

1 **Effectiveness of Ghana’s COVID-19 policy responses and lessons learnt for the future:**

2 **A multi-methods evaluation**

3 Shirley Crankson<sup>1</sup>, Subhash Pokhrel<sup>1</sup>, Nana Anokye<sup>1</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup>Division of Global Public Health

5 Department of Health Sciences

6 College of Health, Medicine and Life sciences

7 Brunel University London

8 Uxbridge, London – UK

9

10 Corresponding author: Shirley Crankson

11 Email: [Shirley.Crankson2@brunel.ac.uk](mailto:Shirley.Crankson2@brunel.ac.uk)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 22 **Abstract**

23 Ghana implemented various mitigating policies in response to the COVID-19 outbreak. This  
24 study examined the effectiveness of these policies to contribute to the ongoing discussions on  
25 proactive and pre-emptive interventions for similar future outbreaks.

26 A mix of qualitative and quantitative methods were used for the analysis. Data were drawn  
27 from multiple sources, including peer-reviewed and grey literature, and academic experts from  
28 Ghanaian universities. The data from the literature informed a questionnaire that was sent to  
29 independent academic experts to explore their opinions on whether the policies met their  
30 intended objectives. The experts' opinions were collected on a 5-point Likert scale and from  
31 an open-ended question using an online data collection platform, Qualtrics. The data were  
32 evaluated using narrative synthesis, descriptive statistics and thematic analysis.

33 We identified and evaluated eight key COVID-19 policy responses in Ghana: (1) partial  
34 lockdown of epicentres; (2) COVID-19 public awareness campaigns; (3) ban on public  
35 gatherings; (4) COVID-19 vaccination; (5) border closures; (6) entry border COVID-19  
36 screening; (7) incentives for healthcare workers (HCWs); and (8) the Ghana Alleviation and  
37 Revitalisation of Enterprises Support (GCARES). Two policies - the COVID-19 awareness  
38 campaigns and border closure - effectively improved public awareness of COVID-19 and  
39 helped to reduce COVID-19 case importation (median score  $\geq 4$ ).

40 Ghana's COVID-19 public awareness campaigns and border closure policies could serve as a  
41 valuable model for informing proactive interventions to address future infectious disease  
42 outbreaks.

43

44

## 45 **Introduction**

46 The COVID-19 outbreak has been one of the most consequential infectious disease outbreaks  
47 in the 21st century, affecting all facets of life, including global health systems, education and  
48 economies [1, 2]. However, while its horizontal experience has been comparable globally, its  
49 vertical impact has differed in many countries due to contextual boundaries emanating from  
50 multiple factors, such as socioeconomic and environmental variations [3]. Correspondingly, its  
51 mitigating policies have also been akin, to some extent, and differed in many regards globally  
52 to ensure their socioeconomic, cultural and environmental appropriateness and acceptability  
53 [4]. For example, many countries implemented a lockdown policy to curtail the spread of the  
54 outbreak; however, its operationalisation differed between countries owing to the earlier  
55 mentioned differences in contextual characteristics, including variations in housing structures,  
56 technological advancement, access to social amenities and economic activities [5]. A case in  
57 point is the lockdown intervention approach in Ghana and the UK, where the former  
58 implemented a partial lockdown and the latter a complete lockdown [6,7]. Apart from the  
59 similar policies with different operationalisation between countries, the contextual variations  
60 also accounted for very distinct and country-specific COVID-19 policies, like the Ghana  
61 Alleviation and Revitalisation of Enterprises Support (GCARES) policy, to ensure countries  
62 meet their specific pandemic and post-pandemic goals considering their COVID-19  
63 experiences [8].

64 Notwithstanding the similarity and distinctiveness between countries regarding their COVID-  
65 19 policies, enhanced globalisation suggests that countries must continually evaluate their  
66 COVID-19 mitigating approaches to ultimately curb the outbreak on the global front [9]. One  
67 such evaluation could be reflecting and assessing the effectiveness of implemented policies to  
68 learn key lessons in order to inform policy guidelines for the continuous management of the  
69 outbreak or similar outbreaks in the future. The current COVID-19 literature is inundated with

70 several such COVID-19 policies' effectiveness analyses, with many of the analyses skewed  
71 towards many developed countries [10, 11]. Given the comparable policies globally, the  
72 findings from these analyses could offer helpful policy guides for other countries with scarcer  
73 literature representation. However, given the argued socioeconomic variations and country-  
74 specific COVID-19 policies, there is an urgent need for more comprehensive effectiveness  
75 analyses of country-specific COVID-19 policies, particularly from developing countries. These  
76 analyses can provide crucial evidence to support targeted and more tailored interventions in the  
77 event of another outbreak. They could also ensure a fair literature representation on COVID-  
78 19 mitigating strategies, which is fundamental for guiding the global mitigation agenda for  
79 similar outbreaks in the future. Therefore, this study, which evaluated the effectiveness of the  
80 COVID-19 policy responses in Ghana, a developing country with comparably scarce data in  
81 the literature on its COVID-19 policy assessments.

82 Ghana implemented several COVID-19 policies from 2020 to 2022 to lessen and avert any  
83 further dire repercussions of the outbreak [12]. These policies include a partial lockdown in the  
84 country's COVID-19 disease hotspots, COVID-19 public awareness campaigns, enhanced  
85 testing capacities of earmarked COVID-19 testing centres and incentivisation of front-line  
86 workers [13]. Some of these policies have been evaluated in a few studies to ascertain their  
87 effectiveness and continuous relevance in the event of another outbreak. However, most of  
88 these studies primarily used a single approach, primarily qualitative approaches, to assess the  
89 policies' effectiveness [12, 13, 14], offering nuanced evidence but limited robustness on the  
90 validity of the evidence. Further, most of the studies focused on the effectiveness of only a few  
91 of Ghana's COVID policies [6, 15], offering insufficient data to enhance our understanding of  
92 the interconnectedness of Ghana's multiple and simultaneously implemented COVID-19  
93 policies and whether the policies' interconnectedness impacted Ghana's overall COVID-19  
94 outcomes.

95 Therefore, this study was underpinned by a complementary multi-method approaches to  
96 diminish the subjectivity in the previous studies and enhance the validity of the evidence on  
97 the policies' effectiveness [16]. As such, it combined a literature review approach with expert  
98 opinions (collected both qualitatively and quantitatively) to corroborate evidence on the  
99 effectiveness of Ghana's COVID-19 policies. The literature review examined the existing  
100 evidence on the effects of Ghana's COVID-19 policies and the quantitative and qualitative  
101 analyses leveraged independent expert perspectives on a 5-point Likert scale and open-ended  
102 questions to corroborate or challenge the literature review findings on the effectiveness of the  
103 policies. The study design required a framework for a standard or benchmark approach for  
104 demonstrating a policy's' effectiveness. Therefore, the policies' objectives were used as  
105 benchmarks for assessing their effectiveness in the adopted multiple methods.

106

## 107 **Methods**

108 This study was carried out in several stages as described below:

### 109 **Stage 1: Literature review**

110 The study reviewed the grey and peer-reviewed literature to provide evidence on the  
111 effectiveness of Ghana's COVID-19 policies in addressing the burden of the outbreak in  
112 Ghana. The data for the review was sourced from multiple sources: First, Scopus, the largest  
113 database of peer-reviewed journals and encompassing journals from other large databases [17],  
114 was searched for peer-reviewed articles evaluating Ghana's COVID-19 policies using the  
115 keywords: 'COVID-19', 'coronavirus', 'effectiveness', 'effect', 'impact', 'influence', 'policy',  
116 'intervention', 'response', 'policy response', 'Ghana'. Second, the Google database was  
117 searched for generic articles using a combination of the above search terms. Third, specific  
118 websites, including the WHO, Worldometer and Government of Ghana (GoG) websites and  
119 local news agencies, were searched for reports on COVID-19 policy responses in Ghana. The

120 GOG websites comprised Ghana Health Service (GHS), the Ministry of Health (MoH), the  
121 Ministry of Education (MoE), the Ministry of Information (MoI) and the Ministry of Finance  
122 (MoF) databases. The local media houses included Ghana Broadcasting Corporation (GBC),  
123 Citi FM, TV3 and Joy News, acknowledged and recognised local news agencies in Ghana that  
124 were involved in disseminating information on GoG's responses to the COVID-19 outbreak.  
125 The multiple data sources contributed to enhancing the validity and reliability of identified  
126 information on Ghana's COVID-19 policy responses. The search was first carried out from  
127 30th March 2022 to 1st April 2022 and updated on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2024. After the literature search,  
128 a narrative synthesis was done to compare information across multiple articles to provide  
129 evidence on a policy's effectiveness. The whole review was guided by a logic model [18].

130 After the synthesis, a 3-point valuation measure was used to quantify a policy's gains. The  
131 valuation, guided by the findings of the narrative synthesis, was necessary to provide an  
132 objective overview of the policy's effectiveness. In the valuation, '0' was given if literature  
133 review evidence showed that a policy did not effectively address any of its intended objectives,  
134 '1' if at least one objective was met and '2' when all objectives were met. Consequently,  
135 policies with a '0' score were considered ineffective, those with '1' were perceived as  
136 somewhat effective, and those with a score of '2' were termed effective.

137

## 138 **Stage 2: Expert validation**

139 Experts were invited to validate the effectiveness of the COVID-19 policies per their identified  
140 objectives in stage 1. Experts were defined in this study as academics, independent of the  
141 research team, with sufficient knowledge of the local context regarding Ghana's COVID-19  
142 policy landscape. The choice of academics as experts was informed by their documented  
143 attention to details, scientific rigour, and broader perspectives in developing, reviewing, and  
144 evaluating policies [19]. The academic experts were from universities in Ghana who were

145 either teaching or researching in any health or economics disciplines. The two disciplines were  
146 informed by the nature of the COVID-19 policies in Ghana. A gatekeeper, who is affiliated to  
147 multiple universities in Ghana, was used to recruit the experts. The gatekeeper informed the  
148 experts about this study's objectives and their expectations through a Participant Information  
149 Sheet (PIS) and furnished them with the link to the study's questionnaire. The link and PIS  
150 were all shared through a broadcast study invitation email. The questionnaire was uploaded on  
151 Qualtrics, an online tool for data collection. Consent information was also embedded in the  
152 online questionnaire, and the experts could only record their responses after agreeing to the  
153 consent statement by clicking 'agree' on the online questionnaire. The link to the questionnaire  
154 was opened for the experts' responses from 08/12/2022 to 16/01/2023. The questionnaire  
155 included sociodemographic questions and a question each on the objectives of the eight  
156 COVID-19 policies, as identified from the literature review. The experts rated the effectiveness  
157 of the policies on a scale of 1 to 5 (where 1 = not effective, 2 = not very effective, 3 = do not  
158 know, 4 = effective, 5 = very effective), except for the vaccination policy which was rated on  
159 a 1 to 3 scale (1 = no, 2 = maybe, 3 = yes) because it was still ongoing unlike the other policies,  
160 and the assessment aimed to examine its possible influence at the end of its implementation as  
161 per its prospective aim of inducing herd immunity. In addition to rating individual policies'  
162 performance, the experts were given an open-ended field to record what they thought had  
163 contributed to a specific policy's influence on a COVID-19 burden. Ethics approval for the  
164 expert's recruitment and data collection was granted by the College of Health, Medicine and  
165 Life Sciences (CHMLS) Research Ethics Committee.

166 The questionnaire to collect expert opinions was a multi-item survey developed specifically for  
167 this study to allow items specific to the characteristics of Ghana's COVID-19 policies, as no  
168 such questionnaire existed prior to this study. The questionnaire was informed by the findings  
169 of the literature review, suggestions from academics within the Department of Health Sciences,

170 Brunel University London, and a review of the literature on standard approaches to  
171 questionnaire development to ensure content and face validity, respectively [20, 21]. A  
172 Cronbach's alpha test was conducted to examine the reliability of the items on the survey  
173 questionnaire.

174 The analysis of the data on expert's opinions involved several steps. Descriptive and thematic  
175 analyses were conducted to provide meanings to the experts' responses. The descriptive  
176 analyses used frequencies, proportions, medians and Interquartile ranges (IQR) to summarise  
177 the experts' characteristics. Policies with a median rating  $\geq 4$  were perceived as effective, and  
178 those with a median  $< 4$  were perceived as ineffective. An IQR value  $\leq 1$  was used to determine  
179 experts' consensus on a policy's effectiveness [22] The thematic analysis identified common  
180 themes from the participant's responses to the open-ended question on what they think  
181 contributed to the outcomes of the COVID-19 policies. In the analysis, the responses from each  
182 expert were first read thoroughly to ensure familiarisation with the data. Codes were generated  
183 to represent phrases/sentences from the experts' responses in the data familiarisation. The  
184 codes were then reviewed and observed for patterns regarding the policy's effectiveness.  
185 Common codes from the experts were then combined into themes. The thematic analysis was  
186 conducted by SC and reviewed by NA to ensure that they accurately represented the experts'  
187 responses. The final themes were defined in sentences to provide meanings to the experts'  
188 responses and enhance understanding of the policies' effect.

## 189 **Results**

190 We evaluated eight key COVID-19 policies implemented in Ghana between 2020 and 2022.  
191 The policies were (1) partial lockdown of epicentres; (2) COVID-19 public awareness  
192 campaigns; (3) ban on public gatherings; (4) COVID-19 vaccination; (5) border closures; (6)  
193 entry border COVID-19 screening; (7) incentives for healthcare workers (HCWs); and (8) the  
194 Ghana Alleviation and Revitalisation of Enterprises Support (GCARES). The valuation



195 measures, based on the literature review findings, found the public awareness campaigns,  
 196 COVID-19 vaccination, border closures, entry border COVID-19 screening and the incentives  
 197 for HCWs as ‘effective’, the partial lockdown and GCARES policies as ‘somewhat effective’  
 198 and the bans on public gatherings as ineffective. Table 1 summaries the literature review and  
 199 valuation measures findings.

200 Table 1: Review findings and valuation score of Ghana’s COVID-19 policies’ effectiveness

| <b>COVID-19 policy</b>         | <b>Policy’s intended objectives</b>   | <b>Review’s evidence on policy’s effect</b>  | <b>Proportion (%) of studies reporting policy as effective</b> | <b>Valuation score</b> |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|
| Partial lockdown of epicentres | Reduce spread of COVID-19             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did not reduce COVID-19 spread [6; 14; 23; 24]</li> <li>• Unclear/inconclusive evidence [13]</li> </ul> | 0/5 (0)  | 1 (somewhat effective) |
|                                | Enhance COVID-19 disease surveillance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced COVID-19 surveillance [24; 25; 26; 27]</li> </ul>  | 4/4 (100)  |                        |
|                                | Scaling up COVID-19                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scaled up COVID-19 testing and treatment</li> </ul>   | 3/5 (60)   |                        |

| <b>COVID-19 policy</b>              | <b>Policy's intended objectives</b>                                  | <b>Review's evidence on policy's effect</b>   | <b>Proportion (%) of studies reporting policy as effective</b> | <b>Valuation score</b> |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|------------------------|
|                                     | treatment capacities   | capacities [25; 27; 28]<br><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not scale up COVID-19 testing and treatment capacity [26; 29].</li> </ul> |  |                        |
| COVID-19 public awareness campaigns | Create awareness of COVID-19, its prevention and treatment protocols | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created awareness [13; 14; 25; 26; 30; 31; 32]</li> </ul>  | 7/7 (100)  | 2 (effective)          |
| Ban on public gatherings            | Reduce COVID-19 transmission   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did not reduce COVID-19 transmission [ 23; 24; 27; 33]</li> </ul>  | 0/4 (0)  | 0 (ineffective)        |
| COVID-19 vaccination                | Reduce risk and severity of  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced number of COVID-19</li> </ul>  | 2/2 (100)  | 2 (effective)          |

| <b>COVID-19 policy</b>            | <b>Policy's intended objectives</b>                       | <b>Review's evidence on policy's effect</b>  | <b>Proportion (%) of studies reporting policy as effective</b> | <b>Valuation score</b> |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------|
|                                   | COVID-19 infections through vaccine-induced herd immunity | infections and deaths [23; 24]   |  |                        |
| Border closures                   | Reduce COVID-19 case importation                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduced COVID-19 case importation by air [24; 34]</li> </ul>                | 2/2 (100)  | 2 (effective)          |
| Entry border COVID-19 screening   | Detect and isolate COVID-19 cases                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detected and isolated over 7,000 COVID-19 active cases [24; 35]</li> </ul>  | 2/2 (100)  | 2 (effective)          |
| Incentives for healthcare workers | Widen workforce capacity                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased in number of frontline healthcare workers [28; 36; 37]</li> </ul> | 3/3 (100)  | 2 (effective)          |

| <b>COVID-19 policy</b> | <b>Policy's intended objectives</b> | <b>Review's evidence on policy's effect</b>   | <b>Proportion (%) of studies reporting policy as effective</b> | <b>Valuation score</b> |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|------------------------|
| GCARES                 | Stimulate economic recovery         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stimulating economic recovery [38]</li> <li>Not simulating economic recovery [39; 40]</li> </ul> | 1/3 (33)   | 1 (somewhat effective) |

201

202 Thirty-four experts evaluated the eight COVID-19 policies, providing 272 main data points.

203 Most of them were women (n = 25; 73.5%), aged 18 – 34 years (n = 17; 50%) and were from

204 a health discipline (n = 30; 88.2%), including medicine, nursing and physiotherapy. They rated

205 the public awareness campaigns, bans on public gathering, partial lockdown and border

206 closures policies as effective (Median score  $\geq 4$ ), and the incentives for HCWs, COVID-19

207 entry border screening and GCARES policies as ineffective (Median score  $< 4$ ). There was

208 consensus among the experts on the effectiveness of the public awareness campaigns (IQR =1).

209 The reliability test showed a Cronbach's alpha of 0.88, indicating a high internal consistency

210 between the questionnaire's items. Fig. 1 shows the median and IQR of the policies as rated by

211 the experts. The vaccination policy is not included in Fig 1 as it was not rated on a 1 to 5 scale

212 like the other policies. Also, only ten of the experts rated the effectiveness of the GCARES

213 policy.

214 Fig 1. Experts' ratings of the effectiveness of Ghana's key COVID-19 policy responses.

215

216 The review findings for each policy and corresponding experts' ratings of the policy's  
217 effectiveness are presented below:

218 **(1) Partial lockdown of epicentres**

219 A partial lockdown policy was implemented in two metropolises in Ghana – Greater Accra and  
220 Kumasi from 30th March 2020 to 20th April 2020 to reduce the burden of the COVID-19  
221 disease [6, 41]. The policy allowed individuals in the targeted cities to access essential services,  
222 like food, pharmacy and banking services when needed, and members of the executive,  
223 judiciary, legislative, and media could operate [12, 13; 41]. The objective of the lockdown was  
224 to halt the spread of the virus (through movement restriction), enhance disease surveillance and  
225 scale up COVID-19 testing capacity [12, 42]. Before the policy, the number of COVID-19  
226 cases was 152. This number increased to 1,042 on 20/04/2020 when the lockdown was lifted,  
227 indicating an 85% increase in the case count [23, 24]. The number of cases is reported to have  
228 increased steadily, even after the lockdown was lifted [23]. The increase in cases was attributed  
229 to testing backlog and intensified contact tracing, one of the objectives of the lockdown [28].  
230 The contact tracing activity intensified COVID-19 disease surveillance [24], accounting for  
231 about 63% of active COVID-19 cases identified during the partial lockdown period [24, 25].

232 On the scaling up COVID-19 testing capacity objective, only two public laboratories, i.e., the  
233 Kumasi Centre for Collaborative Research (KCCR) and Noguchi Memorial Institute for  
234 Medical Research (NMIMR), were equipped to test for COVID-19 before and during the  
235 partial lockdown period [26]. The combined testing capacity of the laboratories before the  
236 lockdown was about 300 tests per day, and this doubled during the lockdown due to the  
237 adoption of a 'pool testing system', where tests were conducted in groups of 10s instead of  
238 individuals [34]. However, there were significant sample backlogs by the two labs during and

239 post-lockdown, which affected the testing turnaround time [12, 28]. The pooling method was  
240 later abandoned when the case positivity rate increased [28]. Six hospitals were allocated for  
241 the management of COVID-19 during the lockdown, with one earmarked as the main treatment  
242 centre. Isolation and quarantine centres were also allocated in major cities during the lockdown  
243 period, with assistance from churches and private entities [28]. Capacity training was provided  
244 for the staff of these hospitals on COVID-19 testing, treatment, and appropriate use of Personal  
245 Protective Equipment (PPEs) [28]. These facilities, however, faced inadequate PPEs during the  
246 lockdown period, which affected their management of COVID-19 patients [26]. The partial  
247 lockdown was associated with unintended outcomes, such as job losses for individuals and  
248 institutions, social exclusion, and severe economic hardship for people with low incomes [14,  
249 43]. The enhanced COVID-19 testing capacity of the country and some of the unintended  
250 outcomes informed the lifting of the partial lockdown in April 2020 [13, 42]. On the experts'  
251 perceived effectiveness of the partial lockdown policy, twenty-two indicated that the policy  
252 was effective in enhancing COVID-19 disease surveillance (Effective: n = 17; Very Effective:  
253 n = 5), and nineteen of them said it was effective in reducing the spread of the virus (Effective:  
254 n = 15; Very effective: n = 4) and scaling up COVID-19 testing and treatment capacities  
255 (Effective: n = 15; Very effective: n = 4).

256

## 257 **(2) COVID-19 public awareness campaigns**

258 COVID-19 public education and awareness campaigns were implemented in Ghana before the  
259 country recorded its first two COVID-19 cases on 12th March 2020 [42]. In the early stages of  
260 the outbreak, the campaigns were aimed to create public awareness of COVID-19 and ensure  
261 public adherence to COVID-19 prevention and management protocols [13]. As the disease  
262 progressed, the education campaigns were extended to include education on COVID-19  
263 vaccination, with focus on demystifying the disease, ensuring social inclusion of recovered

264 individuals and promoting COVID-19 vaccine uptake. The President was the key agent in the  
265 COVID-19 education campaigns. He encouraged the public to adhere to the COVID-19  
266 preventive protocols and updated them on the government's efforts to curtail the disease  
267 through frequent speeches through mass media [42]. There were several COVID-19 awareness  
268 campaigns in different local dialects on mass media across the country, and regular updates on  
269 the disease's characteristics were made on government portals [14; 43]. The public could  
270 access COVID-19 information from multiple sources, including radio, TV and social media  
271 [31], with the internet being the major source of information [30]. The information included  
272 COVID-19 causes, symptoms, effects, and preventive measures [31]. Telecommunication  
273 companies also used push SMS to educate the public about COVID-19 [13]. Data showed that  
274 about 97% of Ghanaians knew about COVID-19 and the COVID-19 emergency centre [30],  
275 and the COVID-19 campaigns significantly influenced the awareness of the disease [32].  
276 Notwithstanding, there were also reported cases of misinformation, mostly channelled through  
277 social media, friends and families [31, 44], and COVID-19-related stigmatisation [45].

278 The GoG and institutions issued directives to promote compulsory adherence to the COVID-  
279 19 preventive protocols, such as wearing nose masks and hand hygiene directives [46].  
280 However, studies report low public adherence to the protocols, especially on hand washing,  
281 social distancing, and wearing face masks [46, 47, 48]. The low adherence to the protocols was  
282 linked to decreasing advocacy and awareness of COVID-19 by relevant agents, including the  
283 GOG [49]. There were campaigns on the benefits and safety of the COVID-19 vaccine [24;  
284 26]. Some government officials took vaccines in public to create awareness of their safety [26].  
285 Regular vaccine information was also provided on the GHS website. However, media  
286 campaigns on vaccine education were reportedly low [26]. Many experts (n = 30) rated the  
287 public awareness campaigns as effective (Effective: n = 21; Very effective: n = 9). The experts

288 who rated it ineffective were divided equally between ‘Not effective’ (n = 2) and ‘Not very  
289 effective’ (n = 2).

290

### 291 **(3) Ban on public gatherings**

292 The President of Ghana announced a COVID-19 informed public gatherings ban on 15th March  
293 2020 to curtail the spread of the disease. The policy banned school activities, conferences,  
294 festivals, workshops, political rallies, religious activities, sporting events and all other social  
295 events for one month. However, private burials with a maximum of 25 attendees were  
296 permitted. The ban was initially imposed for four weeks and was extended until 5th June 2020,  
297 when the President eased the restrictions, citing low mortality and morbidity rates as reasons  
298 for the decision [42, 34]. Social activities, including conferences, workshops, and religious  
299 activities, were allowed with a maximum of a hundred persons following the lifting of the ban,  
300 and schools were reopened in batches for academic activities from 15th January 2021.  
301 However, in February 2021, the President re-introduced all the initial restrictions on public  
302 gatherings following a surge in COVID-19 cases [42]. The bans were finally lifted in March  
303 2022.

304 During the public gatherings ban (from March 2020 to March 2022), the incidence of COVID-  
305 19 infections fluctuated. However, the highest number of daily new cases (n = 2,521) since the  
306 outbreak began was recorded within the ban period [23, 24]. It is argued that the reported high  
307 daily COVID-19 incidences during the ban period were possibly influenced by spillovers from  
308 before the ban’s imposition due to the observed delays in laboratory testing and case reporting  
309 [12, 50]. Evidence suggests that COVID-19 transmission did not decline following the bans on  
310 public gatherings, and relaxing the ban did not increase COVID-19 transmission [33].  
311 Reopening schools, however, increased the COVID-19 transmission rate in some regions of  
312 Ghana [33]. Several reports also allude to ban violations, especially by religious groups and



313 government officials during the ban period, which may have increased COVID-19 transmission  
314 [13, 14, 45, 51]. Most experts (n = 24) rated the ban on public gatherings policy as effective  
315 (Effective: n = 17; Very effective: n = 7) in reducing the spread of the virus. Of those that said  
316 the policy was ineffective, six rated it as ‘not very effective’, and two rated it as ‘not effective’.

317

#### 318 **(4) COVID-19 vaccination**

319 Ghana implemented a mass COVID-19 vaccination intervention on 1st March 2021 after  
320 receiving 600,000 doses of AstraZeneca on 24th February 2021. The intervention was to reduce  
321 the risk and severity of COVID-19 infections through vaccination-induced herd immunity [24,  
322 52]. It targeted a 60% full vaccination (2 doses of a vaccine) of Ghanaians aged  $\geq 15$  years by  
323 the end of June 2022 to achieve herd immunity [42]. The proportion of the targeted Ghanaians  
324 vaccinated as of 9th September 2024 is 56.7% [24], 3.3% shy of the June 2022 target. The total  
325 number of COVID-19-related deaths as of 1st March 2021, when the mass vaccination began,  
326 was 607. This number had increased to 1,462 as of 7th April 2024 (The last COVID-19 death  
327 updates by GHS) [24, 53], representing 855 deaths. The 607 reported deaths were in the space  
328 of 12 months (between 12th March 2020 and 1st March 2021), representing approximately 51  
329 deaths per month. The 855 additional deaths were also in the space of 37 months (2nd March  
330 2021 to 7th April 2024), representing about 23 deaths per month. This data suggests that the  
331 number of monthly COVID-19-related deaths reduced by about 55% since the vaccination  
332 policy began. On the experts’ perspectives of whether the vaccination policy could achieve  
333 vaccine-induced herd immunity, nineteen (56%) said the vaccine policy ‘may’ reduce the  
334 COVID-19 burden through herd immunity, two (6%) said the vaccine would not achieve this  
335 objective, and thirteen (38%) of them were certain that the policy would achieve the objective.

## 336 **(5) Border closures**

337 Ghana announced a non-admittance restriction on other nationals travelling from countries with  
338 over 200 confirmed COVID-19 cases, except those with resident permits, on 15th March 2020  
339 to reduce COVID-19 case importation [54]. This restriction continued until 22nd March 2020,  
340 when all borders, including air, sea and land, were completely closed to all outbound and  
341 inbound travellers; however, the movement of Cargo, essential goods and supplies was not  
342 restricted [55]. The first two COVID-19 cases in Ghana were imported cases, which increased  
343 to 105 by mid-March 2020, necessitating the border closure intervention [23, 24]. The borders  
344 were opened for air travel on 1st September 2020, but the restrictions on land borders remained  
345 until April 2022. Data shows that 705 imported cases were recorded from March 2020 to  
346 December 2020 [28], suggesting that about 600 COVID-19 cases were imported after lifting  
347 the air travel restrictions, i.e., from September to December 2020, as 105 imported cases had  
348 already been reported pre-border closure. By estimation, about 150 cases were imported  
349 monthly for the first four months after lifting the border closure restrictions. This estimation  
350 could also suggest that about 150 cases per month, representing about 750 cases for the period  
351 of the ban imposition (March – September; 5 months), were prevented [24, 34]. Most of the  
352 experts (n = 20) said the border closure policy effectively prevented COVID-19 case  
353 importation (Effective: n = 13; Very effective: n = 7). Three did not know whether the policy  
354 prevented case importation, and eleven rated the policy as ineffective per its targeted objective.

355

## 356 **(6) Entry border COVID-19 screening**

357 Prior to the re-opening of air borders, Ghana introduced compulsory COVID-19 screening at  
358 its main international airport, the Kotoko International Airport (KIA), in September 2020 [42].  
359 The policy aimed to detect and isolate imported COVID-19 cases at entry points to prevent a  
360 case-importation-induced increase in COVID-19 prevalence. In addition to the compulsory

361 airport testing, passengers were mandated to present a negative PCR test result from their  
362 country of embarkment [28]. The compulsory entry border screening was suspended when the  
363 land borders were opened for outbound and inbound travel in March 2022 [42]. Infographics  
364 from GHS showed that the COVID-19 testing at KIA identified and isolated over 7,000 active  
365 cases during the policy's implementation period [24]. The experts' ratings of the border  
366 screening policy's effectiveness were spread equally between effective (Total = 17; Effective:  
367 n = 15; Very effective: n = 2) and ineffective/unsure of effectiveness (Total = 17; Not effective:  
368 n = 2; Not very effective: n = 10; Don't know: n = 5). But when fragmented, most experts (n =  
369 15) rated the policy as 'effective' rather than 'not very effective' (n = 10).

370

#### 371 **(7) Incentives for HCWs**

372 Ghana announced incentive packages for healthcare workers in March 2020 to widen its  
373 workforce to fight the COVID-19 outbreak [37]. The incentives included about US\$60,000 in  
374 insurance coverage per person, free transportation, 50% of the basic salary allowance for all  
375 frontline workers, and tax-free salaries on employee emoluments for all health workers [37].  
376 These financial packages were rolled out from April 2020 to December 2020 [56, 57]. In  
377 addition, over 45,000 healthcare workers were recruited from March 2020 to November 2022,  
378 increasing the health worker capacity by about 35% [36]. By the end of 2020, Ghana had spent  
379 about US\$35 million on health workers' financial packages and recruitment to sustain and  
380 boost its workforce capability against the COVID-19 outbreak [36]. The experts who said the  
381 HCWs incentives policy was effective (Total = 14; Effective: n = 11; Very effective: n = 3)  
382 were fewer than those who said the policy was ineffective (Total = 18; Not effective: n = 8; Not  
383 very effective: n = 10) in widening the human resource capital against COVID-19.

384

385

386 **(8) GCARES**

387 Ghana implemented a GCARES policy in May 2020 to stimulate economic recovery from the  
388 COVID-19 impact [58]. The three- and half-year program was rolled out in two phases [58].  
389 The first phase focused on revamping the economy through tax exemptions, reduced cost of  
390 essential services and provision of loans up to 600 million cedis with two years repayment  
391 schedule for informal and formal Micro, Small and Medium-scale Enterprises (MSMEs) [58].  
392 As of 21st May 2020, about 8,000 applicants had registered to access the loan to revamp their  
393 businesses [59]. The first phase ended in July 2020. The second phase, launched for three years  
394 (2021-2023), aimed to transform Ghana's economy through revived industries, such as  
395 manufacturing, construction, digitalisation and agri-business [58]. Data shows that the Gross  
396 Domestic Product (GDP) in the fourth quarter of 2021 (7%) was higher than 2020's GDP  
397 (4.3%), indicating marginal economic growth, which could have been influenced by the  
398 GCARES policy [38]. Of the ten experts who rated the effectiveness of the GCARES policy,  
399 five said the policy was ineffective (Not effective: n = 3; Not very effective: n = 2) in  
400 stimulating economic recovery from the COVID-19 impact. Four of the remaining five did not  
401 know the policy's effectiveness, and one said it was effective.

402

403 On the open-ended responses on the rationale for the policies' effectiveness rating, ten of the  
404 experts gave reasons for their effectiveness ratings of the COVID-19 policies. Their reasons  
405 are summarised in Table 2 below. Many (n = 4) of them commented on the ban on public  
406 gatherings policy and their reasons included:

407 *“On the ban of the public gathering, it really helped to curb the spread of the virus. It was*  
408 *actually one of the effective measures employed” (Participant 010).*

409 *“The restriction on public gathering was very effective. This was because churches and club*  
410 *houses were closed, and anyone seen disobeying were punished” (Participant 009).*

411 On other policies, one explained that the *“the closure of the borders in a way helped to reduce*  
412 *spread of Covid-19, but it affected traders a lot and people used unauthorized borders to go*  
413 *about their business. So, at the end it wasn’t effectively controlled and not everyone got tested”*  
414 *(Participant 014).*

415 **Table 2: Thematic findings of the experts’ reasons for their policies’ effectiveness ratings**

| Type of policy                             | Themes  | Participant ID |
|--|---|----------------|
| Ban on public gathering                    | The policy curbed the spread of COVID-19  | 010, 030       |
|  | The Policy’s effectiveness was facilitated by the lockdown  | 014            |
|  | Policy was effective because it had punitive measures.  | 009            |
| COVID-19 public awareness campaigns        | The Public education campaign informed people about COVID1-19   | 007, 014       |
| Incentives for HCWs                        | Policy was ineffective due to equipment unavailability  | 011, 014       |
| Partial lockdown                           | Migration of people to non-locked down areas before lockdown implementation made the policy ineffective | 014            |
|  | The public fear of COVID-19 made the lockdown policy effective  | 033            |
| Border closures and entry border screening | The usage of some unauthorised borders affected the policies effectiveness                              | 014            |

| Type of policy | Themes   | Participant ID |
|----------------|--|----------------|
| GCARES         | Most entrepreneurs did not benefit from the GCARES policy                                    | 035            |
| Vaccination    | The COVID-19 vaccination can reduce the disease's burden by preventing related complications | 014            |
| All policies   | All the policies collectively improved the COVID-19 outcomes                                 | 001            |
|                | The COVID-19 outcomes were worsened by poor attitudes towards policies                       | 004            |

416

## 417 Discussion

418 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the effectiveness of key COVID-  
419 19 policies in Ghana, by first using a robust scrutiny of the literature and then validating the  
420 findings in a rigorously structured expert poll. The literature review assessment of effective  
421 (public awareness campaigns, COVID-19 vaccination, border closures, entry border COVID-  
422 19 screening and HCWs), somewhat effective (GCARES and partial lockdown) and ineffective  
423 (bans on public gatherings) policies was consistent with the experts' opinion for some policies  
424 and inconsistent with others. For example, agreement was obtained between the review  
425 findings and experts' ratings regarding the COVID-19 public awareness campaigns as being  
426 effective but there was disagreement on the effectiveness of the partial lockdown, ban on public  
427 gatherings, HCWs incentives, GCARES and entry border COVID-19 screening policies. The  
428 disagreement could emanate from the policies' characteristics and operationalisation, which  
429 blurs objective evaluations. For example, some of the policies were complementary, had  
430 similar intended outcomes and were implemented around the same time, therefore obscuring

431 possible attribution of policy outcomes to specific policies. A case in point is the partial  
432 lockdown and bans on gatherings policies which were implemented around the same time and  
433 had the same intended outputs of reducing the spread of COVID-19. This similarity restricted  
434 estimating actual outcomes attributable to either of the policies, limiting precise objective  
435 assessments. This limitation could have contributed to the variations in the results between  
436 experts' opinions and the initial ratings. Arguably, the study could have addressed this  
437 attribution limitation with a period analysis of their outcomes [60]. However, given that these  
438 policies were implemented concurrently, there were insufficient data for such an analysis.

439 Unlike the other policies, the vaccination policy was assessed prospectively by the experts,  
440 given that it is still in force. Therefore, its experts' findings may not represent the policy's  
441 present gains. Nonetheless, its literature review findings demonstrate a reduction in the number  
442 of COVID-19 infections and related deaths since the vaccination intervention started. This  
443 reduction is not specific to any vaccine type and no empirical data was found to attribute this  
444 reduction to the vaccination intervention. However, a recent modelling study showed that  
445 Ghana's vaccination intervention could reduce symptomatic COVID-19 infections in adults  
446 aged 25 to 64 years by about 7% [61]. This evidence suggests that Ghana could enhance its  
447 vaccination uptake to continue reducing its COVID-19 infections and deaths.

448 The literature review finding on whether the vaccination policy achieved herd immunity was  
449 comparable to the experts' perspectives. Ghana did not achieve its herd immunity objective in  
450 June 2022, even almost two years after, potentially due to vaccine unavailability and hesitancy  
451 [52]. Studies have reported vaccine hesitancy in Ghana and have attributed it to poor  
452 knowledge, anxiety, conspiracy theories, safety concerns and misconceptions [62 – 64]. This  
453 observation, however, is not isolated to Ghana, as several studies from other jurisdictions have  
454 also reported COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy [65 – 67]. When positioned within behavioural

455 models, it could be explained that vaccine uptake among populations could be influenced by a  
456 multidirectional interplay of complex sociocultural, religious, and behavioural factors [68],  
457 warranting a comprehensive intervention to prevent hesitancy. Policymakers in Ghana could,  
458 therefore, explore these factors to scale-up its vaccination intervention uptake and address any  
459 vaccine hesitancy that could impede efforts at meeting its herd immunity target.

460 The review showed that the entry border COVID-19 screening policy helped isolate and  
461 quarantine travellers who tested positive for COVID-19 on arrival [35]. Consequently, those  
462 testing negative for the virus were allowed entry into the country [35]. Therefore, it could not  
463 be established whether the policy was sufficient in curtailing COVID-19 transmission from  
464 imported cases, particularly as a negative test at the point of entry may not indicate a ‘true’  
465 negative COVID-19 status, given the influence of viral incubation periods on test results [69],  
466 and it was unclear in the literature whether the travellers with negative test results on arrival  
467 were required to have a repeated test within specified time to confirm the arrival test outcome.

468 The partial lockdown policy did not reduce COVID-19 spread per the literature review  
469 findings, and though the experts rated it effective in reducing COVID-19 transmission, they  
470 did not achieve consensus. The increased COVID-19 cases during the lockdown [23] could  
471 have been from the not-lockdown areas. However, data from GHS [24] shows reported  
472 COVID-19 cases from the lockdown areas, suggesting viral spread in the epicentres during the  
473 policy period. The viral spread could have been facilitated by hindered early identification and  
474 isolation of cases due to the delayed testing turnaround time experienced during the lockdown  
475 because of the lower testing capacities in Ghana [28, 70]. It could have also resulted from the  
476 reported scaling down of contact tracers at some point during the lockdown imposition [25].  
477 Like the partial lockdown, there was no consensus among the experts on the effectiveness of  
478 the bans on public gatherings policy, and the review found it ineffective. Given the Ghanaian  
479 socioeconomic context, it was probably impossible to curtail COVID-19 transmission through



480 the imposition of a public gathering ban. This is because it is impractical to attain complete  
481 adherence to such a ban at all population levels due to socioeconomic inequalities [13]. Like  
482 many developing countries, individuals at the bottom of the economic pyramid in Ghana face  
483 myriad challenges, including low purchasing power, shared and poor sanitation facilities and  
484 housing conditions [71]. These challenges may limit their tendency to avoid public gatherings  
485 and practise social distancing [72].

486 There are several lessons learnt from this study for handling future pandemics of the nature and  
487 scale of COVID-19. First, relevant policymakers in Ghana could consider the country's  
488 socioeconomic and cultural fabrics, such as education, traditions, religion and housing  
489 characteristics, when implementing policies like lockdowns and bans on public gatherings to  
490 ensure their optimal impacts in the event of another pandemic. When needed to flatten the  
491 transmission curve, Ghana could consider a lockdown intervention when the number of  
492 infections exceeds treatment capacities [73]. However, this decision must be complemented  
493 with scaled-up testing capacities and well-equipped treatment facilities to avoid prolonged  
494 lockdown periods, which could have dire economic consequences [25]. Second, given Ghana's  
495 economic situation, which usually affects its provision of equipment and resources for health  
496 service delivery, a public-private partnership could be helpful to ensure an uninterrupted and  
497 adequate supply of resources to manage pandemics. The government could also support  
498 hospital facilities to generate internal funds through grants, such as clinical grants, to ensure  
499 their self-reliance, which could boost their preparedness for emergencies like pandemics.

500 Third, Ghana's government could equip and support relevant state agencies and appropriate  
501 private organisations to improve its policy regulations and enforcements strategies. This  
502 support is necessary as the evidence suggests that enhanced policy enforcement strategies are  
503 crucial to mitigate the burden of any similar future outbreak in Ghana [13]. Fourth, Ghana  
504 could adopt its COVID-19 awareness campaigns as a model communication and awareness

505 strategy for educating the public in future infectious disease outbreak management, as evidence  
506 supports its effectiveness for pandemic management [74]. The policy could be strengthened  
507 further by blocking sources of misinformation. Finally, global systems could enhance their  
508 efforts to promote COVID-19 herd immunity by ensuring equitable distribution of COVID-19  
509 vaccines for the benefits of developing countries like Ghana. They could also consider strategic  
510 partnerships with social media platforms to control spread of misinformation during disease  
511 outbreaks.

512 Our study used data triangulation to advance the knowledge of the effectiveness of Ghana's  
513 critical COVID-19 policy responses. Leveraging the advantages of this approach allowed our  
514 study to contribute more reliable evidence of the policies' effectiveness. In addition, we  
515 integrated quantitative and qualitative approaches, offering complementary approaches that  
516 could diminish each approach's weaknesses while maintaining their strengths. However, as  
517 associated with qualitative analysis, this study is possibly limited by some subjective data  
518 interpretations, which could have implications for interpreting our findings. However, given  
519 the data triangulation herein, this limitation could be subdued. Our study was also faced with  
520 attribution of effects limitations, given the similar characteristics of the policies and the non-  
521 availability of comparable data to address counterfactuals. For example, the researchers could  
522 not attribute the identified COVID-19 outcomes to any single policy, as most of the evaluated  
523 policies in this study were implemented concurrently. Therefore, by inferences, the COVID-  
524 19 outcomes discussed here could be interpreted as the outcome of all the policies combined.  
525 Also, the relatively small number of experts in this study limits the generalisation of the  
526 findings as a reflection of the viewpoints of all academic experts in Ghana. Further, the  
527 evaluations focused mainly on the policies' direct effects, limiting comprehensively accounting  
528 for their indirect effects.

529 Comparing our findings to the literature, no study was found to have evaluated all the policies  
530 herein at a go, as done in this study. Therefore, the findings presented here could not be  
531 compared to the literature as a composite. However, when defragmented, the findings on the  
532 partial lockdown policy and the public awareness policy are consistent with similar studies [6;  
533 32].

## 534 **Conclusions**

535 Ghana's COVID-19-related public awareness campaigns and border closure policies  
536 effectively informed the public about COVID-19 and contained COVID-19 case importation,  
537 respectively. All the identified eight COVID-19 policies contributed to the COVID-19  
538 outcomes in Ghana. Future studies could expand on the current understanding by exploring  
539 more robust data and approaches to examine the effectiveness of Ghana's COVID-19 policies.

## 540 **Acknowledgments**

541 The authors wish to thank the Ghana Scholarships Secretariat for their immense support  
542 towards this research, and all the experts who participated in this research.

## 543 **References**

- 544 1. Maia Chagas A, Molloy JC, Prieto-Godino LL, Baden T. Leveraging open hardware to  
545 alleviate the burden of COVID-19 on global health systems. *PLoS biology*. 2020 Apr  
546 24;18(4):e3000730.
- 547 2. Pitaloka H, Al Umar AU, Hartati ER, Fitria D. The economic impact of the COVID-19  
548 outbreak: Evidence from Indonesia. *Jurnal Inovasi Ekonomi*. 2020 Apr 29;5(02).
- 549 3. Zhu J, Yan W, Zhu L, Liu J. COVID-19 pandemic in BRICS countries and its  
550 association with socio-economic and demographic characteristics, health vulnerability,  
551 resources, and policy response. *Infectious diseases of poverty*. 2021 Dec;10:1-8.

- 552 4. Alon T, Kim M, Lagakos D, VanVuren M. How should policy responses to the covid-  
553 19 pandemic differ in the developing world? National Bureau of Economic Research;  
554 2020 Jun 1.
- 555 5. Haider N, Osman AY, Gadzekpo A, Akipede GO, Asogun D, Ansumana R, Lessells  
556 RJ, Khan P, Hamid MM, Yeboah-Manu D, Mboera L. Lockdown measures in response  
557 to COVID-19 in nine sub-Saharan African countries. *BMJ Global health*. 2020 Oct  
558 1;5(10):e003319.
- 559 6. Assan A, Hussein H, Agyeman-Duah DN. COVID-19 lockdown implementation in  
560 Ghana: lessons learned and hurdles to overcome. *Journal of Public Health Policy*.  
561 2022;43(1):129.
- 562 7. Smith LE, Amlôt R, Lambert H, Oliver I, Robin C, Yardley L, Rubin GJ. Factors  
563 associated with adherence to self-isolation and lockdown measures in the UK: a cross-  
564 sectional survey. *Public Health*. 2020 Oct 1;187:41-52.
- 565 8. Tuffour P, Opoku-Mensah E, Asiedu-Ayeh LO, Darko D. Assessing governments  
566 response to exogenous shocks: Considering the COVID-19 pandemic in the Ghanaian  
567 context. *Journal of Public Affairs*. 2022 Nov;22(4):e2755.
- 568 9. Bickley SJ, Chan HF, Skali A, Stadelmann D, Torgler B. How does globalization affect  
569 COVID-19 responses?. *Globalization and health*. 2021 May 20;17(1):57.
- 570 10. Haug N, Geyrhofer L, Londei A, Dervic E, Desvars-Larrive A, Loreto V, Pinior B,  
571 Thurner S, Klimek P. Ranking the effectiveness of worldwide COVID-19 government  
572 interventions. *Nature human behaviour*. 2020 Dec;4(12):1303-12.
- 573 11. Brauner JM, Mindermann S, Sharma M, Johnston D, Salvatier J, Gavenčiak T,  
574 Stephenson AB, Leech G, Altman G, Mikulik V, Norman AJ. Inferring the  
575 effectiveness of government interventions against COVID-19. *Science*. 2021 Feb  
576 19;371(6531):eabd9338.

- 577 12. Antwi-Boasiako J, Abbey CO, Ogbey P, Ofori RA. Policy Responses to fight COVID-  
578 19; the case of Ghana. *Revista de Administração Pública*. 2021 Mar 5;55:122-39.
- 579 13. Khoo A. Ghana in COVID-19 pandemic. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*. 2020 Oct  
580 1;21(4):542-56.
- 581 14. Smith CS, Quartey NK. Racialisation of COVID-19 Pandemic and its Impact in Ghana.  
582 COVID-19 ODA Rapid Response Research Report. University of Liverpool. 2020  
583 Aug.
- 584 15. Awekeya H, Dubik SD, Amegah K, Ashinyo A, Wuobar F, Kaitoo E, Ofori W,  
585 Ashinyo ME. An evaluation of COVID-19 surveillance system in New Juaben South  
586 Municipality of Ghana: a cross-sectional study. *Pan African Medical Journal*. 2021 Dec  
587 6;40(1).
- 588 16. Queirós A, Faria D, Almeida F. Strengths and limitations of qualitative and quantitative  
589 research methods. *European journal of education studies*. 2017 Sep 7.
- 590 17. Baas J, Schotten M, Plume A, Côté G, Karimi R. Scopus as a curated, high-quality  
591 bibliometric data source for academic research in quantitative science studies.  
592 *Quantitative science studies*. 2020 Feb 1;1(1):377-86.
- 593 18. Knowlton LW, Phillips CC. *The logic model guidebook: Better strategies for great*  
594 *results*. Sage; 2012 Aug 24.
- 595 19. Qu M, Ahponen P, Tahvanainen L, Pelkonen P. Chinese academic experts' assessment  
596 for forest bio-energy development in China. *Energy Policy*. 2010 Nov 1;38(11):6767-  
597 75.
- 598 20. Boynton PM, Greenhalgh T. Selecting, designing, and developing your questionnaire.  
599 *Bmj*. 2004 May 27;328(7451):1312-5.

- 600 21. Khubchandani J, Sharma S, Price JH, Wiblishauser MJ, Sharma M, Webb FJ. COVID-  
601 19 vaccination hesitancy in the United States: a rapid national assessment. *Journal of*  
602 *community health*. 2021 Apr; 46:270-7.
- 603 22. Cheung KL, de Ruijter D, Hiligsmann M, Elfeddali I, Hoving C, Evers SM, de Vries  
604 H. Exploring consensus on how to measure smoking cessation. A Delphi study. *BMC*  
605 *Public Health*. 2017 Dec;17:1-0.
- 606 23. Worldometer. Coronavirus case count – Ghana. 2022 [Cited 2022 Feb 23]. Available  
607 from: <https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/country/ghana/#graph-deaths-daily>.  
608 Accessed: 2022 Feb 23.
- 609 24. Ghana Health Service. COVID-19 – Ghana’s outbreak response management updates.  
610 2024 [Cited 2024 Aug 28]. Available from: <https://www.ghs.gov.gh/covid19/>
- 611 25. Kenu E, Odikro MA, Malm KL, Asiedu-Bekoe F, Noora CL, Frimpong JA, Calys-  
612 Tagoe B, Koram KA. Epidemiology of COVID-19 outbreak in Ghana. *Ghana Medical*  
613 *Journal*. 2020 Dec;54(4 Suppl):5.
- 614 26. Quakyi NK, Asante NA, Nartey YA, Bediako Y, Sam-Agudu NA. Ghana’s COVID-19  
615 response: the Black Star can do even better. *BMJ global health*. 2021 Mar  
616 1;6(3):e005569.
- 617 27. Agyeman-Manu K. COVID-19 response - Ghana’s experience. 2020 [Cited 2024 Aug  
618 30]. Available from: [https://apps.who.int/gb/COVID-19/pdf\\_files/07\\_05/Ghana.pdf](https://apps.who.int/gb/COVID-19/pdf_files/07_05/Ghana.pdf)
- 619 28. Sarkodie B, Asiedu-Bekoe F, Laryea DO, Ampofo WK, Phillips RO, Samba A, Nsiah-  
620 Asare A, Asamoah-Baah A, Odame E, Ohene SA, Amoako YA. Overview of  
621 preparedness and response to COVID-19 in Ghana. *Ghana medical journal*. 2021 Sep  
622 1;55(2):38-47.
- 623 29. Tawiah O. KATH’s COVID-19 Management Team Threatens to Strike over Unpaid  
624 Allowances. *Joy Online News*. 2021. [Cited 2024 Aug 30]. Available from:

- 625 <https://www.myjoyonline.com/kaths-covid-19-management-team-threatens-to-strike->  
626 [over-unpaid-allowances/](https://www.myjoyonline.com/kaths-covid-19-management-team-threatens-to-strike-over-unpaid-allowances/)
- 627 30. Serwaa D, Lamptey E, Appiah AB, Senkyire EK, Ameyaw JK. Knowledge, risk  
628 perception and preparedness towards coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19) outbreak  
629 among Ghanaians: a quick online cross-sectional survey. The Pan African Medical  
630 Journal. 2020;35(Suppl 2).
- 631 31. Adu-Gyamfi S, Asante EA. Sources of information about COVID-19 among older  
632 adults in Ghana, 2019-2021. Journal of Social, Behavioral, and Health Sciences.  
633 2022;16(1):1-8.
- 634 32. Dubik SD, Amegah KE, Adam AS. Resumption of school amid the COVID-19  
635 pandemic: a rapid assessment of knowledge, attitudes, and preventive practices among  
636 final-year senior high students at a technical institute in Ghana. Education Research  
637 International. 2021 Mar 31;2021:1-8.
- 638 33. Ofori SK, Schwind JS, Sullivan KL, Cowling BJ, Chowell G, Fung IC. Transmission  
639 dynamics of COVID-19 in Ghana and the impact of public health interventions. The  
640 American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 2022 Jul;107(1):175.
- 641 34. Sibiri H, Zankawah SM, Prah D. Coronavirus diseases 2019 (COVID-19) response:  
642 Highlights of Ghana's scientific and technological innovativeness and breakthroughs.  
643 Ethics, Medicine and Public Health. 2020 Jul 1;14:100537.
- 644 35. Adu B, Bonney JK, Odoom JK, Bonney EY, Obodai E, Asante IA, Aboagye J, Adusei-  
645 Poku MA, Lartey L, Asiedu EK, Ampofo WK. SARS-CoV-2 detection among  
646 international air travellers to Ghana during mandatory quarantine. Ghana Medical  
647 Journal. 2021 Sep 1;55(2):48-50.
- 648 36. Asamani JA, Ismaila H, Okoroafor SC, Frimpong KA, Oduro-Mensah E, Chebere M,  
649 Ahmat A, Nabyonga-Orem J, Christmalls CD, Nyoni J, Kuma-Aboagye P. Cost analysis

- 650 of health workforce investments for COVID-19 response in Ghana. *BMJ Global Health*.  
651 2022 May 1;7(Suppl 1):e008941.
- 652 37. Ministry of Health - Ghana. Financial incentives for healthcare workers. 2020. [Cited  
653 2022 Apr 30] Available from: [https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/general-](https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/general-news/coronavirus-ghana-announces-special-life-insurance-cover-for-health-workers.html)  
654 [news/coronavirus-ghana-announces-special-life-insurance-cover-for-health-](https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/general-news/coronavirus-ghana-announces-special-life-insurance-cover-for-health-workers.html)  
655 [workers.html](https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/general-news/coronavirus-ghana-announces-special-life-insurance-cover-for-health-workers.html)
- 656 38. Ghana Statistical Service. 'National Accounts: Annual GDP'. 2022. [Cited 2022 Apr  
657 30]. Available at:  
658 [https://statsghana.gov.gh/nationalaccount\\_macros.php?Stats=MjQyODAxMDY3NC4](https://statsghana.gov.gh/nationalaccount_macros.php?Stats=MjQyODAxMDY3NC42Mzg=/webstats/227532q92p)  
659 [2Mzg=/webstats/227532q92p](https://statsghana.gov.gh/nationalaccount_macros.php?Stats=MjQyODAxMDY3NC42Mzg=/webstats/227532q92p)
- 660 39. Antwi-Boasiako J, Abbey CO, Ogbey P, Ofori RA. Policy Responses to fight COVID-  
661 19; the case of Ghana. *Revista de Administração Pública*. 2021 Mar 5;55:122-39.
- 662 40. Duho KC, Kauppinen AR. Fiscal relations, class politics, and the election year in  
663 Ghana's Covid-19 Context. In *Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics*  
664 (SASE) 33rd Annual Meeting 2021 Jun 25.
- 665 41. Salifu Yendork J, James S. COVID-19 in Ghana: Changes and the way forward. *Journal*  
666 *of Comparative Family Studies*. 2020 Oct;51(3-4):369-84.
- 667 42. The Presidency - Republic of Ghana. Speeches. 2022. [Cited 2022 Feb 23]. Available  
668 from: <https://presidency.gov.gh/index.php/briefing-room/speeches>
- 669 43. Amewu S, Asante S, Pauw K, Thurlow J. The economic costs of COVID-19 in sub-  
670 Saharan Africa: insights from a simulation exercise for Ghana. *The European Journal*  
671 *of Development Research*. 2020 Dec; 32:1353-78.
- 672 44. Tabong PT, Segtub M. Misconceptions, misinformation and politics of COVID-19 on  
673 social media: a multi-level analysis in Ghana. *Frontiers in communication*. 2021 May  
674 5; 6:613794.



- 675 45. Adom D, Mensah JA, Osei M. The psychological distress and mental health disorders  
676 from COVID-19 stigmatization in Ghana. *Social sciences & humanities open*. 2021 Jan  
677 1;4(1):100186.
- 678 46. Dzisi EK, Dei OA. Adherence to social distancing and wearing of masks within public  
679 transportation during the COVID 19 pandemic. *Transportation Research*  
680 *Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. 2020 Sep 1;7:100191.
- 681 47. Apanga PA, Kumbeni MT. Adherence to COVID-19 preventive measures and  
682 associated factors among pregnant women in Ghana. *Tropical Medicine & International*  
683 *Health*. 2021 Jun;26(6):656-63.
- 684 48. Apanga PA, Lettor IB, Akunvane R. Practice of COVID-19 preventive measures and  
685 its associated factors among students in Ghana. *The American journal of tropical*  
686 *medicine and hygiene*. 2021 Feb;104(2):526.
- 687 49. The National Commission for Civic Education – Ghana. ‘Change COVID-19 advocacy  
688 language’. 2022 [Cited 2022 Apr 26} Available from:  
689 [https://www.ghanabusinessnews.com/2020/06/26/change-covid-19-advocacy-](https://www.ghanabusinessnews.com/2020/06/26/change-covid-19-advocacy-language-ncce/)  
690 [language-ncce/](https://www.ghanabusinessnews.com/2020/06/26/change-covid-19-advocacy-language-ncce/)
- 691 50. Ampofo WK. ‘COVID-19 Tests: Noguchi Clears All Backlog of Samples’. 2020.  
692 [Cited 2022 Feb 25] Available from:  
693 <https://www.peacefmonline.com/pages/local/news/202005/407488.php>
- 694 51. Yeboah AS, Takyi SA, Amponsah O, Anafo D. Assessing the practicality of the  
695 COVID-19 social distancing guidelines to the urban poor in the Ghanaian context.  
696 *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*. 2020 Jan 1;2(1):100087.
- 697 52. Acheampong T, Akorsikumah EA, Osae-Kwapong J, Khalid M, Appiah A, Amuasi JH.  
698 Examining vaccine hesitancy in Sub-Saharan Africa: a survey of the knowledge and

- 699 attitudes among adults to receive COVID-19 vaccines in Ghana. *Vaccines*. 2021 Jul  
700 22;9(8):814.
- 701 53. WHO. Ghana finds success in COVID-19 mass vaccination campaigns. 2023. [Cited  
702 2023 May 10]. Available from: [https://www.afro.who.int/countries/ghana/news/ghana-](https://www.afro.who.int/countries/ghana/news/ghana-finds-success-covid-19-mass-vaccination-campaigns)  
703 [finds-success-covid-19-mass-vaccination-campaigns](https://www.afro.who.int/countries/ghana/news/ghana-finds-success-covid-19-mass-vaccination-campaigns)
- 704 54. Duncan J. Coronavirus: Travellers from countries with over 200 cases won't be allowed  
705 in Ghana. 2020 [Cited 2022 Apr 4]. Available from:  
706 [https://citinewsroom.com/2020/03/coronavirus-travellers-from-countries-with-over-](https://citinewsroom.com/2020/03/coronavirus-travellers-from-countries-with-over-200-cases-wont-be-allowed-in-ghana/)  
707 [200-cases-wont-be-allowed-in-ghana/](https://citinewsroom.com/2020/03/coronavirus-travellers-from-countries-with-over-200-cases-wont-be-allowed-in-ghana/)
- 708 55. Adogla-Bessa D. Coronavirus: Ghana to close all borders from Sunday. 2020. [Cited  
709 2022 Apr 29]. Available from: [https://citinewsroom.com/2020/03/coronavirus-ghana-to-](https://citinewsroom.com/2020/03/coronavirus-ghana-to-close-all-borders-from-sunday/)  
710 [close-all-borders-from-sunday/](https://citinewsroom.com/2020/03/coronavirus-ghana-to-close-all-borders-from-sunday/)
- 711 56. Amponsah R, Frimpong IA. Ghana in the face of COVID-19: economic impact of  
712 coronavirus (2019-NCOV) outbreak on Ghana. *Open Journal of Business and*  
713 *Management*. 2020 Jun 17;8(04):1404.
- 714 57. Arku J. 'COVID-19: Incentives for health workers extended to end of year'. 2022.  
715 [Cited 2022 Apr 30] Available from: [https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/general-](https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/general-news/covid-19-incentives-for-health-workers-extended-to-end-of-year.html)  
716 [news/covid-19-incentives-for-health-workers-extended-to-end-of-year.html](https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/general-news/covid-19-incentives-for-health-workers-extended-to-end-of-year.html).
- 717 58. Ministry of Finance. 'Ghana Covid-19 Alleviation and Revitalization of Enterprises  
718 Support'. 2022 [Cited 2022 Apr 30]. Available from:  
719 <https://mofep.gov.gh/sites/default/files/news/care-program.pdf>
- 720 59. Kwofi M. 'COVID-19 Alleviation Programme: 8,000 apply for loan'. 2022. [Cited  
721 2022 May 1]. Available from: [https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/general-news/covid-](https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/general-news/covid-19-alleviation-programme-8-000-apply-for-loan.html)  
722 [19-alleviation-programme-8-000-apply-for-loan.html](https://www.graphic.com.gh/news/general-news/covid-19-alleviation-programme-8-000-apply-for-loan.html)

- 723 60. Fuller J. Conceptual lessons for containing an epidemic of questionable COVID-19  
724 counterfactual comparisons. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2021 Nov 1;75(11):1031-  
725 2.
- 726 61. Ofori SK, Schwind JS, Sullivan KL, Chowell G, Cowling BJ, Fung IC. Age-stratified  
727 model to assess health outcomes of COVID-19 vaccination strategies, Ghana.  
728 *Emerging Infectious Diseases*. 2023 Feb;29(2):360.
- 729 62. Alhassan RK, Aberese-Ako M, Doegah PT, Immurana M, Dalaba MA, Manyeh AK,  
730 Klu D, Acquah E, Ansah EK, Gyapong M. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy among the  
731 adult population in Ghana: evidence from a pre-vaccination rollout survey. *Tropical*  
732 *Medicine and Health*. 2021 Dec;49(1):1-3.
- 733 63. Lamptey E, Serwaa D, Appiah AB. A nationwide survey of the potential acceptance  
734 and determinants of COVID-19 vaccines in Ghana. *Clinical and Experimental Vaccine*  
735 *Research*. 2021 May;10(2):183.
- 736 64. Agyekum MW, Afrifa-Anane GF, Kyei-Arthur F, Addo B. Acceptability of COVID-19  
737 vaccination among health care workers in Ghana. *Advances in Public Health*.  
738 2021;2021(1):9998176.
- 739 65. Kreps SE, Goldfarb JL, Brownstein JS, Kriner DL. The relationship between US adults'  
740 misconceptions about COVID-19 vaccines and vaccination preferences. *Vaccines*.  
741 2021 Aug 13;9(8):901.
- 742 66. Bendau A, Plag J, Petzold MB, Ströhle A. COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy and related  
743 fears and anxiety. *International immunopharmacology*. 2021 Aug 1;97:107724.
- 744 67. Ullah I, Khan KS, Tahir MJ, Ahmed A, Harapan H. Myths and conspiracy theories on  
745 vaccines and COVID-19: Potential effect on global vaccine refusals. *Vacunas*. 2021  
746 May 1;22(2):93-7.

- 747 68. Breslin G, Dempster M, Berry E, Cavanagh M, Armstrong NC. COVID-19 vaccine  
748 uptake and hesitancy survey in Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland: Applying the  
749 theory of planned behaviour. PLoS One. 2021 Nov 17;16(11):e0259381.
- 750 69. Mina MJ, Andersen KG. COVID-19 testing: One size does not fit all. Science. 2021  
751 Jan 8;371(6525):126-7.
- 752 70. Asiiimwe N, Tabong PT, Iro SA, Noora CL, Opoku-Mensah K, Asampong E.  
753 Stakeholders perspective of, and experience with contact tracing for COVID-19 in  
754 Ghana: A qualitative study among contact tracers, supervisors, and contacts. PloS one.  
755 2021 Feb 11;16(2):e0247038.
- 756 71. Asante D, Twumasi MA, Sakyi AS, Gyamerah S, Asante B. A socio-geographic  
757 perspective of health and economic impacts of COVID-19 on poor households in  
758 Ghana. GeoJournal. 2022 Oct;87(5):4113-25.
- 759 72. Asori M, Musah A, Peprah P. Spatial targeting and prediction of factors responsible for  
760 optimum Covid-19 based social distancing—the case of Upper west region, Ghana.  
761 Research Square. [Preprint]. 2022 [cited 2023 Dec 15]. Available from:  
762 <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1364371/v1>
- 763 73. Caulkins J, Grass D, Feichtinger G, Hartl R, Kort PM, Prskawetz A, Seidl A,  
764 Wrzaczek S. How long should the COVID-19 lockdown continue? Plos one. 2020  
765 Dec 2;15(12):e0243413.
- 766 74. Kwame A, Makarova V, Hudu F, Petrucka PM. The Covid-19 pandemic in Ghana:  
767 exploring the discourse strategies in president Nana Addo’s speeches. Humanities and  
768 Social Sciences Communications. 2023 Nov 4;10(1).




Fig 1.  
Figure