

1 **Article type:** Research article

2 **Title:** Assembling the Challenge of Multimorbidity in Zimbabwe: A Participatory
3 Ethnographic Study

4 **Authors:** Justin Dixon^{1,2,3*}, Efison Dhodho,^{2,3†} Fionah Mundoga^{1,2‡}, Karen Webb^{2†}, Pogie
5 Chimberengwa^{2,4}, Trudy Mhlanga², Tatenda Nhapi², Theonevus Tinashe Chinyanga², Justice
6 Mudavanhu⁵, Lee Nkala⁵, Ronald Nyabereka⁶, Gwati Gwati⁷, Gerald Shambira⁸, Trust
7 Zaranyika⁹, Clare I.R. Chandler^{3‡}, Rashida A. Ferrand^{1,10‡}, Chiratidzo Ellen Ndhlovu^{9‡}

8

9 **Affiliations:**

10 1. The Health Research Unit Zimbabwe, Biomedical Research and Training Institute, Harare,
11 Zimbabwe

12 2. Organisation for Public Health Interventions and Development, Harare, Zimbabwe

13 3. Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical
14 Medicine, London, UK

15 4. National University of Science and Technology, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe

16 5. Directorate of Non-Communicable Diseases, Ministry of Health and Child Care, Harare,
17 Zimbabwe

18 6. AIDS and TB Unit, Ministry of Health and Child Care, Harare, Zimbabwe

19 7. Directorate of Policy, Planning, and Health Economics, Ministry of Health and Child Care,
20 Harare, Zimbabwe

21 8. Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University
22 of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe

23 9. Department of Internal Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of
24 Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 10. Department of Clinical Research, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine,
26 London, UK

27

28 ***Correspondence to:**

29 Justin Dixon

30 Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical

31 Medicine, 15-17 Tavistock Place, Kings Cross, London WC1H 9SH, United Kingdom

32 Email: justin.dixon@lshtm.ac.uk

33 † Equally contributing second authors, listed alphabetically

34 ‡ Equally contributing last authors, listed alphabetically

35

36 **Keywords:** Multimorbidity, Zimbabwe, global health, ethnography, interdisciplinarity

37 **Word count:** 8,540

38 **Abstract:** 273

39 **References:** 62

40 **Tables and Figures:** Tables: 2, Figures: 3

41 **Supporting information files:** 4

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 **Abstract**

50 Multimorbidity, increasingly recognised as a global health challenge, has recently emerged on
51 the health agendas of many lower-income countries, including in Africa. Yet with its
52 conceptual origins in the global North, its meaning and possible utility for stakeholders in
53 lower-resources settings remains abstract. This study drew together policymakers, public
54 health practitioners, academics, health informaticians, health professionals, and people living
55 with multimorbidity (PLWMM) in Zimbabwe to understand: What is the transformative
56 potential and possible limitations of elevating multimorbidity as a priority in this setting? To
57 bring these different perspectives into conversation, we used a participatory ethnographic
58 design that involved a health facility survey, participant-observation, in-depth interviews,
59 audio-visual diaries, and participatory workshops. Multimorbidity, we found, was new to many
60 respondents but generally viewed as a meaningful and useful concept. It foregrounded a range
61 of challenges related to the ‘vertical’ organisation and uneven funding of different diseases,
62 while revealing promising opportunities for integration across entrenched silos of knowledge
63 and practice. However, with capacity and momentum to address multimorbidity currently
64 concentrated within the HIV programme, there was concern that multimorbidity could itself
65 become verticalized, undercutting its transformative potential. Participants agreed that
66 responding to multimorbidity requires a decisive shift from vertical, disease-centred
67 programming to restore the comprehensive primary care that undergirded Zimbabwe’s once-
68 renowned health system. It also means building a policy-enabling environment that values
69 generalist (as well as specialist) knowledge, ground-level experience, and inclusive stakeholder
70 engagement. The ‘learning’ health system, we conclude, represents a promising conceptual
71 lens for unifying these imperatives, providing a tangible framework for how knowledge, policy,
72 and practice synergise within more self-reliant, person-centred health systems able to respond
73 to ever-evolving complex health challenges like multimorbidity.

74 **Key words:** Ethnography, global health, knowledge architecture, learning health systems,
75 multimorbidity, Zimbabwe

76

77

78 **1. Introduction**

79 Multimorbidity, commonly defined as the co-occurrence of two-or-more long-term conditions
80 in one individual, has been described as the next ‘global pandemic’.[1] In countries undergoing
81 epidemiological transitions, including in Africa, multimorbidity has been characterised as a
82 ‘clash’ of persisting communicable diseases (notably HIV and tuberculosis (TB)) and rising
83 non-communicable diseases (NCDs) that require multiple forms of expertise and coordinated
84 care to manage.[2] Yet, health systems remain largely organised around specialist rather than
85 generalist knowledge,[3] which in many African nations translates into siloed organisation of
86 care, fuelled by ‘vertical’ single-disease programming.[2] Priority-setting initiatives for
87 multimorbidity in a global context[4–6] including in sub-Saharan Africa specifically[5,6]
88 highlight the need to identify common disease ‘clusters’ and shared determinants; improve
89 multimorbidity prevention and treatment; and more broadly restructure health systems to
90 become more integrated and person-centred. The COVID-19 pandemic has since highlighted
91 the importance of prioritising multimorbidity, with the virus disproportionately affecting those
92 with multiple ‘underlying conditions’.[7]

93

94 The social sciences, including medical anthropology, have been integral in advancing
95 understandings of multimorbidity. Qualitative research in a range of low-resource contexts
96 including in Africa has shed light on the systemic vulnerabilities that expose marginalised
97 people and populations to multimorbidity,[8,9] the way that health and social challenges
98 cumulatively intertwine to coproduce and exacerbate multimorbidity,[10,11] and the

99 challenges faced by patients and providers navigating fragmented health systems designed for
100 single disease care.[12–15] Qualitative studies have also contributed to recognition that
101 frameworks to integrate care are extremely challenging to implement in practice and often do
102 not go far enough to tackle multimorbidity’s social and structural determinants. Bosire et
103 al,[12] for instance, demonstrated that South Africa’s Integrated Chronic Disease Management
104 (ICDM) Model, designed to provide integrated person-centred care for long-term conditions,
105 has faced considerable challenges delivering on its intended outcomes due to resource scarcity,
106 partial implementation, continued fragmentation, and emphasis on pharmaceutical disease care
107 at the expense of patients’ social and economic context.

108

109 With multimorbidity gaining traction as a global health priority, a growing number of studies
110 have critically interrogated what it is currently ‘doing’ as a concept and whether it is proving
111 as radical and transformative as it has been hoped to be.[16–18] On the one hand,
112 multimorbidity has become a focal point for tensions that have been long building across the
113 spectrum of medicine and global health, sparking cross-cutting recognition of the evident
114 breakdown of ‘vertical’ funding and governance mechanisms, parallel research and data
115 infrastructures, the proliferation of clinical sub-specialities and over generalism and public
116 health; and fragmented, unevenly resourced care delivery systems.[17] As such,
117 multimorbidity may be a powerful concept for confronting these systemic issues and realigning
118 of health systems with increasingly complex health needs. At the same time, multimorbidity is
119 evidently a disease-centred construct and emergent of the very Euro-Western philosophical
120 traditions that have made the single disease model so intractable.[16–18] Recognition of this
121 has prompted several initiatives – including within the current Collection – to reconceptualise
122 multimorbidity to put people-in-context, rather than diseases, back at its theoretical
123 centre.[16,19,20] Yet with little empirical research into the meaning and significance of

124 multimorbidity within particular health system contexts, particularly in low-resource settings,
125 these conversations remain abstract. Inclusive, bottom-up understandings of multimorbidity
126 are required to ensure that multimorbidity is able to fulfil some of the promises that have been
127 pinned to it and that it does not inadvertently perpetuate disease-centred care.[17]

128

129 This article presents findings from a collaborative anthropological study that sought to address
130 the question: what is the transformative potential and possible limitations of elevating
131 multimorbidity as a priority in Zimbabwe? To answer this question we brought together a
132 diversity of perspectives on multimorbidity from across the country's health and academic
133 sectors to better understand the tensions, challenges, and opportunities that multimorbidity
134 brought to the fore for differently-situated respondents and to identify potential benefits and
135 limitations of multimorbidity as a conceptual lens and organising principle. Because
136 multimorbidity in Zimbabwe, like many African nations, was only just starting to emerge on
137 the radar and was not yet part of a formal strategy, this was an opportune moment to develop
138 a formative agenda and set of priorities with already-well positioned respondents while creating
139 new partnerships and relationships to take these forward. The aim was to engage stakeholders
140 in a way that was holistic, critical, and commensurate across different disciplines, fields, and
141 perspectives, and would therefore help ensure that transformative potentials of multimorbidity
142 were optimised while minimising any possible limitations or harms.

143

144 **2. Study Setting and Design**

145 This article is based on findings from the KnowM^M study (2021-2024), an interdisciplinary
146 global health research collaboration centred on a participatory ethnographic study of
147 multimorbidity within the Zimbabwean health system.

148

149 **2.1. Study setting**

150 Zimbabwe is a lower-middle-income country with a population of 16.3 million.[21] Following
151 independence in 1980, huge strides were made in expanding access to healthcare, including in
152 moving from an urban, curative, and racially-biased health system to one focused on delivering
153 affordable primary healthcare to underserved communities.[22–24] Zimbabwe came to boast
154 one of Africa's strongest health systems, with thriving teaching hospitals and academic sector,
155 well-trained health workforce, and decentralised care system organised rationally around its
156 essential medicine list and national treatment guideline (EDLIZ) and co-produced training
157 manuals.[25] However, the achievements of the 1980s–90s were undone by political
158 instability, economic structural adjustment (which decreased public spending in favour of
159 privatisation), hyperinflation, the reintroduction of user fees in hospitals and urban clinics, and
160 the HIV and AIDS epidemic.[26] Since then, Zimbabwe experienced among the steepest
161 exponential rises in NCDs in sub-Saharan Africa,[27] and modelling suggests that
162 multimorbidity, particularly among people living with HIV, will rise sharply by 2035.[28] The
163 health system remains fragmented, under-resourced and oriented towards infectious disease
164 care. It has also experienced high rates of health workers attrition and regular collapses over
165 the last two decades, most recently during the COVID-19 pandemic.[29]

166
167 KnowM^M was conducted in four provinces of Zimbabwe: Harare, Bulawayo, Mashonaland
168 East, and Matabeleland South ([Figure 1](#)). Harare and Bulawayo are metropolitan provinces,
169 with the majority of political institutions, universities, and all Central hospitals. They also both
170 share a similar provincial health system structure, with primary healthcare for the majority
171 provided by City Councils and most referrals going straight to one of the Central hospitals.
172 Both also have large private sectors made up of primary and secondary facilities (for the
173 affluent minority), as well as private pharmacies and laboratories. Mashonaland East, bordering

174 Harare, is a predominantly rural province in which most public healthcare is run by the central
175 government, which includes primary, secondary, and tertiary care, with referrals for quaternary
176 care generally sent to Harare. Matabeleland South is a predominantly rural province with a
177 broadly similar structure to Mashonaland East, with quaternary referrals referred mainly to
178 Bulawayo rather than to Harare. The four provinces were selected to capture urban and rural
179 settings, a balance of provinces in the majority Mashonaland region and minority Matabeleland
180 region, as well as to capture the main differences in health system structure and referral
181 relationships.

182

183

184

[insert figure 1]

185

Figure 1: Provinces of Zimbabwe included in the KnowM^M study

186

187

188

189 **2.2. Study design**

190 KnowM^M used a participatory ethnographic study design. Informed by mapping work of the
191 emerging field of global multimorbidity research,[6,17] primary data collection including
192 participant recruitment took place in Zimbabwe between 01-09-2022 and 31-12-2023 by an
193 interdisciplinary team of medical anthropologists (JD, FM, CC), clinical academics (RAF, GS,
194 TZ, CEN), and public health practitioners from project implementing partner OPHID (KW,
195 ED, PC, TM, TN, and TTC), supported by key Directorates within the Ministry of Health and
196 Child Care (MoHCC) (RN, JM, LN, GG). Our study design is informed by the principle of
197 “slow co-production”[30] which includes participants not just as sources of data but as active
198 agents in the production of knowledge. This was important given that the concept of

199 multimorbidity has emerged from high-income settings, with uncertainty about its relevance
200 beyond the rich world. In engaging with participants, we invited them to think ‘with’ the
201 concept of multimorbidity – where necessary, providing the working definition of ‘multiple
202 long-term conditions’ – but critically, without reifying it as a category and allowing participants
203 to drive conversations about its meaning and significance in the Zimbabwean context.

204

205 In total, 130 individuals took part in the study (overview of participants provided in [Table 1](#)).
206 Data collection commenced with a survey of health facilities (n=30) in the four provinces,
207 purposively selected to provide a broad, formative understanding of the capacity of facilities at
208 different levels of care in different provinces for addressing NCDs and multimorbidity (see
209 [Table 2](#)). Questions pertained to services and staffing; routines and challenges regarding the
210 management of NCDs and multimorbidity; and preparedness for managing specific NCDs
211 (hypertension, diabetes, chronic respiratory disease, and depression), the latter based on WHO
212 facility indicators.[31] Surveys were administered with facility managers, with input on
213 specific questions by clinicians, pharmacists, human resources, and health information officers.
214 To gain a deeper appreciation of how multimorbidity was being engaged with in practice, we
215 conducted participant-observation and in-depth interviews in 10 facilities from the survey
216 purposively selected to represent different levels of care. Participants were generally nurses or
217 physicians (depending on level of care) to whom we were referred by facility managers, with
218 expertise in general medicine, infectious diseases (especially HIV and TB), physical NCDs
219 (including cardiometabolic conditions, oncology, and rheumatology), and mental health
220 conditions (see [Table 1](#)). Participant-observation typically took place over 1-3 days and
221 involved ‘shadowing’ participants to understand practices and routines related to
222 multimorbidity, during which fieldnotes were taken on encrypted tablets. Interviews were
223 conducted using bespoke interview guides developed from a set of high-level pre-determined

224 themes as well as findings from observation, and were conducted where possible at
225 participants' places of work during quiet periods. Interviews lasted approximately 1 hour and
226 were audio-recorded unless participants declined, in which case detailed notes were taken
227 instead. No repeat interviews were conducted. To gain a patient perspective, we included 23
228 PLWMM from facilities involved in participant-observation, purposively selected in
229 consultation with attending health workers to represent differences in age, sex, geographical
230 location, and conditions (S1 Appendix). We conducted in-depth interviews with all 23
231 PLWMM to capture illness and treatment-seeking narratives, understandings of their medical
232 conditions, and experiences accessing care. We asked every third participant to keep 7-day
233 audio-visual diary on encrypted smartphones to gain a deeper understanding of their
234 experiences and routines. Where appropriate (e.g., for elderly patients), family members and
235 carers assisted in the recording of the audio-visual diaries.

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

Table 1: Participant demographics and activities breakdown

11

Participant group	Ethnographic fieldwork participants (total and specific activities*)							Workshop participants		Grand total participants
	Total participants	Facility survey	In-depth interviewees	Participant-observation	Audio-visual diaries	Bulawayo workshop	Harare workshop			
People living with multimorbidity	23	-	23	-	10	2(2†)	3(3)	23		
Healthcare professionals#	46	31‡	6	18	-	9(3)	7(3)	56		
Clinical academics and educators#)	7		5	7	-	1(1)	4(2)	9		
Public health policymakers and officers within the Ministry of Health and Child Care (MoHCC)	5(7) §	-	4	5	-	7(3)	13(3)	19		
Health informaticians, electronic health record (EHR) experts and/or data managers	2(3) ¶	-	3	2	-	1(0)	1(0)	4		
Non-governmental organization (NGOs) employees	10(11) &	-	4	6	-	12(7)	9(5)	19		
Cumulative total	93	31	45	38	10	32(16)	37(16)	130		

* Some participants took part in multiple research activities
Fields and specialties represented by healthcare workers and clinical academics included: general practice (GPs), general nursing, midwifery, infectious disease (mostly HIV and TB), rheumatology, endocrinology, oncology, psychiatry, mental health, epidemiology, and public health
† Number of which were prior research participants in ethnography and excluded from the cumulative totals of participants
‡ In one central hospital, there were 2x survey respondents due to semi-autonomous nature of its psychiatric unit but have merged these in the analysis to total n=30 surveys
§ n=2 policymakers/officers co-classified as healthcare professionals and not added to cumulative total participants
¶ n=1 health informatician co-classified as a policymaker and not added to cumulative total participants
&n=1 NGO employee co-classified an academic and not added to cumulative total participants

245 **Table 2: Health facility survey details**

Province	Facility Level*				
	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary	Quaternary	
Harare	5(2)	-	-	1(1)	
Mashonaland East	3	2	1(1)	-	
Bulawayo	6(4)	-	-	3	
Matabeleland South	6(1)	2(1)	1	-	
Total	19	4	2	5	n=30(10)

246 *Definitions of levels of care:

- 247 • **Primary.** Clinics, polyclinics, private clinics, mission clinics, council/municipal clinics, rural
- 248 health centres.
- 249 • **Secondary.** District hospitals and other public and private health facilities to which patients are
- 250 referred from primary facilities for more specialist care.
- 251 • **Tertiary.** Provincial hospitals and other health facilities offering more advanced medical
- 252 investigations and treatment than available at secondary level.
- 253 • **Quaternary.** Central hospitals in Harare and Bulawayo.
- 254 (n) facilities also included in participant-observation work (n=10)
- 255

256 To capture how multimorbidity was being engaged in other spaces within the health system

257 beyond the service delivery level, we conducted in-depth interviews and, where appropriate,

258 participant-observation with professionals working across Zimbabwe’s health and academic

259 sectors. This included public health policymakers and practitioners in the MoHCC (n=7),

260 health informaticians, electronic health record (EHR) experts and/or data managers (n=3),

261 technical partners and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) (n=11), and

262 academics/researchers at tertiary education and research institutions (n=7). Most of the latter

263 were also at the top of their fields in their respective specialities, providing a clinical academic

264 perspective; most were also lecturers, thus also offering a medical education perspective.

265 Interviews and participant-observation were conducted using the same approach, timeframe,

266 and data collection tools to those used at service delivery level, with some overlap given the

267 aforementioned porosity of academic and clinical roles. Finally, we held two participatory

268 workshops, one in Bulawayo (including participants and stakeholders from Bulawayo and

269 Matabeleland South, n=32), and one in Harare (including participants and stakeholders from

270 Harare and Mashonaland East, n=37). The aim was to collaboratively interpret primary data
271 and co-develop a formative agenda comprised of priority areas, specific recommendations, and
272 focal institutions/departments for taking forward. Participants were invited to bring their
273 knowledge and experiences to bear on discussions, but in the process to reflexively situate and
274 potentially challenge their own assumptions through engagement with others' perspectives.

275

276 ***2.3 Data Analysis***

277 All data sources were entered into NVivo 14 for analysis. Data was analysed using the
278 principles of grounded theory – an inductive, theory-generating methodology that produces
279 contextualised, process-oriented theories of social phenomena.[32] Analysis was performed on
280 an ongoing, iterative basis by JD and FM that overlapped with, and was fed back into, the
281 ongoing collection of data. During primary data collection, observational, interview, audio-
282 video were coded, firstly through initial mapping and categorisation of data, before identifying
283 key themes emerging from different perspectives. During the collaborative workshops,
284 participants actively engaged in interpreting the findings and played a crucial role in the
285 validation and refinement of emerging themes. Workshop participants further worked together
286 to translate findings into a provisional multimorbidity agenda, which was subsequently refined
287 and finalised during a final round of data analysis and feedback.

288

289 ***2.4. Ethical Considerations***

290 Ethical approval was sought from the Medical Research Council of Zimbabwe
291 (MRCZ/A/2842), Joint Research Ethics Committee of the Parirenyatwa Group of Hospitals
292 and University of Zimbabwe Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences (386/2021), the City of
293 Harare, and the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (26469). All participants
294 provided written informed consent to take part. Where appropriate, group briefings were

295 conducted at healthcare facilities prior to asking individuals for consent. Before participant-
296 observation, timeframes were agreed upon with participants such that they were always
297 comfortable with the researcher’s presence and were free to alter any agreed-upon timeframes.
298 Regarding the use of interview data, participants were asked for their consent for anonymised
299 quotations to be used, otherwise their words were paraphrased. Before the collaborative
300 workshops, in the case of participants who had not provided written informed consent as part
301 of earlier study activities, they were asked to provide verbal consent for workshop data to be
302 used for research purposes, which was recorded in an Excel spreadsheet.

303

304 **3. Results**

305 Multimorbidity was a new term for many of our respondents. A familiar scene during
306 interviews, for instance, was a participant pausing mid-conversation to search for the term:
307 “multi...what do you call it?...bidity”. Familiarity and prior engagement with the term was
308 most pronounced in the international research community, HIV programme, and professional
309 healthcare networks, and continued to grow during the lifecycle of the study (not least because
310 of our study’s influence). Those who were already acquainted with the concept generally
311 understood it as the cooccurrence of multiple long-term conditions in one person, with HIV-
312 NCD a commonly cited example. But what challenges and tensions the concept brought to the
313 fore, its implications, and any reservations about prioritising multimorbidity were closely tied
314 to participants’ particular positioning within the health system. In the following sections, we
315 trace a narrative through the key themes that emerged through different ‘windows’ into
316 multimorbidity including health seeking and delivery; policy and planning; medical training
317 and professionalisation, and health data and research.

318

319 ***3.1. Whose Multimorbidity is “Better”?***

320 “Interviewee: Yes, my [younger] sister is asthmatic and diabetic as well, the one
321 who comes after me is also asthmatic and diabetes, I am asthmatic too... We joke
322 about our illnesses at times comparing who is better than the other, the one with
323 HIV or diabetes plus asthma.

324 Interviewer: Do you fear that you might have diabetes too?

325 Interviewee: (laughs loudly) Yes, I am already asthmatic and HIV positive, I can
326 just imagine being told I am now diabetic. Once you have diabetes the next thing
327 is high blood pressure these two go together. Can you imagine all this burden on
328 me? For now, I am okay without knowing, I will ignore the symptoms till I
329 seriously get ill then I know it’s time.”

330 (Patient_5, Mashonaland East, living with HIV, asthma, hypertension)

331 “When I had HIV alone, I was confident that chances of living longer are high
332 because I had known some people who were HIV positive for years. However,
333 when I had diabetes, I felt robbed of life.”

334 (Patient_14, Bulawayo, living with diabetes & HIV)

335 None of the PLWMM in our study had encountered the term ‘multimorbidity’ before our study.
336 However, all talked comfortably about the ‘multiple’ nature of their conditions. As illustrated
337 by the first respondent, they spoke about how different conditions interacted and were
338 associated, the burden they exerted, and, indeed, which condition or combination of conditions
339 were ‘better’ to have. Such appraisals, as the second respondent suggests, often foregrounded
340 the differential experience of HIV and NCDs, reflecting the stark difference in the resourcing
341 and organisation of services for these conditions. HIV+ PLWMM were, we found,
342 comparatively satisfied with the quality of care for this particular condition. HIV prevention
343 and treatment was decentralised and delivered by nurses, assisted by community health

344 workers, near their homes, with only complicated cases needing referral/doctor support.
345 Services were free, with consistently available medicine refills (which could also be collected
346 at a community health post), integrated care for opportunistic infections related to HIV (e.g.
347 TB), and often additional resources and support. In the higher-volume primary clinics
348 especially in Harare, Bulawayo, and provincial centres, services were usually offered in a
349 dedicated HIV clinic, referred to less explicitly as the ‘opportunistic infection’ or ‘OI’ clinic
350 with their own separate staff, often supported by NGO-paid nurses.

351

352 The addition of NCDs or mental health conditions, however, dramatically shifted the
353 experience of multimorbidity. Private clinics and certain “bougie” (i.e. high-resource) NGO-
354 run HIV clinics were able to provide integrated, person-centred care for most NCDs,
355 increasingly with an explicit multimorbidity focus. These one-stop-shop models were a
356 common frame of reference among both PLWMM and health workers for what ‘good’
357 multimorbidity care for looks like:

358 “What I learnt at [NGO-run HIV clinic] is that...The patient gets attended to as a
359 whole under one roof, they don't need to go elsewhere for other conditions, tests
360 and collection of results like we do here. We need to upgrade and provide all
361 services under one roof” (HCW_20, sister-in-charge, Bulawayo)

362 The nurse here was comparing partner-funded HIV-NCD care with the ‘standard’ of care for
363 most living with NCD-related multimorbidity, which was provided through general clinic
364 outpatient departments (OPD). OPDs were generally busy, overcrowded environments often
365 staffed by only one extremely stressed, overworked and underpaid nurse. Typically this nurse
366 was working with very little in the way of equipment, diagnostics, and medicines needed to
367 perform the basic consultations per the EDLIZ guideline, with particular shortages noted with

368 second-line NCD medications (S2 Appendix). Unlike HIV, user fees were required to visit
369 urban clinics (with the exception of those <5 and >65 years old; rural clinics remain free), and
370 all patients also had to pay for their medicines (either at the clinic or, if out of stock, at a private
371 pharmacy). A further major bottleneck is that unlike HIV, for which most tasks have been
372 shifted to nurses, initiation of treatment for most NCDs requires seeing a doctor – which, given
373 the severe shortage of doctors, usually meant referral to a hospital clinic. Often, indeed, patients
374 went straight to one of the central hospitals, either because they knew that they would not be
375 helped at the primary level or because they were so ill that they required immediate hospital
376 attention. While stable patients were referred to their local clinic OPD for ongoing (self-)
377 management, HIV and NCDs would be managed separately. NCDs also normally required
378 ongoing lifelong hospital visits – for quarterly reviews, any changes to medications, for any
379 complications or further morbidities. All of this exerted a huge burden on PLWMM. While
380 some felt that they were able to cope with cumulative costs, few were satisfied with the quality
381 of care, and others felt unable to afford to ‘keep up’. They frequently had to make impossible
382 choices about which condition to prioritize, which appointments to attend, or which medicines
383 to buy. Ultimately the cumulative toll of health, social, and economic problems often inevitably
384 led to secondary complications requiring more expensive inpatient care, as well as further
385 conditions, frailty, and diminished coping capacity. Engaging with PLWMM and providers at
386 different levels of care enabled us to sketch a care pathway for long-term conditions (Figure 2)
387 that we used to engage further stakeholder groups.

388

389 [insert figure 2]

390

391

392

393

Figure 2. Illustrative care pathway for long-term conditions[#]

394

[#]Considerable heterogeneity exists across provinces and districts, thus this pathway may not be
395 representative of all referral possibilities

396

397 *3.1 Siloes from “the Top” and the Erosion of Comprehensive Primary Care*

398 When talking to policymakers and public health practitioners especially in Harare and
399 Bulawayo about multimorbidity, one of the recurring narratives was that people are now living
400 longer in part because of the successes of HIV care, resulting in a greater burden of NCDs and
401 mental health conditions. Yet, Northern partners preferred to work through ringfenced funding
402 for HIV, TB, and malaria which created ‘siloes’ within the health system. As one policymaker
403 argued:

404 “We have had HIV for quite some time, and the survivors for those living with HIV
405 also have other conditions, in that same person you can find malaria, TB and HIV
406 or other non-communicable diseases then it becomes imperative to probably shift.

407 The initial design of these grants was to look at TB, HIV and malaria which created
408 siloes within the health system and the move away from there is taking time”.

409 (Policymaker_1, MoHCC, Harare)

410 Through interviews and participant-observation, we found that these fragmented funding
411 streams have very real consequences in the day-to-day management of the health system that
412 prevented working across different disease areas. Certain directorates, for instance, notably
413 those relating to HIV programming, were large, well-funded and supported by lower-level
414 implementing personnel at provincial, district, and facility levels. By contrast, departments
415 without much in the way of donor backing, for instance those for NCDs and mental health
416 directorates, were made up of a handful of individuals, with limited funds to strategize and
417 plan, and far fewer focal persons at lower levels to support implementation. Against this
418 backdrop, an air of competition and protectionism characterized inter-programme relations,
419 likened by one policymaker to fighting over a “carcass” (Policymaker_2, Harare). This worked
420 against collaboration between disease programmes and could result in separate, sometimes

421 contradictory policies and interventions. This was even within areas that had historically been
422 the focus of integration, for instance TB and HIV. Walking with another policymaker through
423 one of the long corridors housing different disease-specific departments, they observed that:

424 “The departments of NCDs, HIV, TB and malaria hardly meet to discuss patient
425 issues, but they are all under the same roof which is a challenge already. At the
426 higher level the focus is on the condition and as we go to the lower levels, they see
427 a person and not a condition” (fieldnote excerpt, Policymaker_3, Harare)

428 Those at “lower levels” certainly had much to say on the matter. Health workers, facility
429 managers and district/provincial decision-makers, particularly those who had experienced and
430 contributed to the prior strength of the system in the early postcolonial era, were fierce critics
431 of the current scenario. It was indeed, a provocation offered during a collaborative workshop
432 that was thought by the assembled to have hit the nail on the head. Perplexed by why
433 multimorbidity was being discussed like it was something new that had arrived once the HIV
434 epidemic had stabilised, one provincial policymaker pointed out that the country’s primary
435 clinics were already designed to be multimorbidity clinics. It was siloes from “the top” that
436 were inhibiting the “already-integrated” nurse from delivering integrated care:

437 “Already at the primary healthcare level you get [Bulawayo] clinic, it’s a
438 multimorbidity clinic. You go to [Bulawayo] clinic, and it’s a multimorbidity
439 clinic...Our priorities should be integration from the top. These siloes come to the
440 already integrated primary care nurse who deals with all the conditions under one
441 roof. Fund those clinics at the right places and let the proper pyramid in primary
442 healthcare work as it used to be” (Policymaker_8, Bulawayo)

443 Responding to multimorbidity, for her, was a matter of allowing the lower levels of care to do
444 what they were already designed and previously able to do in the 1980s and 1990s before the
445 HIV epidemic.

446
447 Integrating primary care services and combatting entrenched ‘siloes’ was, on the one hand,
448 explicitly written into National Health Strategy 2021-25.(30) This was being enacted through
449 a number of promising initiatives including an early-stage pilot of the WHO Package of
450 Essential Non-Communicable Disease (PEN) Programme (designed to decentralise the
451 management of common NCDs), new NCD guidance within the latest HIV Operational and
452 Service Delivery Manual (OSDM) on the integration of HIV-NCD services, and a recent
453 application to the Global Fund to fund medicines for common NCDs among people living with
454 HIV which was hoped to “unlock” previously inaccessible resources for NCDs: “I believe with
455 integration there is a lot of resources that can be unlocked which can then spill over”
456 (Policymaker_1, Harare). Many felt, however, that while these were positive steps, they would
457 be insufficient to respond to multimorbidity and will likely only benefit HIV+ patients and
458 buttress the HIV programme. The underlying issue, many felt, was that the international
459 funders neither had the resources nor the inclination to take the step beyond vertical funding
460 that would be needed to respond to multimorbidity. Nor, despite the emphasis in the National
461 Health Strategy on combatting siloes, was reinvigorating comprehensive primary healthcare
462 felt to be especially high on the government’s agenda either. For as several suggested, head
463 office was preoccupied with developing specialist capacity at the quaternary level, which
464 would predominantly benefit the country’s political and economic elite.

465

466 ***3.3. Clinical (Sub-)Specialism over Generalism and Public Health***

467 This perceived drive towards higher-level, specialist medicine, relative to lower-level
468 ‘generalist’ care was a key theme brought to the fore when discussing multimorbidity with
469 clinicians and educators. Specialist trajectories were inscribed at multiple levels: from
470 individual-level pressures to enhance earning potentials and opportunities; to institutional
471 aspirations towards becoming recognised centres of excellence in research, training, and care;
472 to national level strategies (e.g. “Education 5.0”) to enhance specialist training, biotechnology,
473 and novel drug development. Speaking to one specialist-in-training (Academic_2, Harare)
474 about their hospital’s mission statement of one hospital to become a superspecialist centre of
475 excellence by 2030, she related that these aspirations were still a way off. While specialist
476 training (e.g. internal medicine) was offered at the central teaching hospitals, sub-specialising
477 (e.g. in cardiology, neurology, etc.) required advanced training in South Africa or overseas, a
478 route very few were able to afford, less motivated to return to practice in Zimbabwe – fewer
479 still in the public sector. For those working within the public sector, the ability to practice one’s
480 (sub-)specialty was severely constrained by available diagnostics, treatments and, indeed, what
481 the patient was able to afford. Referrals to the private sector – often, indeed, to one’s own
482 private clinic – was often the only available route, but this was not an option in many cases.
483 And, indeed, such was the need and resource scarcity that it was impossible to exclusively
484 practice one’s speciality. The hospital OPDs and general medical wards were overflowing,
485 many with multimorbidity, at least in part because of the lack of capacity at lower levels of
486 care to treat these conditions or prevent them from needing specialist hospital-level attention.
487 As a result, as one sub-specialist put it, “we [sub-specialists] are all general with an interest in
488 one area.” (Academic_3, sub-specialist physician and lecturer, Harare).

489

490 If generalism was the reality even for the country’s top sub-specialists, it was certainly the case
491 for the majority of physicians working at lower levels of care. The problem was that the

492 development of generalist skillsets was, as several observed, not adequately valued or
493 supported. Both classroom learning and rotations were taught around diseases and organ-
494 systems – “in siloes”, as another lecturer described (Academic_1, sub-specialist physician and
495 lecturer, Harare), which ran contrary to a multimorbidity approach. On the one hand, a common
496 line of thinking was that trainees were given ample opportunity to consolidate specialist
497 knowledge including in the management of multimorbidity during their internships, which
498 often took place in district hospitals. At the same time, it was argued by others that this ‘on the
499 job’ approach to ‘putting it all together’ was not felt to be sufficient, and reflected a lack of
500 value placed on generalism compared to the advanced training expected of specialists. As one
501 Bulawayo-based general practitioner argued:

502 “A good generalist is someone who should be able to take care of the most common
503 and prevalent conditions that burdens the local community that he practices in and
504 should be in a position to be a team leader in the preventive aspect of medicine...
505 Let’s try to prevent the conditions from getting worse to require specialist care...
506 But we don’t do that, why, because people don’t know how important a generalist
507 is, a family physician is, a primary care physician is.” (HCW_43, general
508 practitioner, Bulawayo)

509 That new physicians were ‘default GPs’, as a number of physicians put it, was contrasted with
510 high-income settings, such as the UK, where post-basic certification was required. While in the
511 1980s, there was a well-subscribed MMED in General Medicine similar to the UK model, this
512 was discontinued in the 1990s. A more recently introduced MMED in Family Medicine
513 remains undersubscribed, especially compared to the MMed Internal Medicine (for those
514 looking to (sub-)specialise) and the MSc Public Health. Training in family medicine, we found,
515 was disincentivised by the fact that graduates were, as ‘generalists’, still not regarded as (or

516 able to charge as) ‘specialists’: “I think there is then need for a move to formalise some of these
517 professions so that even if they do these kind of training they actually, well I will call them
518 specialized in a way” (Policymaker_4, Matabeleland South). Those training in public health,
519 meanwhile, often ended up transitioning towards either MoHCC head office, NGOs, or
520 research institutions. This not only removed these skillsets from the clinical level but meant
521 that they were unevenly absorbed into the better-funded programme areas.

522 The training of nurses and other cadres was, on the whole, perceived to be more ‘generalist’ in
523 orientation. Indeed, the training of general nurses and village health workers has historically
524 been one of the great strengths of Zimbabwe’s primary healthcare system, with the ‘old style
525 nurse’ being adept not only in managing all common conditions found in the EDLIZ guideline
526 but also really ‘thinking through’ your problems. Standards were felt to have dropped in recent
527 years due to resource scarcity, staff attrition, and resulting a lack of trainers and mentors, often
528 forcing some older nurses out of retirement. This is at precisely the time when, as the senior
529 nurse above put it, the “already integrated primary care nurse” (Policymaker_6, Bulawayo)
530 was being pulled in different directions by the increasingly fragmented needs of disease-
531 specific programmes, disproportionately for HIV, TB, and malaria, each coming with
532 additional evidence-based clinical practice guidelines, training packages and monitoring and
533 evaluation (M&E) systems. In these there was, as one policymaker specialising in service
534 integration put it, “no room for other diseases, or usually just a small component”
535 (Policymaker_3, Harare). Such a ‘small component’ included the recent inclusion of training
536 in carrying out the aforementioned expansion of OSDM guidance to include hypertension,
537 diabetes, and depression. Meanwhile, there were no in-service training for NCD management
538 beyond HIV, with most nurses relying on what they learned in basic training, evidenced in our
539 facility survey by few nurses trained in the last 2 years in diabetes, hypertension, asthma, or
540 depression ([S2 Appendix](#)). Together, falling standards and the fragmentation of training around

541 disease-specific programmes was seen to work against the previously strong generalist
542 capacities underpinning Zimbabwe’s nurse-led primary care, so important for managing
543 complex health needs like multimorbidity at lower levels.

544

545 ***3.4. Fragmentation and Demands of Health Data***

546 If tensions between specialist and generalist training came to the fore when considering
547 multimorbidity from human resources perspective, the fragmentation and demands of health
548 data presented another layer of complexity to the challenge. Health informaticians and data
549 experts described for us a complex data ecosystem that made up the ‘back end’ of Zimbabwe’s
550 health system, one that had become progressively more expansive and fragmented in recent
551 years. It comprised patient books/cards and records; disease tally sheets (referred to as the “T-
552 series”); a plethora of single-disease programme-specific registers; and the recent introduction
553 of Electronic Health Records (EHR), intended to phase much of this data into a more integrated
554 electronic format. It also includes the MoHCC central health information system, DHIS2 (a
555 widely-used system across Africa), into which routine data sources are fed through structures
556 of upward reporting from facility to national level.

557

558 In terms of clinical management and follow-up, tracing patients with multimorbidity was
559 challenging because, while in theory patient-level records should include all known conditions
560 about a patient, this was not always the case. Even at primary clinic level, there were separate
561 books for the OI department (the so-called “green book”) and general OPD, often making it
562 hard to keep track of HIV+ patients with NCDs and vice versa, particularly if the patient forgot
563 their book(s). Facility-held records for long-term conditions included HIV-related and TB
564 registers and the ‘chronic’ register for common NCDs (hypertension, diabetes, asthma,
565 epilepsy, and depression). While facility-held, registers unlike the patient booklets were more

566 condition-oriented than the latter, with the same patient often appearing across registers with
567 no cross-reference, making it challenging to identify patients with multiple conditions. In some
568 facilities, we found that nurses would informally record a patient's other conditions against
569 their name wherever it appeared, so that whoever attends to the patient knows they need to
570 update for all other conditions:

571 "If a patient's clinic number is one on the HPT register and number 3 on DM
572 register then on their book it will be recorded for example 1HPT and 3DM. It will
573 show their clinic number in each condition they have. The clinic chronic register is
574 all we have. If the patient is on ART his or her O.I number will be written on their
575 booklet too". (HCW_9, Acting sister-in-charge, Mashonaland East)

576 The challenge, however, once patients were sorted into a disease specific register or programme
577 for ongoing chronic management of a particular disease, it was likely that a patient would be
578 fast-tracked to registers for this particular disease in future consultations, and less likely,
579 especially in a resource/time-constrained environment, that clinicians were optimally thinking
580 about other conditions unless the patient explicitly mentioned them. On the one hand, EHR
581 was felt by many to hold considerable promise for ameliorating fragmentation and improving
582 the tracking of patients through a unique patient identifier, in theory across facilities and levels
583 of care. Currently, however, EHR is still inconsistently available within and across provinces,
584 often down due to connectivity or electricity issues, and remains currently only operable within
585 the public sector. Perhaps more fundamentally, EHR is still ultimately an e-copy of the paper-
586 based system, with disease 'modules' taking the place of physical registers. This does not
587 actually depart from disease-specific health information and, in fact, may reinforce it. EHR,
588 for instance, was initially funded by the HIV programme, whose module is thus more advanced
589 than the 'chronic' module. There has also been funding provided from the other partner-backed

590 programmes to have their modules developed and updated – much of which is occurring
591 without necessarily considering of the overall integration of the system.

592 Data used beyond the immediate clinical encounter – for disease surveillance and control,
593 annual health reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of specific programme targets, and
594 policy and resource allocation – was, if anything, more single-disease focused. Abstracted from
595 the tally sheets (T-series), programme registers, and other forms, data reported upwards were
596 largely cross-sectional – basically counts of disease conditions rather than counts of diseases
597 in a single person: “The moment you run an aggregated system certainly there is no way you
598 would expect figures that relate to a single person” (Health_Infor_3_Policymaker_5, Harare).
599 The data were also heavily biased towards the programme-backed diseases ([Figure 4](#)). The
600 better-funded programmes, for instance, have additional, high-resource M&E infrastructure
601 that runs alongside MoHCC standard reporting systems. It includes standardised programme-
602 specific registers (corresponding to their clinical guidelines); finely-differentiated indicators;
603 regular visits and back-and-forths on data quality at the facility level; and M&E officers and
604 analysts working at sub-national level all the way upwards. Certainly at the facility level, the
605 heterogeneity of programme documentation meant a considerable paper burden on the nurses,
606 experienced as representatives from one programme coming one day with demands, the next
607 another programme doing the same, who were often felt to have a distinct lack of knowledge
608 of the reality on the ground or the overall impact of the paper burden was having. “It
609 demoralises us!,” as one nurse from Matabeleland South exclaimed. Further obscuring
610 challenges on the ground was that, while the facilities were encouraged to examine data to
611 identify challenges and solutions, it was felt that rarely were these efforts reciprocated, leading
612 to despondency in reporting what could be vital sources of information:

613 “We used to sit religiously interrogating the data then we would come up with a
614 list of challenges and proposals. We ended up copying and pasting because nothing
615 was changing. I think these are the things that should be informing policy so that
616 policy changes.” (HCW_42_Policymaker_7, District Medical Officer,
617 Matabeleland South)

618 A further knock-on effect of the demands of health data was that, while some data was of high
619 quality non-programme backed diseases, which had neither the standardised registers, nor the
620 human resources to chase data quality, nor the analytic capacity, were far more likely to be
621 incomplete and left behind. NCD data, in particular, were felt to be under-reported and of poor
622 quality, with whatever data making it up to DHIS2 going there only to “die”:

623 “Nobody reports NCDs! We’ve lagged for so long we’ve let things go, even DHIS2
624 for schizophrenia – that data is there but not consumed, so it dies.” (NGO_6, NGO
625 physician, Bulawayo)

626 On the one hand, while still early days, there is recognition of the need to improve data and
627 information systems for NCDs but also, increasingly, multimorbidity. In terms of NCDs, this
628 includes recent efforts to improve M&E infrastructure for NCDs as part of the WHO PEN
629 programme, as well as plans to more regularly conduct the WHO STEPS survey which includes
630 a component on NCD risk factors (the last of which was conducted in 2006 and is still being
631 used in the National Health Profile[33] and Strategy[34]). There is also diagnostic yields from
632 NCD screening initiatives conducted by HIV implementing partners; routine data available
633 from HIV donor clinics able to support fully integrated NCD care; and the recent addition of
634 new data points in DHIS2 on certain HIV-NCD data points, corresponding to the expanded
635 HIV-NCD integration guidance in the HIV guidelines. Finally, there a growing body of
636 clinical, epidemiological, and social research on multimorbidity in Zimbabwe (the current

637 project among them), and this research is starting to push the horizons beyond what has been
638 a fairly HIV-centric discourse until fairly recently. Of note, however, is that the knowledge
639 architectures within which researchers and programmers are starting to understand and develop
640 interventions for multimorbidity remain constrained to a large extent by the infrastructure
641 already in place centred around HIV and TB. Thus in our experience, when it comes to
642 questions around where to start – where to integrate from, on what to model our interventions
643 – answers tend to gravitate towards the known quantities of HIV and TB.

644 [insert figure 3]

645 **Figure 3. Data Flows for Long-Term Conditions and Multimorbidity**

646

647 **4. Discussion**

648 In this study, we used a participatory ethnographic research design to gauge and integrate
649 different perspectives on the challenge multimorbidity in Zimbabwe. Bringing together
650 different viewpoints at a time when multimorbidity was just emerging on the policy radar
651 allowed us to produce a rich, holistic description to inform priority and agenda-setting while
652 keeping sight of the possible limitations of elevating it as a specific priority. Overall, we found
653 that multimorbidity almost unanimously resonated with respondents, who positioned
654 multimorbidity as fundamental challenge to the current organisation of the health system.
655 Multimorbidity was being most actively being engaged with from an HIV perspective and by
656 the international research community, with conversations around multimorbidity beyond these
657 groups somewhat less explicit or coordinated.

658

659 Our findings building upon a growing body of social research on multimorbidity in Africa.
660 Consistent with findings in Malawi,[14] Ghana[35], Ethiopia,[15] and South Africa,[12,13] we

661 found that, for PLWMM and their families, the concept of multimorbidity captured the
662 tremendous health, economic and social burden imposed by the competing demands of
663 different long-term conditions that were, in anything, exacerbated by the ‘vertical’ organisation
664 and uneven resourcing of care around single diseases. The challenges faced by PLWMM, we
665 went onto show, were a downstream reflection of wider tensions facing Zimbabwe’s
666 policymakers and planners, for whom multimorbidity presented as profound managerial
667 disenfranchisement characterised by contestation over the “carcasses” of disease-specific
668 funding – a situation that rings all-too familiar with accounts of other African governments’
669 engagements with ‘global health’.[36–38] Such administrative challenges in turn speak a yet
670 wider, well-described rupture in the biopolitical order from the promises of nation-state-led
671 public healthcare systems following Alma Ata to the bankrupting of such systems and incursion
672 of fragmented donor funding following HIV.[39] With Zimbabwe having made among the
673 greatest strides towards comprehensive primary care grounded in its essential medicines
674 programme,[25] the system’s downfall and current inability to even provide basic NCD
675 medicines was experienced by many as a profound sense of loss of grassroots-level primary
676 care. Further gutting the system is the strain placed on clinical and public health professionals
677 being trained and socialised within the system, for whom multimorbidity presents a series of
678 interlocking pressures towards specialised hospital medicine, the private sector, NGOs and
679 research institutes. This corresponds with a weakening and devaluation of the strong generalist
680 positions and skillsets that previously made comprehensive care possible at the lower
681 levels.[17,40] Finally, health information and data, rather than revealing a problem with the
682 status quo, functioned to legitimise it. From a health data perspective, multimorbidity
683 manifested as the systematic ‘papering over’ of patient complexity through echo-chambers of
684 disease-specific data capture, upward reporting, and feedback, with the ‘best’ data mediated by
685 institutes and analysts in the global North.[41] This made it difficult to track multimorbidity

686 patients over time and space; imposed a paper burden on nurses that detracted from time with
687 patients,[17,42] while concurrently making the challenges faced at the care delivery level
688 almost impossible to see, less listened and responded to, higher up. This demoralising situation
689 functioned to disempower nurses, exacerbate the burden on patients, while reproducing the
690 hypervisibility and prioritisation of already-funded diseases.

691
692 Multimorbidity may have been a meaningful and useful concept for most. However, the current
693 direction from which most explicit multimorbidity discourse is coming, coupled with the
694 perspectives of our respondents, gives reason to pause. Multimorbidity has been promised to
695 lead us towards integrated person-centred care,[18] however as critics have pointed out, it has
696 followed a familiar pattern within global health, focused on quantifying and objectifying it such
697 that it can form the basis of new evidence-based interventions..[16] As this has been transposed
698 into a global health problem, multimorbidity has found fertile ground in a ‘clashing epidemics’
699 narrative[17,43] that, in Zimbabwe as elsewhere,[44] has been readily absorbed within the HIV
700 programme’s remit, reflected in growing knowledge of HIV-NCD comorbidity, progress with
701 integrating certain NCDs into the existing HIV structures, and plans to use HIV as a model for
702 NCDs and multimorbidity beyond the HIV+ population.[45] But ethnographic evidence, both
703 in high-income[18] and lower-income settings,[12] suggests that expanding or merging vertical
704 programmes will not be sufficient to respond to the challenge of multimorbidity.[16,17] In the
705 UK, Lynch et al. found that multimorbidity has failed to live up to its promise to deliver on
706 person-centred care, partly because the emphasis has been on building bridges between an ever-
707 growing number of (sub-)speciality areas, with very few talking about the *repair* or *restoration*
708 of the more comprehensive primary care services that were in place prior to greater
709 specialism.[18] In Zimbabwe, the picture was somewhat different. For many participants,
710 Zimbabwe was already prepared for multimorbidity before HIV was extracted, given its own

711 clinic, and made into something special. As we have also shown in prior ethnographic research,
712 Zimbabwe’s historically strong, comprehensive primary care system remained a powerful
713 memory and guiding frame,[25] and thus what it meant to respond to multimorbidity, for many,
714 was at least as much about restoring or repairing what was within the system, as much as
715 preparing ourselves for a ‘new’ emerging pandemic.[1]

716

717 Accordingly, the formative agenda that emerged from the collaborative interpretations of the
718 study’s findings during workshops was oriented towards what it would take to restore the
719 centrality of comprehensive primary healthcare and support the nurse-patient encounter (S4
720 Appendix). While the priority areas within the agenda are expansive, two topics occupied a
721 great deal of the conversations and cut across several of the priority areas. One was the question
722 of what integrated care meant for existing HIV and ‘OI’ infrastructure. Such conversations
723 drew from other countries’ experiences with addressing this situation, including South Africa’s
724 ICDM model,[46–49] INTE-AFRICA study in Tanzania and Uganda,[50] and Malawi’s
725 Integrated Chronic Care Clinics,[51,52] the latter of which MoHCC representatives had visited
726 recently. A common feature of such approaches is the reorganisation of care from an ‘HIV vs.
727 all other conditions’ model to an ‘acute vs. (stable) chronic conditions’ model in which existing
728 HIV clinic/spaces are repurposed such that all chronic patients, regardless of HIV status, are
729 seen within the same clinic/space. Proposed benefits include: creating a platform for the
730 decentralisation of chronic conditions previously treated at higher levels; more efficient use of
731 clinic space and resources; more patient-centred management plans, guidelines, and training; a
732 harmonised and less burdensome M&E infrastructure; and the destigmatisation of
733 HIV;[48,51,53] – though to date, such efforts remain few in example, early stage, and with
734 challenges of uptake, sustainability, and scale-up.[44,54] The Zimbabwe MoHCC and
735 technical partners have recently participated in cross-country discussions exploring

736 possibilities for such a model in this setting,[53] and, for the most part, the collaborator group
737 in this study (some of whom took part in that initiative) welcomed such a model. At the same
738 time, consistent with our primary data, a particular proviso was that another parallel silo is not
739 inadvertently created, which may come from the reification the chronic clinic concept without
740 consideration of what was actually needed in different settings and levels of care (e.g. in a rural
741 clinic set-up where there was no ‘OI’ setup to begin with). Insofar as such model could be
742 useful, it would be one focused not on taking chronic disease or multimorbidity *out* but putting
743 HIV back *in*, leveraging resources and infrastructure where needed but only insofar as it helped
744 restore and strengthen the generalist orientation and referral pyramid.

745

746 If chronic clinics occupied conversations at the service delivery level, a second cross-cutting
747 conversation was the more upstream enabling environment needed to facilitate meaningful and
748 sustainable change at the service delivery level. Enacting a multimorbidity-responsive health
749 system, it was felt, required being able to draw together knowledge and experience across
750 different academic and applied spheres and to really *listen* to experience on the ground –
751 currently so difficult within a siloed, top-down environment in which priorities and pathways
752 for action are determined by external funding, agendas, and analysts. Certainly a lot of this
753 boiled down to the structure of health financing and resulting fragmented policy structures, and
754 the first step was recognised as being stronger with external partners on the pooled financing
755 mechanisms that do exist but are consistently been undercut by earmarking of donor funds to
756 particular conditions.[34] At the same time, it was also recognised that decades of under-
757 resourcing, disenfranchisement, decapacitation, and attrition have meant a ‘culture’ that is
758 simply not conducive to knowledge co-production, collective problem-solving, or innovation.
759 Recent work within health policy and systems research (HPSR) has stressed the importance of
760 active investment in learning as a core pillar of health system strengthening, over more short-

761 term wins that are often prioritised.[55,56] Part of this means enhancing domestic information
762 systems, research, and analytic capacity, particularly to lessen the dependence on parallel
763 extractive data systems. However, as our respondents made clear, data can only take us so far
764 and easily become overemphasised. Just as important within a learning framework is elevating
765 other modes of learning that transgress traditional knowledge-practice binaries: inclusive
766 deliberative platforms, practical or ‘experiential’ learning, and ‘embedded’ research, oriented
767 towards what Gilson et al. have referred to as “collective sensemaking”.[57,58] A learning
768 health system approach, we suggest, may bring together of these more upstream imperatives
769 expressed by our respondents, providing a quite radical but tangible framework for how
770 knowledge, policy, and practice might synergise within a multimorbidity-responsive health
771 system. Unless we explicitly invest in strengthening these more ‘upstream’ capacities,[16] then
772 integrated or person-centred care models at the service delivery level – the dominant focus of
773 evidence-based interventions – may be undercut by familiar systemic challenges.

774
775 Striving towards a ‘multimorbidity-learning’ health system may seem aspirational, particularly
776 in the context of Zimbabwe’s challenging social, political and economic environment.
777 However, the need for bold movements to challenge the status quo is urgent. COVID-19, while
778 underscoring the need to take multimorbidity seriously, also made evident the waning
779 international capacity for supporting lower-income countries beyond securitised public health
780 measures.[59] Donor funding for HIV is expected to reduce drastically by 2030 as part of the
781 transition towards a ‘maintenance’ model. Against this backdrop, health systems across Africa
782 may soon need to have developed domestic capacity to respond to increasingly complex needs
783 of both those living with and without HIV, while navigating an increasingly securitised global
784 health agenda that may not be responsive to such needs.[59] At the same time, these
785 developments and the potential loosening of ‘vertical’ programming may yet offer an

786 opportunity to further the decolonising health agenda.[60,61] At this moment when
787 multimorbidity seems to be reigniting calls for more holistic, person-centred approaches to
788 medicine and global health in a way the primary care and NCD agendas have largely failed to
789 do,[62] we suggest that this could yet be a fruitful construct (if framed carefully) for building
790 and pooling resources toward a shared vision for the future of African health systems. This
791 could be grounded in recognition of not only shared challenges in the current moment but also
792 aspirations towards – or in Zimbabwe’s case, back towards – more integrated, adaptive, and
793 ultimately more person-centred healthcare systems.

794

795 **Conclusions**

796 In this article, we have sought to piece together the challenge of multimorbidity from the
797 perspective of multiple actors across Zimbabwe’s health system. Our particular message has
798 been that how multimorbidity is presented as a challenge, and by whom, matters.
799 Multimorbidity, it is hardly new to say, is hoped to bring about a return to more holistic,
800 upstream, person-centred approaches. But while it may be tempting to frame it as new and
801 pressing, worthy of funding and attention amidst competing priorities, doing so may perpetuate
802 the same challenges it is hoped to overcome.[16,17] Following other ethnographic approaches,
803 we have proposed multimorbidity is pointed in a somewhat different direction, focusing on
804 repair and restoration of older systems as an integral part of responding to what is (apparently)
805 new.[18] Of course, it is not simple to turn back the tide, and there is need to consider other
806 countries’ experiences with integrating care or otherwise putting systems in place in which
807 HIV is not the centre. In doing so, there is need to expand beyond the care delivery, as the
808 violence of vertical programming has impacted all aspects of health system functioning.[17]
809 The learning health system, unsettling many of the knowledge siloes and hierarchies that

810 continue to perpetuate single-disease thinking, may offer a framework for intervening at this
811 level and thus towards more sustainability person-centred health systems.

812

813 **Acknowledgements**

814 We thank the Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Child Care (MoHCC), Provincial and District
815 authorities in Harare, Bulawayo, Mashonaland East, and Matabeleland South, the University
816 of Zimbabwe and the National University of Science and Technology for their invaluable
817 guidance, support and collaboration. We express our gratitude to all the participants who took
818 part in the study, whose experiences, insights, expertise and often collegiality were invaluable
819 to the study's findings. We also thank all administrative and technical staff who helped to
820 ensure the operational success of the study, including the considerable work that went into
821 organising and implementing the collaborative workshops.

822

823 **Funding statement**

824 This research was funded by a Wellcome Trust Research Fellowship in Humanities and Social
825 Sciences (Multimorbidity and Knowledge Architectures: An Interdisciplinary Global Health
826 Collaboration, ref. 222177, to JD). The research was embedded within OPHID Target,
827 Accelerate and Sustain Quality Care (TASQC) for HIV Epidemic Control (ref.
828 72061320CA00005) with support from the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
829 (PEPFAR) through USAID (to ED, KW, PC, TM, TN and TTC).

830

831 **References**

832 1. PLOS Medicine Editors. Multimorbidity: Addressing the next global pandemic. PLoS
833 Med. 2023;20:e1004229.

- 834 2. Basto-Abreu A, Barrientos-Gutierrez T, Wade AN, Melo DO De, Souza ASS De,
835 Nunes BP. Multimorbidity matters in low and middle-income countries. *Journal of*
836 *Multimorbidity and Comorbidity*. 2022;12:1–10.
- 837 3. Whitty CJM, Macewen C, Goddard A, Alderson D, Marshall M, Calderwood C, et al.
838 Rising to the challenge of multimorbidity. *BMJ* 2020;368:l6964.
- 839 4. The Academy of Medical Sciences. Multimorbidity: a priority for global health
840 research. 2018. Available from: <https://acmedsci.ac.uk/file-download/82222577>
- 841 5. Academy of Medical Sciences, Academy of Science of South Africa. Improving the
842 prevention and management of multimorbidity in sub-Saharan Africa: Workshop report. 2019.
843 Available from: <https://acmedsci.ac.uk/file-download/22652130>
- 844 6. Banda GT, Bosire E, Bunn C, Chandler CIR, Chikumbu E, Chiwanda J, et al.
845 Multimorbidity research in Sub-Saharan Africa: Proceedings of an interdisciplinary workshop.
846 *Wellcome Open Res*. 2023;8:110.
- 847 7. Horton R. Offline: COVID-19 is not a pandemic. *The Lancet*. 2020;396(10255):874.
- 848 8. Mendenhall E, Omondi GB, Bosire E, Isaiah G, Musau A, Ndeti D, et al. Stress,
849 diabetes, and infection: Syndemic suffering at an urban Kenyan hospital. *Soc Sci Med*.
850 2015;146:11–20.
- 851 9. Mendenhall E, Kim AW, Panasci A, Cele L, Mpondo F, Bosire EN, et al. A mixed-
852 methods, population-based study of a syndemic in Soweto, South Africa. *Nat Hum Behav*.
853 2022;6(1):64–73.
- 854 10. Manderson L, Warren N. “Just One Thing after Another”: Recursive Cascades and
855 Chronic Conditions. *Med Anthropol Q*. 2016;30(4):479–97.
- 856 11. Mendenhall E. *Syndemic Suffering: Social Distress, Depression, and Diabetes among*
857 *Mexican Immigrant Women*. New York and London: Routledge; 2012.

- 858 12. Bosire N Edna, Mendenhall Emily, Norris A Shane GJ. Provider perspectives on
859 patient-centred care for patients with HIV and diabetes at a public tertiary hospital in South
860 Africa. *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2021;10(9):1–12.
- 861 13. Matima R, Murphy K, Levitt NS, BeLue R, Oni T. A qualitative study on the
862 experiences and perspectives of public sector patients in Cape Town in managing the workload
863 of demands of HIV and type 2 diabetes multimorbidity. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(3):1–19.
- 864 14. Chikumbu EF, Bunn C, Kasenda S, Dube A, Phiri-Makwakwa E, Jani BD, et al.
865 Experiences of multimorbidity in urban and rural Malawi: An interview study of burdens of
866 treatment and lack of treatment. *PLOS Global Public Health.* 2022;2(3):e0000139.
- 867 15. Eyowas FA, Schneider M, Alemu S, Getahun FA. Experience of living with
868 multimorbidity and health workers perspectives on the organization of health services for
869 people living with multiple chronic conditions in Bahir Dar, northwest Ethiopia: a qualitative
870 study. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2023;23(1).
- 871 16. Blarikom E Van, Fudge N, Swinglehurst D. The emergence of multimorbidity as a
872 matter of concern : a critical review. *Biosocieties.* 2023;18:614–631.
- 873 17. Dixon J, Mendenhall E, Bosire EN, Limbani F, Ferrand RA, Chandler CIR. Making
874 Morbidity Multiple: History, Legacies, and Possibilities for Global Health. *Journal of*
875 *Multimorbidity and Comorbidity.* 2023;13:1–2
- 876 18. Lynch R, Hanckel B, Green J. The (failed) promise of multimorbidity: chronicity,
877 biomedical categories, and public health. *Crit Public Health.* 2021;32(4):450–61.
- 878 19. Dixon J et al. Interdisciplinary perspectives on multimorbidity in Africa: developing an
879 expanded conceptual model. *PLoS Global Public Health.* 2024; In Press
- 880 20. Dixon J, Mendenhall E. Syndemic thinking to address multimorbidity and its
881 structural determinants. *Nature Reviews Disease Primers.* *Nature Research;* 2023;9

- 882 21. World Bank. World Development Indicators. 2024. Population total, Zimbabwe.
883 Available from: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=ZW>
- 884 22. Loewenson R, Sanders D, Davies R. Challenges to equity in health and health care: A
885 Zimbabwean case study. *Soc Sci Med*. 1991;32(10):1079–88.
- 886 23. Mutizwa-Mangiza D. Doctors and the State, The Struggle for Professional Control in
887 Zimbabwe. London and New York: Routledge; 1990.
- 888 24. Woelk GB. Primary healthcare in Zimbabwe: Can it Survive? *Soc Sci Med*.
889 1994;39(8):1027–35.
- 890 25. Dixon J, Manyau S, Kandiye F, Kranzer K, Chandler CIR. Antibiotics, Rational Drug
891 Use and the Architecture of Global Health in Zimbabwe. *Soc Sci Med*. 2020;272:113594.
- 892 26. Green A. Zimbabwe post-Mugabe era: reconstructing a health system. *Lancet*.
893 2018;391(10115):17–8.
- 894 27. Gouda HN, Charlson F, Sorsdahl K, Ahmadzada S, Ferrari AJ, Erskine H, et al. Burden
895 of non-communicable diseases in sub-Saharan Africa, 1990–2017: results from the Global
896 Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2019;7(10):e1375–87.
- 897 28. Smit M, Olney J, Ford NP, Vitoria M, Gregson S, Vassall A, et al. The growing burden
898 of noncommunicable disease among persons living with HIV in Zimbabwe. *Aids*.
899 2018;32(6):773–82.
- 900 29. Olaru ID, Chingono RMS, Bottomley C, Kandiye FR, Mhino F, Nyamayaro CA, et al.
901 The effect of a comprehensive typhoid conjugate vaccine campaign on antimicrobial
902 prescribing in children in Harare, Zimbabwe: a mixed methods study. *Lancet Glob Health*.
903 2023;11(9):e1422–31.
- 904 30. Miles S, Renedo A, Marston C. ‘Slow co-production’ for deeper patient involvement
905 in health care. *The Journal of Health Design*. 2018 Apr 1;3(1):57–62.

- 906 31. World Health Organisation. Service Availability and Readiness Assessment (SARA):
907 An annual monitoring system for service delivery Reference Manual. Geneva; 2015. Available
908 from: [https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/service-availability-and-](https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/service-availability-and-readinessassessment(sara)/sara_reference_manual_chapter2.pdf?sfvrsn=e46072be_3&ua=1)
909 [readinessassessment\(sara\)/sara_reference_manual_chapter2.pdf?sfvrsn=e46072be_3&ua=1](https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/service-availability-and-readinessassessment(sara)/sara_reference_manual_chapter2.pdf?sfvrsn=e46072be_3&ua=1)
- 910 32. Bernard HR. Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative
911 Approaches. Fifth. Lanham, Maryland: Altamira Press; 2011.
- 912 33. World Health Organisation. Zimbabwe NCD National Profile. Geneva: World Health
913 Organisation. 2018. Available from:
914 [https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/noncommunicable-diseases-zwe-country-profile-](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/noncommunicable-diseases-zwe-country-profile-2018)
915 [2018](https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/noncommunicable-diseases-zwe-country-profile-2018)
- 916 34. Zimbabwe Ministry of Health and Child Care. National Health Strategy 2021-2025.
917 2021.
- 918 35. Morgan SA, Eyles C, Roderick PJ, Adongo PB, Hill AG. Women living with multi-
919 morbidity in the Greater Accra Region of Ghana: A qualitative study guided by the Cumulative
920 Complexity Model. *J Biosoc Sci.* 2019 Jul 1;51(4):562–77.
- 921 36. Brown H. Global health partnerships, governance, and sovereign responsibility in
922 western Kenya. *Am Ethnol.* 2015;42(2):340–55.
- 923 37. Taylor EM, Harper I. The Politics and Anti-Politics of the Global Fund Experiment:
924 Understanding Partnership and Bureaucratic Expansion in Uganda. *Medical Anthropology:*
925 *Cross Cultural Studies in Health and Illness.* 2014;33(3):206–22.
- 926 38. Prince RJ, Marsland R, editors. Making and Unmaking Public Health in Africa:
927 Ethnographic and Historical Perspectives. Ohio: Ohio University Press; 2013.
- 928 39. Geissler PW, editor. Para-states and medical science: making African global health.
929 Durham: Duke University Press; 2015.

- 930 40. Wendland CL. A Heart for the Work: Journeys through an African Medical School.
931 Chicago and London: Chicago University Press; 2010.
- 932 41. Leonelli S, Tempini N. Data Journeys in the Sciences. London: Springer Open; 2020.
- 933 42. Hull E. Paperwork and the contradictions of accountability in a South African hospital.
934 Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute. 2012;18(3):613–32.
- 935 43. Megan Vaughan, Kafui Adjaye-Gbewonyo, Marissa Mika. Epidemiological Change
936 and Chronic Disease in Sub-Saharan Africa. Vaughan M, Adjaye-gbewonyo K, Mika M,
937 editors. London: UCL Press; 2021.
- 938 44. Bosire EN, Mendenhall E, Norris SA, Goudge J. Patient-Centred Care for Patients With
939 Diabetes and HIV at a Public Tertiary Hospital in South Africa: An Ethnographic Study. Int J
940 Health Policy Manag. 2020;(x):1–12.
- 941 45. Rabkin M, El-Sadr WM. Why reinvent the wheel? leveraging the lessons of HIV scale-
942 up to confront non-communicable diseases. Glob Public Health. 2011;6(3):247–56.
- 943 46. South African Department of Health. Integrated Chronic Disease Management Manual.
944 2017. Available from: [https://knowledgehub.health.gov.za/system/files/elibdownloads/2020-](https://knowledgehub.health.gov.za/system/files/elibdownloads/2020-08/Integrated-chronic-disease-management-manual.pdf)
945 [08/Integrated-chronic-disease-management-manual.pdf](https://knowledgehub.health.gov.za/system/files/elibdownloads/2020-08/Integrated-chronic-disease-management-manual.pdf)
- 946 47. Lebina L, Alaba O, Ringane A, Hlongwane K, Pule P, Oni T, et al. Process evaluation
947 of implementation fidelity of the integrated chronic disease management model in two districts,
948 South Africa. BMC Health Serv Res. 2019 Dec 16;19(1).
- 949 48. Oni T, McGrath N, BeLue R, Roderick P, Colagiuri S, May CR, et al. Chronic diseases
950 and multi-morbidity - A conceptual modification to the WHO ICCM model for countries in
951 health transition. BMC Public Health. 2014;14(1):1–7.
- 952 49. Mahomed O, Freeman M, Asmall S. An Integrated Chronic Disease Management
953 Model-A diagonal approach to health system strengthening. Journal of health care for the poor
954 and underserved. 2014;25(5):1723–9.

- 955 50. Kivuyo S, Birungi J, Okebe J, Wang D, Ramaiya K, Ainan S, et al. Integrated
956 management of HIV, diabetes, and hypertension in sub-Saharan Africa (INTE-AFRICA): a
957 pragmatic cluster-randomised, controlled trial. *The Lancet*. 2023;402(10409):1241–50.
- 958 51. Wroe EB, Kalanga N, Dunbar EL, Nazimera L, Price NF, Shah A, et al. Expanding
959 access to non-communicable disease care in rural Malawi: Outcomes from a retrospective
960 cohort in an integrated NCD-HIV model. *BMJ Open*. 2020;21;10(10).
- 961 52. McBain RK, Petersen E, Tophof N, Dunbar EL, Kalanga N, Nazimera L, et al. Impact
962 and economic evaluation of a novel HIV service delivery model in rural Malawi. *AIDS*. 2017;
963 10;31(14):1999–2006.
- 964 53. International Aids Society. Differentiated service delivery for chronic conditions
965 beyond HIV: A workshop on implementing differentiated service delivery (DSD) models for
966 clients established on treatment across chronic diseases. 2013. Available from:
967 [https://www.differentiatedservicedelivery.org/resources/resources-for-dsd-for-chronic-](https://www.differentiatedservicedelivery.org/resources/resources-for-dsd-for-chronic-conditions-beyond-hiv)
968 [conditions-beyond-hiv](https://www.differentiatedservicedelivery.org/resources/resources-for-dsd-for-chronic-conditions-beyond-hiv)
- 969 54. Mahomed OH, Asmall S, Voce A. Sustainability of the integrated chronic disease
970 management model at primary care clinics in South Africa. *Afr J Prim Health Care Fam Med*.
971 2016;8(1):1–7.
- 972 55. Institute of Medicine. *The Learning Health System and its Collaboratives: Update*
973 *Report*. 2011. Available from: [https://docplayer.net/2723483-The-learning-health-system-and-](https://docplayer.net/2723483-The-learning-health-system-and-its-innovation-collaboratives.html)
974 [its-innovation-collaboratives.html](https://docplayer.net/2723483-The-learning-health-system-and-its-innovation-collaboratives.html)
- 975 56. World Health Organization, Sheikh, Kabir, Abimbola, Seye & Alliance for Health
976 Policy and Systems Research. *Learning health systems: pathways to progress: flagship report*
977 *of the Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research*. World Health Organization. 2021.
978 Available from: <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/344891>

979 57. Gilson L, Barasa E, Brady L, Kagwanja N, Nxumalo N, Nzinga J, et al. Collective
980 sensemaking for action: researchers and decision makers working collaboratively to strengthen
981 health systems. *The BMJ*. 2021 Feb 15;372.

982 58. Brady L, Gilson L, Olivier J, Orgill M, Shung-King M, Whyte E, et al. “Not Just a
983 Journal Club – It’s Where the Magic Happens”: Knowledge Mobilization Through Co-
984 Production for Health System Development in the Western Cape Province, South Africa. *Int J*
985 *Health Policy Manag*. 2022;11(3):323–33.

986 59. Cousins T, Pentecost M, Alvergne A, Chandler C, Chigudu S, Herrick C, et al. The
987 changing climates of global health. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2021;6:e005442.

988 60. Büyüm AM, Kenney C, Koris A, Mkumba L, Raveendran Y. Decolonising global
989 health: If not now, when? *BMJ Glob Health*. 2020;5(8):1–4.

990 61. Roomaney RA, Van Wyk B, Wyk VP Van. Decolonising multimorbidity? research
991 gaps in low and middle-income countries. *Pan African Medical Journal. African Field*
992 *Epidemiology Network*; 2022;41:140

993 62. Herrick C. The (non)charisma of noncommunicable diseases. *Social Theory and*
994 *Health*. 2017;15(1):99–116.

995

996 **Supporting Information**

997 **S1 Table. Breakdown of participant demographics of people living with multimorbidity**
998 **(PLWMM)**. Provides information about the demographics of PLWMM included in the study,
999 including age, sex, province, and conditions.

1000 **S2 Table. Availability of medicines, equipment, diagnostics, and training for common**
1001 **NCDs in 30 health facilities**. Provides select quantitative findings from the health facility
1002 survey regarding medicines, equipment, and training for NCDs.

1003 **S3. Table. Priorities and key institutions for responding to multimorbidity in Zimbabwe.**

1004 Presents the main priorities and focal institutions for responding to multimorbidity identified
1005 during the final collaborative workshop held in Harare 1st December 2023.

1006 **S4 Checklist. COREQ Checklist:** Includes a completed COREQ checklist which is
1007 commonly used for reporting on qualitative studies. Domains include: research team and
1008 reflexivity; study design; and analysis and findings.

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024



Figure 1: Provinces of Zimbabwe included in the KnowM^M study




Figure 3. Illustrative care pathway for long-term conditions[#]

[#]Considerable heterogeneity exists across provinces and districts, thus this pathway may not be representative of all referral possibilities

Fig 2 - Care Pathways




Figure 3. Data Flows for Long-Term Conditions and Multimorbidity