility for place of diagnosis	8 (12%)
	Type of provider for place of treatment	6 (9.1%)
	Sector of facility for place of treatment	9 (14%)
	Reason for patient action (any)	18 (27%)
	Sought care for symptoms	6 (9.1%)
	Self-treated	4 (6.1%)
	Chest x-ray ordered	6 (9.1%)
	Hospitalized	2 (3.0%)
	Sector of facility for place of treatment	9 (14%)
	Availability of services	1 (1.5%)

382

383 **Supplementary materials**

384

385 ***Supplement 1 - Methodological Review Search Strategy***

386

387 CINAHL

388 No field selected; Suggest subject terms checked

389 Total: 519 [6 Apr 29], update TB: 19, May 05

390

Data points	Key words
Patient journey	(TI ("Patient pathway analys*" OR PPA OR "treatment delay" OR "health-seeking" OR "healthcare-seeking" "health-seeking delay" OR "care seeking" OR "cascade of care" OR "access to care" OR "healthcare delivery" OR "diagnostic delay" OR "care seeking delay" OR "barriers and facilitators to care" OR "missed opportunit*" OR "care pathway*") OR AB ("Patient pathway analys*" OR PPA OR "treatment delay" OR "health-seeking" OR "health-seeking delay" OR "care seeking" OR "cascade of care" OR "access to care" OR "healthcare delivery" OR "diagnostic delay" OR "care seeking delay" OR "barriers and facilitators to care" OR "missed opportunit*" OR "care pathway*") OR (MH "Diagnosis, Delayed"))
Tuberculosis OR other pulmonary diseases OR selected infectious diseases	((MH "Tuberculosis, Pulmonary") OR TI (tb OR tuberculosis) OR AB (tb OR tuberculosis) OR (MH "Mycobacterium Tuberculosis")) OR (MH "respiratory tract diseases") OR (MH "respiratory disease") OR (MH "respiratory infection") OR (MH "malaria") OR TI (malaria OR HIV OR covid) OR AB (malaria OR HIV OR covid) OR (MH "human immunodeficiency virus") OR (MH "sars-cov-2") OR (MH "covid-19"))

391

392 PubMed

393 Total: 1631 [1625 apr 29], update TB: 100 May 05

394 Health seeking pathways (May 8):

395

Data points	Key words
Patient journey analysis	"Patient pathway analys*" [tw] OR PPA [tw] OR "treatment delay" [tw] OR "healthcare-seeking" [tw] OR "health-seeking delay" [tw] OR "care seeking" [tw] OR "cascade of care" [tw] OR "access to care" [tw] OR "healthcare delivery" [tw] OR "diagnostic delay" [tw] OR "pathway analysis" [tw] OR "care seeking delay" [tw] OR "barriers and facilitators to care" [tw] OR "missed opportunit*" [tw] OR "care pathway*" [tw] OR "delayed diagnosis" [MeSH] OR "critical pathways" [MeSH] OR "patient acceptance of health care"[MeSH]
Tuberculosis	Tuberculosis, Pulmonary [Mesh] OR tb[tw] OR tuberculosis[tw] OR Mycobacterium tuberculosis[Mesh]
Other pulmonary	"respiratory tract diseases"[MeSH Terms] OR "respiration

diseases and relevant infectious disease	disorders"[MeSH Terms] OR respiratory disease[Text Word] OR "respiratory infection" OR "malaria"[MeSH Terms] OR malaria [tw] OR "hiv"[MeSH Terms] OR HIV[tw] OR "human immunodeficiency virus" [tw] "sars-cov-2"[MeSH Terms] OR "covid-19"[MeSH Terms] OR covid [tw]
--	--

396

397 Web of Science
 398 TS search; no filter
 399 Total: 1336 (3518 apr 29), update TB: 58, May 05
 400

Data points	Key words
Patient journey analysis	TS=("Patient pathway analys*" OR PPA OR "treatment delay" OR "healthcare-seeking" OR "health-seeking delay" OR "care seeking" OR "cascade of care" OR "access to care" OR "healthcare delivery" OR "diagnostic delay" OR "care seeking delay" OR "barriers and facilitators to care" OR "missed opportunit*" OR "care pathway*")
Tuberculosis	TS=(tb OR tuberculosis)
Other pulmonary diseases and relevant infectious disease	TS=("respiratory tract diseases" OR "respiration disorders" OR "respiratory disease" OR "respiratory infection" OR "malaria" OR OR HIV OR "human immunodeficiency virus" OR "sars-cov-2" OR "covid-19" OR covid)

401
 402 Global Health via Ovid
 403 Total: 932 (2798 apr 29), update TB: 100 May 05
 404 No filter
 405

Data points	Key words
Patient journey analysis	("Patient pathway analys*" OR PPA OR "treatment delay" OR "healthcare-seeking" OR "health-seeking delay" OR "care seeking" OR "cascade of care" OR "access to care" OR "healthcare delivery" OR "diagnostic delay" OR "care seeking delay" OR "barriers and facilitators to care" OR "missed opportunit*" OR "care pathway*").mp.
Tuberculosis	(tb OR tuberculosis).mp.
	("respiratory tract diseases" or "respiration disorders" or "respiratory disease" or "respiratory infection" or malaria or HIV or "human immunodeficiency virus" or "sars-cov-2" or covid-19 or covid).mp.

406
 407

408 **Supplement 2 - Data extraction form**

409 **General information**

First author last name	[Open text field]
Year of publication	[Open text field]
Country/setting as specific as possible	[Open text field]
Disease type TB, HIV, malaria, etc.	[Open text field]
Study design/Data sources e.g. population-based surveys, patient interviews	[Open text field]
Quantitative/Qualitative/Mixed	[Open text field]
Total sample size Indicate sex of participants if available	[Open text field]

410

411 **Patient healthcare-seeking journey data points included**

<u>Number of provider encounters to diagnosis</u> Does the paper report the number of visits to a HC provider that it took for patients to go from initial healthcare-seeking for their symptoms until diagnosis? e.g. "On average, patients had 5 encounters before being diagnosed"	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear
<u>Type of provider for each encounter</u> Does the paper mention which type of provider the patients saw? (expressed as % of 1st encounter, 2nd encounter, etc.; or, number of patients who went to each type of provider)	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear
<u>Sector of facility for each encounter</u> Does the paper mention whether the providers are in the private sector, public sector, or informal sector?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear
<u>Proportions of patients per number of encounters to diagnosis</u> For each number of encounters, do they say the proportion of patients who had that many encounters between initial healthcare-seeking and diagnosis? e.g. "20% of patients had 1-2 encounters, 30% had 3 encounters..."	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear
<u>Time to diagnosis</u> Do they give how long it took for patients to get diagnosed in time increments (e.g. precise dates or time in days, weeks, months, etc.)?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear
<u>Location/provider where diagnosis was made</u> Do they say what type of health facility or provider the patients received their diagnosis from?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear
<u>Number of provider encounters to treatment</u> Does the paper report the number of visits to a HC provider that it took for patients to start treatment from the first provider encounter or the point of diagnosis? e.g. "On average, patients had 5 encounters between initial provider contact/diagnosis to receiving treatment"	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear
<u>Time to treatment</u> Do they give how long it took for patients to start treatment in time increments (e.g. precise dates or time in days, weeks, months, etc.)?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear

<p><u>Location/provider where treatment was made</u> Does the paper say the type of health facility or provider the patients first received and continued their treatment at?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear</p>
<p><u>Proportions of patients per number of encounters to treatment</u> For each number of encounters, do the authors report the proportion of patients who had that many encounters between initial healthcare-seeking and treatment? Does the paper specify proportion per encounter for each step in the cascade up to treatment (First encounter after symptom onset -> Testing -> Diagnosis -> Treatment)? e.g. "20% of patients had 1-2 encounters, 30% had 3 encounters..."</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear</p>
<p><u>Alignment of services</u> Do the authors do an analysis of the services available to the study population? (e.g. X% of clinics provide TB diagnosis, provide chest X-rays, provide Xpert)</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear</p>

412

413

Journey methodology & analysis

<p><u>Name or description of journey methodology (type of chart)</u> e.g. Hansen-Chin, flowchart, Sankey chart, etc. Indicate if author's own methodology or replication of previous one. If author's own, indicate main components.</p>	<p>[Open text field]</p>
<p><u>Summary of analysis</u> Description of statistical analysis</p>	<p>[Open text field]</p>
<p><u>Outcome variables or major themes</u></p>	<p>[Open text field]</p>
<p><u>Strengths</u> If authors tried to limit recall bias, indicate how.</p>	<p>[Open text field]</p>
<p><u>Limitations</u></p>	<p>[Open text field]</p>
<p><u>Variables of interest or minor themes</u> Indicate the specific outcome that the variable is in reference to (cost, delay, access, etc.)</p>	<p>[Open text field]</p>

414

415

Outcome measures

<p><u>Delays</u> Select all that apply</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Patient delay <input type="checkbox"/> Provider delay <input type="checkbox"/> Treatment delay <input type="checkbox"/> Diagnostic delay <input type="checkbox"/> Health system delay <input type="checkbox"/> Total delay <input type="checkbox"/> Delay, unspecified <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>
<p><u>Journeys</u> Select all that apply</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Number of visits to diagnosis <input type="checkbox"/> Number of visits to treatment <input type="checkbox"/> Type of provider for every visit <input type="checkbox"/> Sector of facility for every visit <input type="checkbox"/> Type of provider for place of initial healthcare-seeking <input type="checkbox"/> Sector of facility for place of initial</p>

	<p>healthcare-seeking</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Type of provider for place of diagnosis <input type="checkbox"/> Sector of facility for place of diagnosis <input type="checkbox"/> Type of provider for place of treatment <input type="checkbox"/> Sector of facility for place of treatment <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
<p><u>Other Methodology Variables</u> Select all that apply</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Coverage of microscopy services among health facilities <input type="checkbox"/> Access of microscopy at initial healthcare-seeking <input type="checkbox"/> Coverage of treatment services among health facilities <input type="checkbox"/> Access of treatment at initial healthcare-seeking <input type="checkbox"/> Notification location <input type="checkbox"/> Treatment outcome
<p><u>Time and date</u> Select all that apply</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Time to initial healthcare-seeking <input type="checkbox"/> Time to diagnosis <input type="checkbox"/> Time to treatment <input type="checkbox"/> Date of first symptom <input type="checkbox"/> Date of initial care-seeking <input type="checkbox"/> Date of diagnosis <input type="checkbox"/> Date of referral for treatment <input type="checkbox"/> Date of treatment initiation <input type="checkbox"/> Date of treatment completion <input type="checkbox"/> Survival analysis (time to event/death) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
<p><u>Costs of care (at any point in care)</u> Select one</p>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear
<p><u>Other outcomes/major themes</u> Select one</p>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear
<p><u>Other, describe</u></p>	[Open text field]
<p>416 417 Other variables</p>	
<p><u>Patient characteristics</u> Select all that apply</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Age <input type="checkbox"/> Sex/Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Race/Ethnicity <input type="checkbox"/> Education level <input type="checkbox"/> Literacy level <input type="checkbox"/> Place of residence <input type="checkbox"/> Urbanicity <input type="checkbox"/> Income level <input type="checkbox"/> Occupation <input type="checkbox"/> Number of persons/children in household

	<input type="checkbox"/> Socioeconomic status measure (e.g. material deprivation) <input type="checkbox"/> Distance from nearest health facility <input type="checkbox"/> Marital status <input type="checkbox"/> Smoking status <input type="checkbox"/> Alcohol use <input type="checkbox"/> Other drug use <input type="checkbox"/> Comorbidities (any) <input type="checkbox"/> Type of illness <input type="checkbox"/> Severity of illness <input type="checkbox"/> HIV status <input type="checkbox"/> Diabetes status <input type="checkbox"/> Cause of death <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
<u>Provider characteristics</u> Select all that apply	<input type="checkbox"/> Age <input type="checkbox"/> Sex/Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Provider type <input type="checkbox"/> Sector of facility <input type="checkbox"/> Urbanicity <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
<u>Healthcare/health system/healthcare-seeking characteristics</u> Select all that apply	<input type="checkbox"/> Costs of care <input type="checkbox"/> Delay in accessing care <input type="checkbox"/> Number of visits <input type="checkbox"/> Type of provider of all instances of healthcare-seeking <input type="checkbox"/> Sector of facility of all instances of healthcare-seeking <input type="checkbox"/> Type of provider of initial care-seeking <input type="checkbox"/> Sector of facility of initial care-seeking <input type="checkbox"/> Type of provider of diagnosis <input type="checkbox"/> Sector of facility of diagnosis <input type="checkbox"/> Type of provider of treatment location <input type="checkbox"/> Sector of facility of treatment location <input type="checkbox"/> Availability of services <input type="checkbox"/> Region/Sub-national area <input type="checkbox"/> Level of health facility <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
<u>If qualitative, major/minor themes</u>	[Open text field]

418
419
420
421
422
423

Supplement 3 – Quality Assessment Electronic Forms

General information

Reviewer Initials	[Open text field]
Study ID	[Open text field]

Study Title	[Open text field]
First author last name	[Open text field]
Year of publication	[Open text field]
Type of Study Select one	<input type="radio"/> Qualitative Research <input type="radio"/> Mixed Methods <input type="radio"/> Analytical Cross-Sectional Study <input type="radio"/> Cohort Study <input type="radio"/> Prevalence Study

424
425
426
427
428
429

Qualitative Research Quality Assessment

Source: https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2021-10/Checklist_for_Qualitative_Research.docx

Discussion of critical appraisal criteria are added before each question for context.

<p>1. Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology</p> <p>Does the report clearly state the philosophical or theoretical premises on which the study is based? Does the report clearly state the methodological approach adopted on which the study is based? Is there congruence between the two? For example:</p> <p>A report may state that the study adopted a critical perspective and participatory action research methodology was followed. Here there is congruence between a critical view (focusing on knowledge arising out of critique, action and reflection) and action research (an approach that focuses on firstly working with groups to reflect on issues or practices, then considering how they could be different; then acting to create a change; and finally identifying new knowledge arising out of the action taken). However, a report may state that the study adopted an interpretive perspective and used survey methodology. Here there is incongruence between an interpretive view (focusing on knowledge arising out of studying what phenomena mean to individuals or groups) and surveys (an approach that focuses on asking standard questions to a defined study population); a report may state that the study was qualitative or used qualitative methodology (such statements do not demonstrate rigour in design) or make no statement on philosophical orientation or methodology.</p>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
<p>2. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?</p> <p>Is the study methodology appropriate for addressing the research question? For example:</p> <p>A report may state that the research question was to seek understandings of the meaning of pain in a group of people with</p>	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable

<p>rheumatoid arthritis and that a phenomenological approach was taken. Here, there is congruity between this question and the methodology. A report may state that the research question was to establish the effects of counselling on the severity of pain experience and that an ethnographic approach was pursued. A question that tries to establish cause-and effect cannot be addressed by using an ethnographic approach (as ethnography sets out to develop understandings of cultural practices) and thus, this would be incongruent.</p>	
<p>3. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data Are the data collection methods appropriate to the methodology? For example:</p> <p>A report may state that the study pursued a phenomenological approach and data was collected through phenomenological interviews. There is congruence between the methodology and data collection; a report may state that the study pursued a phenomenological approach and data was collected through a postal questionnaire. There is incongruence between the methodology and data collection here as phenomenology seeks to elicit rich descriptions of the experience of a phenomena that cannot be achieved through seeking written responses to standardized questions.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
<p>4. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data? Are the data analyzed and represented in ways that are congruent with the stated methodological position? For example:</p> <p>A report may state that the study pursued a phenomenological approach to explore people’s experience of grief by asking participants to describe their experiences of grief. If the text generated from asking these questions is searched to establish the meaning of grief to participants, and the meanings of all participants are included in the report findings, then this represents congruity; the same report may, however, focus only on those meanings that were common to all participants and discard single reported meanings. This would not be appropriate in phenomenological work.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
<p>5. Is there congruence between the research methodology and the interpretation of results? Are the results interpreted in ways that are appropriate to the methodology? For example:</p> <p>A report may state that the study pursued a phenomenological approach to explore people’s experience of facial disfigurement and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable

<p>the results are used to inform practitioners about accommodating individual differences in care. There is congruence between the methodology and this approach to interpretation; a report may state that the study pursued a phenomenological approach to explore people’s experience of facial disfigurement and the results are used to generate practice checklists for assessment. There is incongruence between the methodology and this approach to interpretation as phenomenology seeks to understand the meaning of a phenomenon for the study participants and cannot be interpreted to suggest that this can be generalized to total populations to a degree where standardized assessments will have relevance across a population.</p>	
<p>6. Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically? Are the beliefs and values, and their potential influence on the study declared? For example:</p> <p>The researcher plays a substantial role in the qualitative research process and it is important, in appraising evidence that is generated in this way, to know the researcher’s cultural and theoretical orientation. A high quality report will include a statement that clarifies this.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>7. Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice-versa, addressed? Is the potential for the researcher to influence the study and for the potential of the research process itself to influence the researcher and her/his interpretations acknowledged and addressed? For example:</p> <p>Is the relationship between the researcher and the study participants addressed? Does the researcher critically examine her/his own role and potential influence during data collection? Is it reported how the researcher responded to events that arose during the study?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>8. Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented? Generally, reports should provide illustrations from the data to show the basis of their conclusions and to ensure that participants are represented in the report.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>9. Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body? A statement on the ethical approval process followed should be in the report.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>10. Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data? This criterion concerns the relationship between the findings reported and the views or words of study participants. In appraising</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>

a paper, appraisers seek to satisfy themselves that the conclusions drawn by the research are based on the data collected; data being the text generated through observation, interviews or other processes.	
Overall appraisal	<input type="radio"/> Low quality <input type="radio"/> Medium quality <input type="radio"/> High quality <input type="radio"/> Seek further info
Comments	[Open text field]

430

431 **Mixed Methods Quality Assessment**

432 Adapted from the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool. Citation: Hong QN, Pluye P, Fàbregues S,
 433 Bartlett G, Boardman F, Cargo M, Dagenais P, Gagnon M-P, Griffiths F, Nicolau B,
 434 O’Cathain A, Rousseau M-C, Vedel I. Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), version
 435 2018. Registration of Copyright (#1148552), Canadian Intellectual Property Office, Industry
 436 Canada.

1. Are there clear research questions?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
2. Do the collected data allow the research questions to be addressed?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Part 1: Assessment of the Qualitative Aspects of the Study	
Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Are the findings adequately derived from the data?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis, and interpretation?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Part 2: Assessment of the Quantitative Aspects of the Study	
Is the sampling strategy relevant to address the research question?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear

	<input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Is the sample representative of the target population?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Are the measurements appropriate?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Is the risk of nonresponse bias low?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Is the statistical analysis appropriate to answer the research question?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Part 3: Assessment of the Mixed Methods Aspects of the Study	
Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to address the research question?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
Overall appraisal	<input type="radio"/> Low quality <input type="radio"/> Medium quality <input type="radio"/> High quality <input type="radio"/> Seek further info
Comments	[Open text field]

437
438
439
440
441

Analytical Cross-Sectional Quality Assessment

Source: [https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2021-10/Checklist for Analytical Cross Sectional Studies.docx](https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2021-10/Checklist%20for%20Analytical%20Cross%20Sectional%20Studies.docx)

442 Discussion of critical appraisal criteria are added before each question for context.

<p>1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined? The authors should provide clear inclusion and exclusion criteria that they developed prior to recruitment of the study participants. The inclusion/exclusion criteria should be specified (e.g., risk, stage of disease progression) with sufficient detail and all the necessary information critical to the study.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail? The study sample should be described in sufficient detail so that other researchers can determine if it is comparable to the population of interest to them. The authors should provide a clear description of the population from which the study participants were selected or recruited, including demographics, location, and time period.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? The study should clearly describe the method of measurement of exposure. Assessing validity requires that a 'gold standard' is available to which the measure can be compared. The validity of exposure measurement usually relates to whether a current measure is appropriate or whether a measure of past exposure is needed.</p> <p>Reliability refers to the processes included in an epidemiological study to check repeatability of measurements of the exposures. These usually include intra-observer reliability and inter-observer reliability.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition? It is useful to determine if patients were included in the study based on either a specified diagnosis or definition. This is more likely to decrease the risk of bias. Characteristics are another useful approach to matching groups, and studies that did not use specified diagnostic methods or definitions should provide evidence on matching by key characteristics.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>5. Were confounding factors identified? Confounding has occurred where the estimated intervention exposure effect is biased by the presence of some difference between the comparison groups (apart from the exposure investigated/of interest). Typical confounders include baseline characteristics, prognostic factors, or concomitant exposures (e.g. smoking). A confounder is a difference between the comparison groups and it influences the direction of the study results. A high quality study at the level of cohort design will identify the potential confounders and measure them (where possible). This is difficult for studies where behavioural, attitudinal or lifestyle factors may impact on the results.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? Strategies to deal with effects of confounding factors may be dealt within the study design or in data analysis. By matching or stratifying sampling of participants, effects of confounding factors can be adjusted for. When dealing with adjustment in data analysis,</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>

<p>assess the statistics used in the study. Most will be some form of multivariate regression analysis to account for the confounding factors measured.</p>	
<p>7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? Read the methods section of the paper. If for e.g. lung cancer is assessed based on existing definitions or diagnostic criteria, then the answer to this question is likely to be yes. If lung cancer is assessed using observer reported, or self-reported scales, the risk of over- or under-reporting is increased, and objectivity is compromised. Importantly, determine if the measurement tools used were validated instruments as this has a significant impact on outcome assessment validity.</p> <p>Having established the objectivity of the outcome measurement (e.g. lung cancer) instrument, it's important to establish how the measurement was conducted. Were those involved in collecting data trained or educated in the use of the instrument/s? (e.g. radiographers). If there was more than one data collector, were they similar in terms of level of education, clinical or research experience, or level of responsibility in the piece of research being appraised?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used? As with any consideration of statistical analysis, consideration should be given to whether there was a more appropriate alternate statistical method that could have been used. The methods section should be detailed enough for reviewers to identify which analytical techniques were used (in particular, regression or stratification) and how specific confounders were measured.</p> <p>For studies utilizing regression analysis, it is useful to identify if the study identified which variables were included and how they related to the outcome. If stratification was the analytical approach used, were the strata of analysis defined by the specified variables? Additionally, it is also important to assess the appropriateness of the analytical strategy in terms of the assumptions associated with the approach as differing methods of analysis are based on differing assumptions about the data and how it will respond.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>Overall appraisal</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Low quality <input type="radio"/> Medium quality <input type="radio"/> High quality <input type="radio"/> Seek further info</p>
<p>Comments</p>	<p>[Open text field]</p>

443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448

Cohort Study Quality Assessment

Source: [https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2021-10/Checklist for Cohort Studies.docx](https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2021-10/Checklist%20for%20Cohort%20Studies.docx)

Discussion of critical appraisal criteria are added before each question for context.

<p>1. Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population? Check the paper carefully for descriptions of participants to determine if patients within and across groups have similar characteristics in relation to exposure (e.g. risk factor under investigation). The two groups selected for comparison should be as similar as possible in all characteristics except for their exposure status, relevant to the study in question. The authors should provide clear inclusion and exclusion criteria that they developed prior to recruitment of the study participants.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
<p>2. Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups? A high-quality study at the level of cohort design should mention or describe how the exposures were measured. The exposure measures should be clearly defined and described in detail. This will enable reviewers to assess whether or not the participants received the exposure of interest.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
<p>3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way? The study should clearly describe the method of measurement of exposure. Assessing validity requires that a 'gold standard' is available to which the measure can be compared. The validity of exposure measurement usually relates to whether a current measure is appropriate or whether a measure of past exposure is needed.</p> <p>Reliability refers to the processes included in an epidemiological study to check repeatability of measurements of the exposures. These usually include intra-observer reliability and inter-observer reliability.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
<p>4. Were confounding factors identified? Confounding has occurred where the estimated intervention exposure effect is biased by the presence of some difference between the comparison groups (apart from the exposure investigated/of interest). Typical confounders include baseline characteristics, prognostic factors, or concomitant exposures (e.g. smoking). A confounder is a difference between the comparison groups and it influences the direction of the study results. A high quality study at the level of cohort design will identify the potential confounders and measure them (where possible). This is difficult for studies where behavioral, attitudinal or lifestyle factors may impact on the results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
<p>5. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated? Strategies to deal with effects of confounding factors may be dealt within the study design or in data analysis. By matching or stratifying sampling of participants, effects of confounding factors can be adjusted for. When dealing with adjustment in data analysis, assess the statistics used in the study. Most will be some form of multivariate regression analysis to account for the confounding factors measured. Look out for a description of statistical methods as regression methods such as logistic regression are usually employed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable

<p>to deal with confounding factors/variables of interest.</p>	
<p>6. Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)? The participants should be free of the outcomes of interest at the start of the study. Refer to the ‘methods’ section in the paper for this information, which is usually found in descriptions of participant/sample recruitment, definitions of variables, and/or inclusion/exclusion criteria.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way? Read the methods section of the paper. If for e.g. lung cancer is assessed based on existing definitions or diagnostic criteria, then the answer to this question is likely to be yes. If lung cancer is assessed using observer reported, or self-reported scales, the risk of over- or under-reporting is increased, and objectivity is compromised. Importantly, determine if the measurement tools used were validated instruments as this has a significant impact on outcome assessment validity.</p> <p>Having established the objectivity of the outcome measurement (e.g. lung cancer) instrument, it’s important to establish how the measurement was conducted. Were those involved in collecting data trained or educated in the use of the instrument/s? (e.g. radiographers). If there was more than one data collector, were they similar in terms of level of education, clinical or research experience, or level of responsibility in the piece of research being appraised?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>8. Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur? The appropriate length of time for follow up will vary with the nature and characteristics of the population of interest and/or the intervention, disease or exposure. To estimate an appropriate duration of follow up, read across multiple papers and take note of the range for duration of follow up. The opinions of experts in clinical practice or clinical research may also assist in determining an appropriate duration of follow up. For example, a longer timeframe may be needed to examine the association between occupational exposure to asbestos and the risk of lung cancer. It is important, particularly in cohort studies that follow up is long enough to enable the outcomes. However, it should be remembered that the research question and outcomes being examined would probably dictate the follow up time.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>9. Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored? It is important in a cohort study that a greater percentage of people are followed up. As a general guideline, at least 80% of patients should be followed up. Generally a dropout rate of 5% or less is considered insignificant. A rate of 20% or greater is considered to significantly impact on the validity of the study. However, in observational studies conducted over a lengthy period of time a</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>

<p>higher dropout rate is to be expected. A decision on whether to include or exclude a study because of a high dropout rate is a matter of judgement based on the reasons why people dropped out, and whether dropout rates were comparable in the exposed and unexposed groups.</p> <p>Reporting of efforts to follow up participants that dropped out may be regarded as an indicator of a well conducted study. Look for clear and justifiable description of why people were left out, excluded, dropped out etc. If there is no clear description or a statement in this regards, this will be a 'No'.</p>	
<p>10. Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized? Some people may withdraw due to change in employment or some may die; however, it is important that their outcomes are assessed. Selection bias may occur as a result of incomplete follow up. Therefore, participants with unequal follow up periods must be taken into account in the analysis, which should be adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow up periods. This is usually done by calculating rates which use person-years at risk, i.e. considering time in the denominator.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>11. Was appropriate statistical analysis used? As with any consideration of statistical analysis, consideration should be given to whether there was a more appropriate alternate statistical method that could have been used. The methods section of cohort studies should be detailed enough for reviewers to identify which analytical techniques were used (in particular, regression or stratification) and how specific confounders were measured.</p> <p>For studies utilizing regression analysis, it is useful to identify if the study identified which variables were included and how they related to the outcome. If stratification was the analytical approach used, were the strata of analysis defined by the specified variables? Additionally, it is also important to assess the appropriateness of the analytical strategy in terms of the assumptions associated with the approach as differing methods of analysis are based on differing assumptions about the data and how it will respond.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>Overall appraisal</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Low quality <input type="radio"/> Medium quality <input type="radio"/> High quality <input type="radio"/> Seek further info</p>
<p>Comments</p>	<p>[Open text field]</p>

449

450 **Prevalence Study Quality Assessment**

451 Source: https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2021-10/Checklist_for_Prevalence_Studies.docx

452

453 Discussion of critical appraisal criteria are added before each question for context.

<p>1. Was the sample frame appropriate to address the target population?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No</p>
---	---

<p>This question relies upon knowledge of the broader characteristics of the population of interest and the geographical area. If the study is of women with breast cancer, knowledge of at least the characteristics, demographics and medical history is needed. The term “target population” should not be taken to infer every individual from everywhere or with similar disease or exposure characteristics. Instead, give consideration to specific population characteristics in the study, including age range, gender, morbidities, medications, and other potentially influential factors. For example, a sample frame may not be appropriate to address the target population if a certain group has been used (such as those working for one organisation, or one profession) and the results then inferred to the target population (i.e. working adults). A sample frame may be appropriate when it includes almost all the members of the target population (i.e. a census, or a complete list of participants or complete registry data).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
<p>2. Were study participants recruited in an appropriate way? Studies may report random sampling from a population, and the methods section should report how sampling was performed. Random probabilistic sampling from a defined subset of the population (sample frame) should be employed in most cases, however, random probabilistic sampling is not needed when everyone in the sampling frame will be included/analysed. For example, reporting on all the data from a good census is appropriate as a good census will identify everybody. When using cluster sampling, such as a random sample of villages within a region, the methods need to be clearly stated as the precision of the final prevalence estimate incorporates the clustering effect. Convenience samples, such as a street survey or interviewing lots of people at a public gatherings are not considered to provide a representative sample of the base population.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable
<p>3. Was the sample size adequate? The larger the sample, the narrower will be the confidence interval around the prevalence estimate, making the results more precise. An adequate sample size is important to ensure good precision of the final estimate. Ideally we are looking for evidence that the authors conducted a sample size calculation to determine an adequate sample size. This will estimate how many subjects are needed to produce a reliable estimate of the measure(s) of interest. For conditions with a low prevalence, a larger sample size is needed. Also consider sample sizes for subgroup (or characteristics) analyses, and whether these are appropriate. Sometimes, the study will be large enough (as in large national surveys) whereby a sample size calculation is not required. In these cases, sample size can be considered adequate. When there is no sample size calculation and it is not a large national survey, the reviewers may consider conducting their own sample size analysis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable

<p>4. Were the study subjects and setting described in detail? Certain diseases or conditions vary in prevalence across different geographic regions and populations (e.g. Women vs. Men, sociodemographic variables between countries). The study sample should be described in sufficient detail so that other researchers can determine if it is comparable to the population of interest to them.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>5. Was data analysis conducted with sufficient coverage of the identified sample? Coverage bias can occur when not all subgroups of the identified sample respond at the same rate. For instance, you may have a very high response rate overall for your study, but the response rate for a certain subgroup (i.e. older adults) may be quite low.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>6. Were valid methods used for the identification of the condition? Here we are looking for measurement or classification bias. Many health problems are not easily diagnosed or defined and some measures may not be capable of including or excluding appropriate levels or stages of the health problem. If the outcomes were assessed based on existing definitions or diagnostic criteria, then the answer to this question is likely to be yes. If the outcomes were assessed using observer reported, or self-reported scales, the risk of over- or under-reporting is increased, and objectivity is compromised. Importantly, determine if the measurement tools used were validated instruments as this has a significant impact on outcome assessment validity.</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>7. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants? Considerable judgment is required to determine the presence of some health outcomes. Having established the validity of the outcome measurement instrument (see item 6 of this scale), it is important to establish how the measurement was conducted. Were those involved in collecting data trained or educated in the use of the instrument/s? If there was more than one data collector, were they similar in terms of level of education, clinical or research experience, or level of responsibility in the piece of research being appraised? When there was more than one observer or collector, was there comparison of results from across the observers? Was the condition measured in the same way for all participants?</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>
<p>8. Was there appropriate statistical analysis? Importantly, the numerator and denominator should be clearly reported, and percentages should be given with confidence intervals. The methods section should be detailed enough for reviewers to identify the analytical technique used and how specific variables were measured. Additionally, it is also important to assess the</p>	<p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable</p>

<p>appropriateness of the analytical strategy in terms of the assumptions associated with the approach as differing methods of analysis are based on differing assumptions about the data and how it will respond.</p>	
<p>9. Was the response rate adequate, and if not, was the low response rate managed appropriately? A large number of dropouts, refusals or “not founds” amongst selected subjects may diminish a study’s validity, as can a low response rates for survey studies. The authors should clearly discuss the response rate and any reasons for non-response and compare persons in the study to those not in the study, particularly with regards to their socio-demographic characteristics. If reasons for non-response appear to be unrelated to the outcome measured and the characteristics of non-responders are comparable to those who do respond in the study (addressed in question 5, coverage bias), the researchers may be able to justify a more modest response rate.</p>	<p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Unclear <input type="radio"/> Not applicable </p>
<p>Overall appraisal</p>	<p> <input type="radio"/> Low quality <input type="radio"/> Medium quality <input type="radio"/> High quality <input type="radio"/> Seek further info </p>
<p>Comments</p>	<p>[Open text field]</p>

454
 455
 456

457 *Supplement 4 – Quality Appraisal*

S/No	Study Title	First author last name	Year of publication	Type of Study	Overall appraisal
1	Health care seeking behavior and patient delay in tuberculosis diagnosis	Almeida	2015	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
2	The road to tuberculosis treatment in rural Nepal: A qualitative assessment of 26 journeys	Asbroek	2008	Qualitative	High
3	Delays to anti-tuberculosis treatment initiation among cases on directly observed treatment short course in districts of southwestern Ethiopia: a cross sectional study	Asres	2019	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
4	Such a long journey: What health seeking pathways of patients with drug resistant tuberculosis in Mumbai tell us	Bhattacharya	2019	Qualitative	High
5	How do patients access the private sector in Chennai, India? An evaluation of delays in tuberculosis diagnosis	Bronner Murrison	2016	Cross-Sectional Study	High
6	Health-seeking behaviour and treatment delay in patients with pulmonary tuberculosis in Switzerland: some slip through the net	Christian	2018	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
7	Delays in TB Diagnosis and Treatment Initiation in Burkina Faso during the COVID-19 Pandemic	Diallo	2022	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
8	Health seeking behaviour and delayed management of tuberculosis patients in rural Bangladesh	Ehsanul Huq	2018	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
9	Real-world colorectal cancer diagnostic pathways in Ontario, Canada: A	Guan	2022	Analytical Cross-	High

	population-based study			Sectional	
10	Patient pathways of tuberculosis care-seeking and treatment: an individual-level analysis of National Health Insurance data in Taiwan	Ku	2020	Cohort	High
11	Health-seeking behaviour for febrile illness in malaria-endemic Kolasib district, Mizoram, India	Lalchhuanawma	2012	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
12	Patient pathways and delays to diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis in an urban setting in Indonesia	Lestari	2020	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
13	Health-seeking pathway and factors leading to delays in tuberculosis diagnosis in West Pokot County, Kenya: a grounded theory study	Mbuthia	2018	Qualitative	High
14	Delayed consultation among pulmonary tuberculosis patients: a cross sectional study of 10 DOTS districts of Ethiopia	Mesfin	2009	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
15	Patterns and predictors of malaria care-seeking, diagnostic testing, and artemisinin-based combination therapy for children under five with fever in Northern Nigeria: a cross-sectional study	Millar	2014	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
16	Demand for malaria rapid diagnostic test, health care-seeking behaviour, and drug use among rural community members with fever or malaria-like illness in Ebonyi state, Nigeria: a cross-sectional household survey	Omale	2021	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
17	Care-seeking during fatal childhood illness in rural South Africa: a qualitative study	Price	2021	Qualitative	High
18	Effect of public-private interface agency in	Shah	2020	Analytical	High

	Patna and Mumbai, India: Does it alter durations and delays in care seeking for drug-sensitive pulmonary tuberculosis?			Cross-Sectional	
19	Healthcare-seeking behavior, treatment delays and its determinants among pulmonary tuberculosis patients in rural Nigeria: a cross-sectional study	Ukwaja	2013	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
20	Tuberculosis patients' knowledge and beliefs about tuberculosis: a mixed methods study from the Pacific Island nation of Vanuatu	Viney	2014	Mixed Methods	High
21	Comparing patient care seeking pathways in three models of hospital and TB programme collaboration in China	Wei	2013	Analytical Cross-Sectional	High
22	Transaction costs of access to health care: Implications of the care-seeking pathways of tuberculosis patients for health system governance in Nigeria	Abimbola	2015	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
23	Diagnostic delay amongst tuberculosis patients in Jogjakarta Province, Indonesia is related to the quality of services in DOTS facilities	Ahmad	2011	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
24	Knowledge on the transmission, prevention and treatment of malaria among two endemic populations of Bangladesh and their health-seeking behaviour	Ahmed	2009	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
25	Duration of intervals in the care seeking pathway for lung cancer in Bangladesh: A journey from symptoms triggering consultation to receipt of treatment	Ansar	2021	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium

26	Patient's site of first access to health system influences length of delay for tuberculosis treatment in Tajikistan	Aye	2010	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
27	Care seeking and attitudes towards treatment compliance by newly enrolled tuberculosis patients in the district treatment programme in rural western Kenya: a qualitative study	Ayisi	2011	Qualitative Research	Medium
28	Men with sexually transmitted diseases in Bangkok: where do they go for treatment and why?	Benjarattanaporn	1997	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
29	Pre-treatment delay and out of pocket expenses by notified new tuberculosis patients in an Indian mega city	Chadha	2022	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
30	Care Seeking Behavior of Chest Symptomatics: A Community Based Study Done in South India after the Implementation of the RNTCP	Charles	2010	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
31	Cost of seeking care for tuberculosis since the implementation of universal health coverage in Indonesia	Fuady	2020	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
32	Care seeking behaviour and various delays in tuberculosis patients registered under RNTCP in Pune city	Gothankar	2016	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
33	The relationship between poverty and healthcare seeking among patients hospitalized with acute febrile illnesses in Chittagong, Bangladesh	Herdman	2016	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
34	Healthcare Seeking and Access to Care for Pneumonia, Sepsis, Meningitis, and Malaria in Rural Gambia	Hossain	2022	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
35	Barriers on the pathway to survival for	Kallander	2019	Cross-	Medium

	children dying from treatable illnesses in Inhambane province, Mozambique			Sectional Study	
36	Study of factors leading to treatment delay in new sputum positive pulmonary tuberculosis patients and its impact on sputum conversion	Kumawat	2022	Cohort Study	Medium
37	Patients are paying too much for tuberculosis: a direct cost-burden evaluation in Burkina Faso	Laokri	2013	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
38	Case-finding tuberculosis patients: diagnostic and treatment delays and their determinants	Maamari	2008	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
39	How much do delayed healthcare seeking, delayed care provision, and diversion from primary care contribute to the transmission of STIs?	Mercer	2007	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
40	Pulmonary tuberculosis in Patna, India: Durations, delays, and health care seeking behaviour among patients identified through household surveys	Mistry	2017	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
41	Durations and Delays in Care Seeking, Diagnosis and Treatment Initiation in Uncomplicated Pulmonary Tuberculosis Patients in Mumbai, India	Mistry	2016	Mixed Methods	Medium
42	Patient navigation pathway and barriers to treatment seeking in cancer in India: A qualitative inquiry	Pati	2013	Mixed Methods	Medium
43	Care-seeking pathways, care challenges, and coping experiences of rural women living with rheumatoid arthritis in Odisha, India	Pati	2019	Qualitative Research	Medium
44	Factors associated with patient and health	Rajeswari	2002	Cross-	Medium

	system delays in the diagnosis of tuberculosis in South India			Sectional Study	
45	Patient treatment pathways of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis cases in coastal South India: Road to a drug resistant tuberculosis center	Rathi	2021	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
46	Care seeking behaviour and diagnostic processes in patients with smear-positive pulmonary tuberculosis in Malawi	Salaniponi	2000	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
47	A comparison of patient treatment pathways among multidrug-resistant and drug-sensitive TB cases in Delhi, India: A cross-sectional study	Sharma	2020	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
48	From fever to anti-malarial: the treatment-seeking process in rural Senegal	Smith	2010	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
49	Pathways to the first contact with specialist mental health care	Steel	2006	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
50	Health care seeking patterns of rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis patients in Harare, Zimbabwe: A prospective cohort study	Tadokera	2021	Mixed Methods	Medium
51	Understanding health care-seeking behaviour of the tribal population in India among those with presumptive TB symptoms	Thomas	2021	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
52	Diagnostic pathways and direct medical costs incurred by new adult pulmonary tuberculosis patients prior to anti-tuberculosis treatment – Tamil Nadu, India	Veesa	2018	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
53	Analysis of care-seeking pathways of tuberculosis patients in Guangxi, China, with and without decentralised tuberculosis	Wei	2009	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium

	services				
54	Patient care pathways under the model of integrating tuberculosis service with general hospitals in China	Wei	2013	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
55	The pathway to diagnosis and treatment for surgically managed lung cancer patients	White	2020	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
56	Healthcare utilization for common infectious disease syndromes in Soweto and Klerksdorp, South Africa	Wong	2018	Cross-Sectional Study	Medium
57	Patients pathways to tuberculosis diagnosis and treatment in a fragmented health system: a qualitative study from a south Indian district	Yellappa	2017	Qualitative Research	Medium
58	Patient pathway analysis of tuberculosis diagnostic delay: a multicentre retrospective cohort study in China	Zhang	2021	Cohort Study	Medium
59	Care Seeking Behavior of the TB Patients who were Registered in an Urban Government Tuberculosis Control in Chennai, Tamilnadu, India	Ananthkrishnan	2012	Cross-Sectional Study	Low
60	Tuberculosis pathways to care and transmission of multidrug resistance in India	Atre	2022	Mixed Methods	Low
61	Health seeking behaviour, health system experience and tuberculosis case finding in Gambians with cough	Kasse	2006	Cross-Sectional Study	Low
62	Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: Physician and patient perspectives on the pathway to care from symptom recognition to diagnosis and disease burden	Lancaster	2021	Cross-Sectional Study	Low
63	Pathways and costs of care for patients	Shete	2015	Cross-	Low

	with tuberculosis symptoms in rural Uganda			Sectional Study	
64	Health seeking and knowledge about tuberculosis among persons with pulmonary symptoms and tuberculosis cases in Bangalore slums	Suganthi	2008	Cross-Sectional Study	Low
65	Health-seeking behavior of COVID-19 cases during the first eight weeks of the outbreak in Singapore: differences between local community and imported cases and having visits to single or multiple healthcare providers	Tay	2022	Cross-Sectional Study	Low
66	A Cross-Sectional Descriptive Study to Ascertain Factors Influencing Delay in Diagnosis among Newly Diagnosed Pulmonary Tuberculosis Patients	Thomas	2022	Cross-Sectional Study	Low

458

References

- 459 1. World Health Organization. Tracking universal health coverage: 2023 global
460 monitoring report: World Health Organization; 2023.
- 461 2. World Health Organization. Global tuberculosis report 2023. 2023.
- 462 3. Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. The path that ends AIDS: 2023
463 UNAIDS global AIDS update. 2023.
- 464 4. Faust L, Naidoo P, Caceres-Cardenas G, et al. Improving measurement of tuberculosis
465 care cascades to enhance people-centred care. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2023.
- 466 5. MacPherson P, Houben RM, Glynn JR, Corbett EL, Kranzer K. Pre-treatment loss to
467 follow-up in tuberculosis patients in low-and lower-middle-income countries and high-
468 burden countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bulletin of the World Health
469 Organization* 2013; **92**: 126-38.
- 470 6. Arokiasamy P, Uttamacharya, Kowal P, et al. Chronic noncommunicable diseases in 6
471 low-and middle-income countries: findings from wave 1 of the World Health Organization's
472 study on global Ageing and adult health (SAGE). *American journal of epidemiology* 2017;
473 **185**(6): 414-28.
- 474 7. Johnson CC, Fonner V, Sands A, et al. To err is human, to correct is public health: a
475 systematic review examining poor quality testing and misdiagnosis of HIV status. *Journal of
476 the International AIDS Society* 2017; **20**: 21755.
- 477 8. Mwenesi H, Harpham T, Snow RW. Child malaria treatment practices among
478 mothers in Kenya. *Social science & medicine* 1995; **40**(9): 1271-7.
- 479 9. Räisänen U, Hunt K. The role of gendered constructions of eating disorders in
480 delayed help-seeking in men: a qualitative interview study. *BMJ open* 2014; **4**(4): e004342.
- 481 10. Storla DG, Yimer S, Bjune GA. A systematic review of delay in the diagnosis and
482 treatment of tuberculosis. *BMC public health* 2008; **8**: 1-9.
- 483 11. Oga-Omenka C, Tseja-Akinrin A, Sen P, et al. Factors influencing diagnosis and
484 treatment initiation for multidrug-resistant/rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis in six sub-
485 Saharan African countries: a mixed-methods systematic review. *BMJ global health* 2020;
486 **5**(7): e002280.
- 487 12. Mavhu W, Dauya E, Bandason T, et al. Chronic cough and its association with TB-HIV
488 co-infection: factors affecting help-seeking behaviour in Harare, Zimbabwe. *Tropical
489 Medicine & International Health* 2010; **15**(5): 574-9.
- 490 13. Allen H, Wright BJ, Harding K, Broffman L. The role of stigma in access to health care
491 for the poor. *The Milbank Quarterly* 2014; **92**(2): 289-318.
- 492 14. Cai J, Wang X, Ma A, Wang Q, Han X, Li Y. Factors associated with patient and
493 provider delays for tuberculosis diagnosis and treatment in Asia: a systematic review and
494 meta-analysis. *PloS one* 2015; **10**(3): e0120088.
- 495 15. Stallworthy G, Dias HM, Pai M. Quality of tuberculosis care in the private health
496 sector. *Journal of clinical tuberculosis and other mycobacterial diseases* 2020; **20**: 100171.
- 497 16. Carrillo JE, Carrillo VA, Perez HR, Salas-Lopez D, Natale-Pereira A, Byron AT. Defining
498 and targeting health care access barriers. *Journal of health care for the poor and
499 underserved* 2011; **22**(2): 562-75.

- 500 17. Tanimura T, Jaramillo E, Weil D, Raviglione M, Lönnroth K. Financial burden for
501 tuberculosis patients in low-and middle-income countries: a systematic review. *European*
502 *Respiratory Journal* 2014; **43**(6): 1763-75.
- 503 18. Organization WH. The END TB strategy: World Health Organization; 2015.
- 504 19. World Health Organization. Interim report: placing people and communities at the
505 centre of health services: WHO global strategy on integrated people-centred health services
506 2016-2026: executive summary: World Health Organization, 2015.
- 507 20. World Health Organization. World Health Assembly adopts framework on integrated
508 people-centred health services. *World Health Organization* 2016.
- 509 21. Odone A, Roberts B, Dara M, Van Den Boom M, Kluge H, McKee M. People-and
510 patient-centred care for tuberculosis: models of care for tuberculosis. *The international*
511 *journal of tuberculosis and lung disease* 2018; **22**(2): 133-8.
- 512 22. Shaller D. Patient-centered care: what does it take?: Commonwealth Fund New York;
513 2007.
- 514 23. World Health Organization. Compendium of data and evidence-related tools for use
515 in TB planning and programming. Compendium of data and evidence-related tools for use
516 in TB planning and programming; 2021.
- 517 24. Oliver A, Mossialos E. Equity of access to health care: outlining the foundations for
518 action. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* 2004; **58**(8): 655-8.
- 519 25. Oga-Omenka C, Bada F, Agbaje A, Dakum P, Menzies D, Zarowsky C. Ease and equity
520 of access to free DR-TB services in Nigeria-a qualitative analysis of policies, structures and
521 processes. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 2020; **19**: 1-13.
- 522 26. Daniels N. Equity of access to health care: some conceptual and ethical issues. *The*
523 *Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly Health and Society* 1982: 51-81.
- 524 27. Huria L, Lestari BW, Saptaningrum E, et al. Care pathways of individuals with
525 tuberculosis before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in Bandung, Indonesia. *PLOS Global*
526 *Public Health* 2024; **4**(1): e0002251.
- 527 28. Lestari BW, McAllister S, Hadisoemarto PF, et al. Patient pathways and delays to
528 diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis in an urban setting in Indonesia. *Lancet Regional*
529 *Health-Western Pacific* 2020; **5**.
- 530 29. Oga-Omenka C, Rosapep L, Baruwa E, et al. Individual journeys to tuberculosis care
531 in Nigeria's private sector during the COVID-19 pandemic. *BMJ Global Health* 2024; **9**(1):
532 e013124.
- 533 30. Pinder R, Petchey R, Shaw S, Carter Y. What's in a care pathway? Towards a cultural
534 cartography of the new NHS. *Sociology of health & illness* 2005; **27**(6): 759-79.
- 535 31. Lismont J, Janssens A-S, Odnoletkova I, vanden Broucke S, Caron F, Vanthienen J. A
536 guide for the application of analytics on healthcare processes: A dynamic view on patient
537 pathways. *Computers in biology and medicine* 2016; **77**: 125-34.
- 538 32. Richter P, Schlieter H. Understanding patient pathways in the context of integrated
539 health care services-implications from a scoping review. 2019.
- 540 33. Gartner J-B, Abasse KS, Bergeron F, Landa P, Lemaire C, Côté A. Definition and
541 conceptualization of the patient-centered care pathway, a proposed integrative framework
542 for consensus: a concept analysis and systematic review. *BMC health services research* 2022;
543 **22**(1): 558.

- 544 34. Hanson CL, Osberg M, Brown J, Durham G, Chin DP. Conducting patient-pathway
545 analysis to inform programming of tuberculosis services: methods. *The Journal of infectious*
546 *diseases* 2017; **216**(suppl_7): S679-S85.
- 547 35. Hanson C, Osberg M, Brown J, Durham G, Chin DP. Finding the missing patients with
548 tuberculosis: lessons learned from patient-pathway analyses in 5 countries. *The Journal of*
549 *infectious diseases* 2017; **216**(suppl_7): S686-S95.
- 550 36. Li Y, Ehiri J, Tang S, et al. Factors associated with patient, and diagnostic delays in
551 Chinese TB patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC medicine* 2013; **11**: 1-15.
- 552 37. Obsa MS, Daga WB, Wosene NG, et al. Treatment seeking delay and associated
553 factors among tuberculosis patients attending health facility in Ethiopia from 2000 to 2020:
554 a systematic review and meta analysis. *PloS one* 2021; **16**(7): e0253746.
- 555 38. Ukwaja KN, Alobu I, Nweke CO, Onyenwe EC. Healthcare-seeking behavior,
556 treatment delays and its determinants among pulmonary tuberculosis patients in rural
557 Nigeria: a cross-sectional study. *BMC health services research* 2013; **13**: 1-9.
- 558 39. Almeida CPBd, Skupien EC, Silva DR. Health care seeking behavior and patient delay
559 in tuberculosis diagnosis. *Cadernos de saude publica* 2015; **31**(2): 321-30.
- 560 40. Fuady A, Houweling TAJ, Mansyur M, Burhan E, Richardus JH. Cost of seeking care for
561 tuberculosis since the implementation of universal health coverage in Indonesia. *BMC*
562 *Health Services Research* 2020; **20**(502).
- 563 41. Camfield L, Streuli N, Woodhead M. Children's well-being in developing countries: A
564 conceptual and methodological review. *The European Journal of Development Research*
565 2010; **22**: 398-416.
- 566 42. Wang J, Lloyd-Evans B, Giacco D, et al. Social isolation in mental health: a conceptual
567 and methodological review. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology* 2017; **52**: 1451-
568 61.
- 569 43. Kallio H, Pietilä AM, Johnson M, Kangasniemi M. Systematic methodological review:
570 developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. *Journal of*
571 *advanced nursing* 2016; **72**(12): 2954-65.
- 572 44. Frederiksen L, Phelps SF, Kimmons R. Introduction to literature reviews. *Rapid*
573 *academic writing [document on the Internet] c2018 [cited 2021 Oct 13] Available from:*
574 https://edtechbooks.org/pdfs/mobile/rapidwriting/lit_rev_intro.pdf 2018.
- 575 45. Hulland J. Conceptual review papers: revisiting existing research to develop and
576 refine theory. *AMS Review* 2020; **10**(1): 27-35.
- 577 46. Jit M, Ng DHL, Luangsanatip N, et al. Quantifying the economic cost of antibiotic
578 resistance and the impact of related interventions: rapid methodological review, conceptual
579 framework and recommendations for future studies. *BMC medicine* 2020; **18**: 1-14.
- 580 47. Campbell M, Egan M, Lorenc T, et al. Considering methodological options for reviews
581 of theory: illustrated by a review of theories linking income and health. *Systematic reviews*
582 2014; **3**: 1-11.
- 583 48. Mbuagbaw L, Lawson DO, Puljak L, Allison DB, Thabane L. A tutorial on
584 methodological studies: the what, when, how and why. *BMC Medical Research*
585 *Methodology* 2020; **20**: 1-12.
- 586 49. Munn Z, Stern C, Aromataris E, Lockwood C, Jordan Z. What kind of systematic
587 review should I conduct? A proposed typology and guidance for systematic reviewers in the
588 medical and health sciences. *BMC medical research methodology* 2018; **18**: 1-9.

- 589 50. Lilford RJ, Richardson A, Stevens A, et al. Issues in methodological research:
590 perspectives from researchers and commissioners. 2001.
- 591 51. Joanna Briggs Institute. Critical Appraisal Tools. 2020. [https://jbi.global/critical-](https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools)
592 [appraisal-tools](https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools).
- 593 52. Hong QN, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, et al. The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT)
594 version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. *Education for information* 2018;
595 **34**(4): 285-91.
- 596 53. Yang W-T, Gounder CR, Akande T, et al. Barriers and delays in tuberculosis diagnosis
597 and treatment services: does gender matter? *Tuberculosis research and treatment* 2014;
598 **2014**.
- 599 54. Subbaraman R, Jhaveri T, Nathavitharana RR. Closing gaps in the tuberculosis care
600 cascade: an action-oriented research agenda. *Journal of clinical tuberculosis and other*
601 *mycobacterial diseases* 2020; **19**: 100144.
- 602 55. Mugavero MJ, Amico KR, Horn T, Thompson MA. The state of engagement in HIV
603 care in the United States: from cascade to continuum to control. *Clinical infectious diseases*
604 2013; **57**(8): 1164-71.
- 605 56. Oga-Omenka C, Boffa J, Kuye J, Dakum P, Menzies D, Zarowsky C. Understanding the
606 gaps in DR-TB care cascade in Nigeria: A sequential mixed-method study. *Journal of Clinical*
607 *Tuberculosis and Other Mycobacterial Diseases* 2020; **21**: 100193.
- 608 57. Baru RV. Disease and Suffering: Towards a Framework for Understanding Health
609 Seeking Behavior. *Indian Anthropologist* 2005: 45-52.
- 610 58. Lestari BW, McAllister S, Hadisoemarto PF, et al. Patient pathways and delays to
611 diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis in an urban setting in Indonesia. *The Lancet*
612 *Regional Health—Western Pacific* 2020; **5**.
- 613 59. Ahmad RA, Mahendradhata Y, Utarini A, de Vlas SJ. Diagnostic delay amongst
614 tuberculosis patients in Jogjakarta Province, Indonesia is related to the quality of services in
615 DOTS facilities. *Tropical Medicine & International Health* 2011; **16**(4): 412-23.
- 616 60. Ansar A, Lewis V, McDonald CF, Liu C, Rahman MA. Duration of intervals in the care
617 seeking pathway for lung cancer in Bangladesh: A journey from symptoms triggering
618 consultation to receipt of treatment. *PloS one* 2021; **16**(9): e0257301.
- 619 61. Asres A, Jerene D, Deressa W. Delays to anti-tuberculosis treatment initiation among
620 cases on directly observed treatment short course in districts of southwestern Ethiopia: a
621 cross sectional study. *BMC Infect Dis* 2019; **19**(1): 481.
- 622 62. Atre SR, Jagtap JD, Faqih MI, et al. Tuberculosis pathways to care and transmission of
623 multidrug resistance in India. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*
624 2022; **205**(2): 233-41.
- 625 63. Ayisi JG, Hoog AHv, Agaya JA, et al. Care seeking and attitudes towards treatment
626 compliance by newly enrolled tuberculosis patients in the district treatment programme in
627 rural western Kenya: a qualitative study. *BMC Public Health* 2011; **11**(515).
- 628 64. Bronner Murrison L, Ananthakrishnan R, Swaminathan A, et al. How do patients
629 access the private sector in Chennai, India? An evaluation of delays in tuberculosis
630 diagnosis. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis* 2016; **20**(4): 544-51.
- 631 65. Diallo A, Combarry A, Veronese V, et al. Delays in TB Diagnosis and Treatment
632 Initiation in Burkina Faso during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Trop Med Infect Dis* 2022; **7**(9).

- 633 66. Gothankar JS, Patil UP, Gaikwad SR, Kamble SB. Care seeking behaviour and various
634 delays in tuberculosis patients registered under RNTCP in Pune city. *Indian Journal of*
635 *Community Health* 2016; **28**(1): 34-9.
- 636 67. Guan Z, Webber C, Flemming JA, et al. Real-world colorectal cancer diagnostic
637 pathways in Ontario, Canada: A population-based study. *European Journal of Cancer Care*
638 2022; **31**(5): 1-13.
- 639 68. Herdman MT, Maude RJ, Chowdhury MS, et al. The relationship between poverty
640 and healthcare seeking among patients hospitalized with acute febrile illnesses in
641 Chittagong, Bangladesh. *PLoS One* 2016; **11**(4): e0152965.
- 642 69. Kasse Y, Jasseh M, Corrah T, et al. Health seeking behaviour, health system
643 experience and tuberculosis case finding in Gambians with cough. *BMC Public Health* 2006;
644 **6**(143).
- 645 70. Kumawat A, Chakraborti A, Kumar S, et al. Study of factors leading to treatment
646 delay in new sputum positive pulmonary tuberculosis patients and its impact on sputum
647 conversion. *Tropical Doctor*.
- 648 71. Lancaster L, Bonella F, Inoue Y, et al. Idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis: Physician and
649 patient perspectives on the pathway to care from symptom recognition to diagnosis and
650 disease burden. *Respirology (Carlton, Vic)* 2022; **27**(1): 66-75.
- 651 72. Laokri S, Drabo MK, Weil O, Kafando B, Dembélé SM, Dujardin B. Patients are paying
652 too much for tuberculosis: a direct cost-burden evaluation in Burkina Faso. *PLoS One* 2013;
653 **8**(2): e56752.
- 654 73. Maamari F. Case-finding tuberculosis patients: diagnostic and treatment delays and
655 their determinants. *Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal* 2008; **14**(3): 531-45.
- 656 74. Mercer CH, Sutcliffe L, Johnson AM, et al. How much do delayed healthcare seeking,
657 delayed care provision, and diversion from primary care contribute to the transmission of
658 STIs? *SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED INFECTIONS* 2007; **83**(5): 400-5.
- 659 75. Mistry N, Lobo E, Shah S, Rangan S, Dholakia Y. Pulmonary tuberculosis in Patna,
660 India: Durations, delays, and health care seeking behaviour among patients identified
661 through household surveys. *Journal of Epidemiology and Global Health* 2017; **7**(4): 241-8.
- 662 76. Mistry N, Rangan S, Dholakia Y, Lobo E, Shah S, Patil A. Durations and Delays in Care
663 Seeking, Diagnosis and Treatment Initiation in Uncomplicated Pulmonary Tuberculosis
664 Patients in Mumbai, India. *PLoS One* 2016; **11**(3).
- 665 77. Priya R, Kalpita S, Bhaskaran U, Abhinav P, Abhirami N. Patient treatment pathways
666 of multidrug-resistant tuberculosis cases in coastal South India: road to a drug resistant
667 tuberculosis center [version 5; peer review: 2 approved, 1 approved with reservations].
668 *F1000Research* 2021; **8**(498).
- 669 78. Rajeswari R, Chandrasekaran V, Suhadev M, Sivasubramaniam S, Sudha G, Renu G.
670 Factors associated with patient and health system delays in the diagnosis of tuberculosis in
671 South India. *International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease* 2002; **6**(9): 789-95.
- 672 79. Salaniponi FM, Harries AD, Banda HT, et al. Care seeking behaviour and diagnostic
673 processes in patients with smear-positive pulmonary tuberculosis in Malawi. *Int J Tuberc*
674 *Lung Dis* 2000; **4**(4): 327-32.
- 675 80. Shah S, Shah S, Rangan S, et al. Effect of public-private interface agency in Patna and
676 Mumbai, India: Does it alter durations and delays in care seeking for drug-sensitive
677 pulmonary tuberculosis? *Gates Open Res* 2020; **4**: 32.

- 678 81. Sharma N, Bhatnagar A, Basu S, et al. A comparison of patient treatment pathways
679 among multidrug-resistant and drug-sensitive TB cases in Delhi, India: A cross-sectional
680 study. *Indian J Tuberc* 2020; **67**(4): 502-8.
- 681 82. Steel Z, McDonald R, Silove D, et al. Pathways to the first contact with specialist
682 mental health care. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 2006; **40**(4): 347-54.
- 683 83. Tay M, Ang L, Wei W, Lee VJM, Leo Y, Toh MPH. Health-seeking behavior of COVID-
684 19 cases during the first eight weeks of the outbreak in Singapore: differences between local
685 community and imported cases and having visits to single or multiple healthcare providers.
686 *BMC Public Health* 2022; **22**(239).
- 687 84. Thomas N, Rajalingam R, Vallabhaneni V, Varghese J. A Cross-Sectional Descriptive
688 Study to Ascertain Factors Influencing Delay in Diagnosis among Newly Diagnosed
689 Pulmonary Tuberculosis Patients. *Indian Journal of Respiratory Care* 2022; **11**(4): 341-8.
- 690 85. Veesa KS, John KR, Moonan PK, et al. Diagnostic pathways and direct medical costs
691 incurred by new adult pulmonary tuberculosis patients prior to anti-tuberculosis treatment -
692 Tamil Nadu, India. *PLoS One* 2018; **13**(2): e0191591.
- 693 86. Viney KA, Johnson P, Tagaro M, et al. Tuberculosis patients' knowledge and beliefs
694 about tuberculosis: a mixed methods study from the Pacific Island nation of Vanuatu. *BMC*
695 *Public Health* 2014; **14**.
- 696 87. Wei X, Zou G, Yin J, Walley J, Sun Q. Comparing patient care seeking pathways in
697 three models of hospital and TB programme collaboration in China. *BMC Infectious Diseases*
698 2013; **13**(93).
- 699 88. Wei XL, Liang XY, Walley JD, Liu FY, Dong BQ. Analysis of care-seeking pathways of
700 tuberculosis patients in Guangxi, China, with and without decentralised tuberculosis
701 services. *International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease* 2009; **13**(4): 514-20.
- 702 89. White V, Bergin RJ, Thomas RJ, Whitfield K, Weller D. The pathway to diagnosis and
703 treatment for surgically managed lung cancer patients. *Family practice* 2020; **37**(2): 234-41.
- 704 90. Yellappa V, Lefèvre P, Battaglioli T, Devadasan N, Van der Stuyft P. Patients pathways
705 to tuberculosis diagnosis and treatment in a fragmented health system: a qualitative study
706 from a south Indian district. *BMC public health* 2017; **17**(1): 1-10.
- 707 91. Zhang L, Weng T, Wang H, et al. Patient pathway analysis of tuberculosis diagnostic
708 delay: a multicentre retrospective cohort study in China. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*
709 2021; **27**(7): 1000-6.
- 710 92. Abimbola S, Ukwaja KN, Onyedum CC, Negin J, Jan S, Martiniuk AL. Transaction costs
711 of access to health care: Implications of the care-seeking pathways of tuberculosis patients
712 for health system governance in Nigeria. *Glob Public Health* 2015; **10**(9): 1060-77.
- 713 93. Asbroek AHAt, Bijlsma MW, Malla P, Shrestha B, Delnoij DMJ. The road to
714 tuberculosis treatment in rural Nepal: a qualitative assessment of 26 journeys. *BMC Health*
715 *Services Research* 2008; **8**(7).
- 716 94. Aye R, Wyss K, Abdualimova H, Saidaliev S. Patient's site of first access to health
717 system influences length of delay for tuberculosis treatment in Tajikistan. *BMC Health*
718 *Services Research* 2010; **10**(10).
- 719 95. Benjarattanaporn P, Lindan CP, Mills S, et al. Men with sexually transmitted diseases
720 in Bangkok: where do they go for treatment and why? *Aids* 1997; **11**(Supplement1): S87-
721 S95.

- 722 96. Bhattacharya Chakravarty A, Rangan S, Dholakia Y, et al. Such a long journey: What
723 health seeking pathways of patients with drug resistant tuberculosis in Mumbai tell us. *PLoS*
724 *One* 2019; **14**(1): e0209924.
- 725 97. Kallander K, Counihan H, Cerveau T, Mbofana F. Barriers on the pathway to survival
726 for children dying from treatable illnesses in Inhambane province, Mozambique. *Journal of*
727 *Global Health* 2019; **9**(1).
- 728 98. Mesfin MM, Newell JN, Walley JD, Gessesew A, Madeley RJ. Delayed consultation
729 among pulmonary tuberculosis patients: a cross sectional study of 10 DOTS districts of
730 Ethiopia. *BMC Public Health* 2009; **9**(53).
- 731 99. Millar KR, McCutcheon J, Coakley EH, et al. Patterns and predictors of malaria care-
732 seeking, diagnostic testing, and artemisinin-based combination therapy for children under
733 five with fever in Northern Nigeria: a cross-sectional study. *Malaria Journal* 2014; **13**(447).
- 734 100. Pati S, Sahoo KC, Samal M, et al. Care-seeking pathways, care challenges, and coping
735 experiences of rural women living with rheumatoid arthritis in Odisha, India. *Primary Health*
736 *Care Research & Development* 2019; **20**.
- 737 101. Renthlei L, Murhekar MV. Health-seeking behaviour for febrile illness in malaria-
738 endemic Kolasib district, Mizoram, India. *International Health (RSTMH)* 2012; **4**(4): 314-9.
- 739 102. Shete PB, Haguma P, Miller CR, et al. Pathways and costs of care for patients with
740 tuberculosis symptoms in rural Uganda. *International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung*
741 *Disease* 2015; **19**(8): 912-7.
- 742 103. Tadokera R, Huo S, Theron G, Timire C, Manyau-Makumbirofa S, Metcalfe JZ. Health
743 care seeking patterns of rifampicin-resistant tuberculosis patients in Harare, Zimbabwe: A
744 prospective cohort study. *PLoS One* 2021; **16**(7).
- 745 104. Thomas BE, Thiruvengadam K, Raghavi S, et al. Understanding health care-seeking
746 behaviour of the tribal population in India among those with presumptive TB symptoms.
747 *PLoS One* 2021; **16**(5).
- 748 105. Wei X, Yin J, Zou G, et al. Patient care pathways under the model of integrating
749 tuberculosis service with general hospitals in China. *Tropical Medicine & International*
750 *Health* 2013; **18**(11): 1392-9.
- 751 106. Wong K, Mollendorf Cv, Martinson N, et al. Healthcare utilization for common
752 infectious disease syndromes in Soweto and Klerksdorp, South Africa. *Pan African Medical*
753 *Journal* 2018; **30**: 271.
- 754 107. Almeida CP, Skupien EC, Silva DR. Health care seeking behavior and patient delay in
755 tuberculosis diagnosis. *Cad Saude Publica* 2015; **31**(2): 321-30.
- 756 108. Ananthkrishnan R, Jeyaraju AR, Palani G, Sathiyasekaran BWC. Care Seeking
757 Behavior of the TB Patients who were Registered in an Urban Government Tuberculosis
758 Control in Chennai, Tamilnadu, India. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research* 2012; **6**(6):
759 990-3.
- 760 109. Charles N, Thomas B, Watson B, Raja Sakthivel M, Chandrasekeran V, Wares F. Care
761 seeking behavior of chest symptomatics: a community based study done in South India after
762 the implementation of the RNTCP. *PLoS One* 2010; **5**(9).
- 763 110. Suganthi P, Chadha VK, Ahmed J, et al. Health seeking and knowledge about
764 tuberculosis among persons with pulmonary symptoms and tuberculosis cases in Bangalore
765 slums. *International Journal of Tuberculosis and Lung Disease* 2008; **12**(11): 1268-73.
- 766 111. Smith LA, Bruce J, Gueye L, et al. From fever to anti-malarial: the treatment-seeking
767 process in rural Senegal. *Malaria Journal* 2010; **9**(333).

- 768 112. Ehsanul Huq K, Moriyama M, Zaman K, et al. Health seeking behaviour and delayed
769 management of tuberculosis patients in rural Bangladesh. *BMC Infect Dis* 2018; **18**(1): 515.
- 770 113. Ahmed SM, Rashidul H, Ubydul H, Awlad H. Knowledge on the transmission,
771 prevention and treatment of malaria among two endemic populations of Bangladesh and
772 their health-seeking behaviour. *Malaria Journal* 2009; **8**(173).
- 773 114. Auer C, Kiefer S, Zuske M, et al. Health-seeking behaviour and treatment delay in
774 patients with pulmonary tuberculosis in Switzerland: some slip through the net. *Swiss Med*
775 *Wkly* 2018; **148**: w14659.
- 776 115. Chadha VK, Praseeja P, Srivastava R, et al. Pre-treatment delay and out of pocket
777 expenses by notified new tuberculosis patients in an Indian mega city. *Indian J Tuberc* 2022;
778 **69**(4): 446-52.
- 779 116. Ku CC, Chen CC, Dixon S, Lin HH, Dodd PJ. Patient pathways of tuberculosis care-
780 seeking and treatment: an individual-level analysis of National Health Insurance data in
781 Taiwan. *BMJ Global Health* 2020; **5**(6).
- 782 117. Ukwaja KN, Alobu I, Nweke CO, Onyenwe EC. Healthcare-seeking behavior,
783 treatment delays and its determinants among pulmonary tuberculosis patients in rural
784 Nigeria: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Health Services Research* 2013; **13**(25).
- 785 118. Pati S, Hussain MA, Chauhan AS, Mallick D, Nayak S. Patient navigation pathway and
786 barriers to treatment seeking in cancer in India: a qualitative inquiry. *Cancer Epidemiology*
787 2013; **37**(6): 973-8.
- 788 119. Hossain I, Hill P, Bottomley C, et al. Healthcare seeking and access to care for
789 pneumonia, sepsis, meningitis, and malaria in rural Gambia. *American Journal of Tropical*
790 *Medicine and Hygiene* 2022; **106**(2): 446-53.
- 791 120. Omale UI, Oka OU, Okeke IM, et al. Demand for malaria rapid diagnostic test, health
792 care-seeking behaviour, and drug use among rural community members with fever or
793 malaria-like illness in Ebonyi state, Nigeria: a cross-sectional household survey. *BMC Health*
794 *Services Research* 2021; **21**(1).
- 795 121. Price J, Willcox M, Dlamini V, et al. Care-seeking during fatal childhood illness in rural
796 South Africa: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open* 2021; **11**(4).