

1 **ePOCT+: Development of an electronic clinical decision support algorithm for the management**
 2 **of paediatric outpatients in low- and middle-income countries**

3
 4 **Supplementary Information**

5 **S1 Appendix: Prevalence of specific symptoms and diagnoses not covered in IMCI from**
 6 **Tanzania**

7 **Table S1:** Notable symptoms and diagnoses for children above 2 months not existing in IMCI added to
 8 ePOCT+

Additional non-IMCI conditions	Frequencies from Tanzanian studies/databases
Symptoms	
Headache	- 34% (0-5 years) and 81% (5-17 years) of febrile outpatients[1]
Abdominal pain	- 13% (0-5 years) and 23% (5-14 years) of febrile outpatients[1] - 4.6% (2 months – 5 years) of febrile outpatients[2]
Sore throat	- 13% (5-14 years) of febrile outpatients[1]
Dental pain	- 30.2% dental pain among children age 12 to 19 years old[3]
Diagnoses / Classifications	
Fever without source (Undifferentiated febrile illness)	- 6.2% (0-5 years) and 7.1% (5-17 years) of outpatients[4]
Urinary tract infection	- 5.9% (2 months – 10 years) of febrile outpatients[5] - 19% (0-5 years) and 16% (5-14 years) of febrile outpatients[1] - 9.9% (0-5 years) and 19.7% (5-17 years) of outpatients[4] - 8.1% (1 month – 5 years) of all outpatients[6] - 18.6% (2-13 years) of febrile outpatients[7]
Eye disease	- 2% (1 month – 5 years) of all outpatients[6]
Trauma including burns	- 4.3% (0-5 years) and 21.6% (5-17 years) of outpatients[4] - 9.7% (all ages) of outpatients[8]
Sexually Transmitted Infections	- 0.1 to 13.7% prevalence among adolescents 12 to 19 years old[9]
Dental caries and related oral problems	- 19.2% dental caries, 45.3% perceived need for dental care: prevalence among children age 13-19 years[3] - 30.7% dental caries: prevalence among all age groups[10]

9
 10 **S2 Appendix: Delphi survey on the reliability and feasibility of measurement of symptoms and**
 11 **signs**

12 **Methods**

13 A pre-selection of clinical elements were identified based on a systematic review on triage tools
 14 (ETAT, PEWS, pSATS, ESI, TOPRS, IMCI).[11] Symptoms and signs were excluded from the Delphi
 15 survey if a) the quality or predictive value was insufficient based on previous research [12], b) they are
 16 collected anyway during registration of the patient or c) they were known to be unfeasible for triage in
 17 Tanzanian primary care beforehand (for example laboratory tests not available at primary care health
 18 facilities). The Delphi survey was based on a recent Delphi study among international experts on
 19 predictors of sepsis in children under five[12] and included questions about each clinical element
 20 based on three domains: 1. Reliability of measurement, 2. Frequency of finding an abnormal value,
 21 and 3. Level of training required. Additionally, availability of instruments to measure vital signs and
 22 other challenges in collecting each element were evaluated. The answers were classified using a 5-
 23 point Likert scale: minimal, moderate, high, not applicable, I don't know. The answer options for the
 24 availability of vital sign instruments were yes/no/ I don't know. We also collected data on the
 25 professional background and expertise of the participants.

26
 27 **Analysis**

28 We analysed the results of the Delphi study according to the three domains. The answers were
 29 classified into a score 0-3: 0 = not applicable, and 1 – 3 for increasing strength of the answer. We
 30 calculated the total score of all participants per variable for each domain, resulting in a sum score of 0
 31 - 90, stratified per level of care (dispensary or health centre). We also calculated the maximum score

32 per variable, excluding the participants who answered 'I don't know' to that particular variable. To
 33 facilitate comparison across items, we calculated the sum score as a percentage of the maximum
 34 score. We also created a composite sum score per item: sum score of domain 1 + score domain 2 –
 35 score domain 3, divided by the sum of max scores of all three domains, and separated for
 36 dispensaries and health centers. We did not predefine a threshold for inclusion in the final proposed
 37 triage tool. Analyses were performed in SPSS (version 25.0).
 38

39 Results

40 The results of the Delphi survey (number of participants=30) are shown in Table 2. While most signs
 41 and symptoms were feasible to assess at primary care health facilities, 'capillary refill time', 'pain score
 42 (0-10)', 'assessment of cold skin', and 'weak and fast pulse' had a lower score and were excluded
 43 from ePOCT+. Vital signs and anthropometric measurements including MUAC, heart rate and oxygen
 44 saturation also had a lower score due to lack of instruments and need for training.

45 **Table 2: Composite score on different domains per triage item**

46

	Combined score dispensary			Combined score health centre		
	<i>combined sum (domain 1+2- 3)</i>	<i>combined max (domain 1+2+3)</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>combined sum (domain 1+2-3)</i>	<i>combined max (domain 1+2+3)</i>	<i>%</i>
General / past medical history*						
Urgent referral status	43	216	20%	53	231	23%
Measurements / vital signs						
MUAC (mm)	7	195	4%	16	207	8%
Temperature	88	237	37%	81	243	33%
Heart rate (HR)	24	189	13%	23	198	12%
Respiratory rate (RR)	46	216	21%	43	219	20%
Oxygen saturation (SpO2)	-10	159	-6%	7	174	4%
Pain score (0 - 10)	-4	150	-3%	-7	153	-5%
Weight	80	234	34%	73	234	31%
Capillary Refill Time	10	162	6%	12	180	7%
Airway / breathing						
Central cyanosis / is the child blue?	52	216	24%	52	225	23%
Apnea (observed or reported)	54	228	24%	54	231	23%
Difficulty breathing (reported)	73	240	30%	77	249	31%
Difficulty breathing (observed: chest indrawing, grunting, nasal flaring)	73	246	30%	67	249	27%
Fast breathing (reported)	79	240	33%	75	243	31%
Circulation						
Skin cold (cool peripheries)	31	207	15%	34	225	15%
Weak and fast pulse	40	216	19%	30	213	14%
Pallor - palmar, oral, conjunctival	77	237	32%	75	240	31%
Neurological						
Irritability, restlessness	87	237	37%	84	240	35%
Convulsions (reported, history of)	77	243	32%	73	249	29%
Convulsing now, actively	86	243	35%	80	243	33%
Not able to drink or feed anything	84	243	35%	81	246	33%
Lethargy (AVPU)	50	219	23%	53	231	23%
Mobility - unable to move as normal	41	222	18%	37	222	17%
Dehydration						
Sunken eyes	77	243	32%	68	240	28%
Reduced urine production	47	210	22%	43	210	20%
Infection						
Fever (reported)	103	234	44%	95	240	40%
Gastrointestinal						

Diarrhea	75	237	32%	76	240	32%
Vomiting everything	87	240	36%	81	240	34%
Trauma						
Significant trauma or other urgent surgical condition	26	207	13%	22	216	10%
Burns	35	216	16%	47	231	20%
Poisoning	39	213	18%	37	216	17%
Severe pain	81	234	35%	75	228	33%
Average score overall			24%			23%

Footnote:

Colours = heat map per level of care, ranged from lowest % of maximum score to highest % of maximum score. Green = above average, red = below average, white = average.

*For duration of illness, number of previous admissions, admitted in past 2 days and history of HIV/sickle cell/palsy information was not available for all domains, so were left out of the composite score.

47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **S3 Appendix: Prognostic value of predictors used in the ePOCT and ALMANACH electronic** 54 **clinical decision support algorithms**

55 **Methods**

56 This is a sub-analysis of previously published data from the ePOCT study.[2] Briefly, a randomized
57 controlled non-inferiority study was performed among children aged 2-59 months presenting with an
58 acute febrile illness to 9 outpatient clinics in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania between December 2014 and
59 February 2016. Patients were randomized by block to receive care using ALMANACH or ePOCT, a
60 first- and a second-generation electronic clinical decision support algorithm (CDSA). The prognostic
61 outcome for the present analysis was clinical failure by day 7. Symptoms, signs and tests were
62 measured/assessed by study clinicians prompted by the respective eCDSAs.

63

64 **Analysis**

65 A bivariate logistic regression analysis and descriptive statistics were performed on a sample of
66 clinically relevant predictors (table 3 and 4). Binary predictors were selected instead of continuous due
67 to the binary cut-offs used within the IMCI chart booklet and ePOCT+ algorithm. Predictors with no
68 observations within the two by two table were omitted from the analysis. Predictors for which the lower
69 and upper 95% confidence intervals (CI) of the odds ratio (OR) do not overlap with 1, and the positive
70 likelihood ratio (PLR) is 5 or above, or the negative likelihood ratio (NLR) is 0.2 or below, were
71 considered to be significant predictors.

72

73 To further understand the independent prognostic value of each predictor, a multivariate logistic
74 regression model with LASSO penalty was performed. A multivariable logistic regression for the
75 probability of clinical failure was fitted to the predictors included in the bivariate analysis for the ePOCT
76 and ALMANACH data sets. A LASSO penalty was used for feature selection. LASSO favours sparse
77 solutions by shrinking less important coefficients to zero according to a penalty, which is proportional
78 to the sum of the absolute values of the coefficients. LASSO exclusions are marked as "LASSO-
79 excluded" in table 3 and 4. Some features appear several times in the bivariate analysis but are
80 binarised at different thresholds (e.g. hemoglobin). To select the appropriate threshold for the
81 multivariable analysis, a sequential feature selection was used, where a model for each available
82 threshold was computed and compared according to the pseudo r-squared measures. The threshold
83 that resulted in the best model was selected for inclusion into the final model. Excluded thresholds are
84 marked as "redundant thresholds" in table 3 and 4. The odds ratio (with 95% confidence interval) was
85 calculated using a multivariable logistic regression model without penalty for each remaining predictor
86 (It is not possible to use the coefficients of the regression with penalty).

87

88 The per protocol population was used for this analysis since the intention to treat population
89 considered all patients lost to follow-up as clinical failure. All analyses were performed using Stata
90 (version 16) and Python 3.9.

91

92 **Results and Discussion**

93 Clinical failure at day 7 occurred in 2.3% (37/1586) of children managed using ePOCT, and 4.1%
94 (65/1573) of children managed using ALMANACH. The bivariate logistic regression model found
95 ePOCT danger signs (Unconscious, lethargic, 2 or more convulsions, or convulsing now) OR 12.4

96 (95% CI 2.5, 62); ALMANACH danger signs OR 13.5 (95% CI 6.6, 27.6), chest indrawing (ePOCT OR
 97 9.3 (95% CI 2.9, 30.2); ALMANACH OR 17.2 (95% CI 7, 42.1)), hypoxemia <90% (ePOCT OR 29.4
 98 (95% CI 4.8, 181.8)), respiratory distress (ALMANACH OR 7 (95% CI 3.2, 15.3) severe general
 99 appearance (ePOCT OR 9.4 (95% CI 2.8, 31.6), somnolence (ALMANACH OR 6.9 (95% CI 1.4, 34.1),
 100 any sign of anemia (ALMANACH OR 6.9 (95% CI 2.9, 16.6), and mid-upper arm circumference
 101 (MUAC) <12.5cm (ePOCT OR 12.3 (95% CI 3.3, 46.1); ALMANACH <11.5cm OR 53 (95% CI 12.9;
 102 218.2)) to be prognostic of clinical failure. The multivariate logistic regression with LASSO penalty
 103 found respiratory distress and severe general appearance within ePOCT, and chest in-drawing, any
 104 sign of anemia and MUAC <12.5cm within ALMANACH to be prognostic of clinical failure. There are
 105 some limitations to the interpretation of this analysis. Notably, the prognostic value of each variable
 106 must be considered within the context of the original model. If the original model (ePOCT or
 107 ALMANACH) used a specific predictor to trigger a specific treatment or referral, then the prognostic
 108 value will likely be underestimated. This was apparent when comparing the prognostic value of very
 109 low weight-for-age z-score which resulted in antibiotics and a referral within the ePOCT algorithm, and
 110 not in ALMANACH.[13] As such, no rule was used to include or omit a clinical element within ePOCT+
 111 based on this analysis, but helps contextualize how the algorithm branches can be improved. Future
 112 analyses however could specifically look at how the current algorithm can be improved in terms of
 113 prognostic and diagnostic accuracy, and model efficiency.
 114

115 **Table 3: Bivariate and multivariate logistic regression model of clinical elements used**
 116 **in ePOCT to predict day 7 clinical failure**
 117

Prognostic factor	Bivariate analysis					Multivariate analysis with LASSO penalty
	OR (95% CI)	PLR	NLR	Sensitivity	Specificity	OR (95% CI)
Binary variables						
Female	1.1 (0.6, 2.1)	1.0	1.0	46%	56%	1.3 (0.7, 2.6)
Hb <10 g/dL	1.9 (0.9, 3.9)	1.3	0.7	70%	45%	1.9 (0.9, 4.1)
Hb <7 g/dL	1.9 (0.6, 6.4)	1.8	1.0	8%	96%	Redundant threshold
Hb <6 g/dL	2.2 (0.3, 17.2)	2.2	1.0	3%	99%	Redundant threshold
Hb <5 g/dL	4.8 (0.6, 38.5)	4.7	1.0	3%	99%	Redundant threshold
Chest indrawing	9.3 (2.9, 30.2)	8.1	0.9	14%	98%	2.2 (0.5, 9.9)
Respiratory distress	4.7 (2.2, 10.1)	2.9	0.6	50%	82%	5.0 (2.3, 11.0)
ePOCT Danger signs (unconscious, lethargic, >=2 convulsions or convulsing now)						Not kept in analysis
Diarrhea	0.9 (0.3, 2.4)	0.9	1.0	14%	85%	LASSO-excluded
Very low weight for age (<-3 WAZ)	1.5 (0.3, 6.3)	1.4	1.0	5%	96%	LASSO-excluded
MUAC <12.5cm	12.3 (3.3, 46.1)	11.2	0.9	10%	99%	2.1 (0.6, 7.9)
Hypoxemia <90%	29.4 (4.8, 181.8)	27.9	0.9	5%	100%	7.0 (0.8, 59.7)
Hypoxemia <93%	4.2 (0.9, 18.4)	4.0	1.0	5%	99%	Redundant threshold
Respiratory Rate >=50%ile	1.5 (0.6, 3.8)	1.1	0.7	86%	19%	Redundant threshold
Respiratory Rate >=75%ile	1.3 (0.7, 2.4)	1.1	0.9	54%	52%	Redundant threshold
Respiratory Rate >=90%ile	1.6 (0.8, 3.1)	1.4	0.9	32%	76%	1.3 (0.6, 2.8)
Respiratory Rate >=97%ile	1.1 (0.3, 3.6)	1.1	1.0	8%	93%	Redundant threshold
Heart Rate >=50%ile	0.8 (0.4, 1.9)	0.9	1.0	22%	75%	0.7 (0.3, 1.6)
Heart Rate >=75%ile	0.3 (0, 2.5)	0.4	1.1	3%	92%	Redundant threshold

General appearance (Normal, severe)	9.4 (2.8, 31.6)	83.7	0.9	5%	100%	127.8 (10.7, 1525.7)
-------------------------------------	------------------------	------	-----	----	------	-----------------------------

118
119
120
121
122
123
124

CI Confidence Interval; Hb hemoglobin; MUAC mid-upper arm circumference; NLR Negative Likelihood ratio; OR Odds ratio; PLR Positive Likelihood ratio; %ile percentile

Table 4: Bivariate and multivariate logistic regression model of clinical elements used in ALMANACH to predict day 7 clinical failure

Prognostic factor	Bivariate analysis					Multivariate analysis with LASSO penalty
	OR (95% CI)	PLR	NLR	Sensitivity	Specificity	OR (95% CI)
Binary variables						
Female	1.3 (0.8, 2.1)	1.1	0.9	51%	55%	1.2 (0.7, 2.0)
Danger sign (History of convulsions, unable to drink, unconscious/lethargic, vomiting everything, jaundice, cyanosis, stiff neck, severe pallor, severe wasting)	13.5 (6.6, 27.6)	11.0	0.8	20%	98%	2.8 (0.7, 11.3)
Any sign of dehydration	4.2 (1.6, 11.2)	3.9	0.9	8%	98%	2.1 (0.6, 7.3)
Sunken eyes	3.8 (0.6, 24.8)	2.7	0.7	40%	85%	LASSO-excluded
Chest indrawing	17.2 (7, 42.1)	14.0	0.8	20%	99%	6.1 (1.2, 32.1)
Respiratory distress	7 (3.2, 15.3)	5.8	0.8	20%	97%	LASSO-excluded
Somnolence	6.9 (1.4, 34.1)	6.8	1.0	3%	100%	LASSO-excluded
Diarrhea	1.1 (0.6, 2.1)	1.1	1.0	21%	81%	LASSO-excluded
Very low weight for age (<-3 WAZ)	3.7 (1.5, 9.1)	3.5	0.9	9%	97%	0.3 (0.1, 1.2)
Respiratory Rate >=50%ile	1.3 (0.6, 2.6)	1.0	0.8	85%	19%	Redundant threshold
Respiratory Rate >=75%ile	1.7 (1, 2.8)	1.3	0.7	63%	50%	1.4 (0.8, 2.5)
Respiratory Rate >=90%ile	1.6 (1, 2.7)	1.4	0.9	35%	75%	Redundant threshold
Respiratory Rate >=97%ile	1.3 (0.6, 2.7)	1.2	1.0	12%	90%	Redundant threshold
Heart Rate >=50%ile	1.5 (0.8, 2.6)	1.3	0.9	27%	79%	Redundant threshold
Heart Rate >=75%ile	1.7 (0.7, 4.1)	1.6	1.0	10%	94%	1.3 (0.5, 3.5)
Any otitis incl discharge	0.8 (0.1, 6)	0.8	1.0	2%	98%	LASSO-excluded
Any skin infection incl severe	0.5 (0.1, 2.3)	0.6	1.0	3%	95%	0.4 (0.1, 2.1)
Any sign of anemia	6.9 (2.9, 16.6)	6.3	0.9	11%	98%	3.6 (1.2, 10.7)
MUAC <11.5cm	53 (12.9, 218.2)	47.5	0.9	11%	100%	Redundant threshold
MUAC <12.5cm	2.5 (0.3, 20.1)	2.5	1.0	2%	97%	12.6 (5.0, 31.4)

125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132

CI Confidence Interval; Hb hemoglobin; MUAC mid-upper arm circumference; NLR Negative Likelihood ratio; OR Odds ratio; PLR Positive Likelihood ratio; %ile percentile

S4 Appendix: Features of the medAL-creator and medAL-reader software as defined by a clinical-IT collaboration with end-user feedback

Programming eCDSA platform (medAL-creator)	
Feature	Description / rationale / example
Easy platform so that clinician can program and/or review the algorithm	Drag and drop interface, obvious connectors, no visible scripts

Allow the integration of Weighted and Boolean algorithms to reach a diagnosis	Boolean (and, or, not); Weighted algorithm; Based on a score using weighted variables
Allow for inclusion of sub-algorithms in any algorithm (predefined syndromes)	Ease the maintenance (and reduce risks of errors) for predefined syndromes that appear in several algorithms
Allow a diagnosis to exclude another diagnosis	Severe or complicated diagnoses can exclude non-severe and uncomplicated diagnoses
Allow a management to exclude other managements	Ex. Guidance to refer a patient to the hospital for one diagnosis excludes 'no referral' from another diagnosis
Allow a drug to exclude another drug	Ex. A broad spectrum antibiotic could exclude another narrow spectrum antibiotic
Ability to make a variable/question mandatory or not mandatory to respond	Allowing users the ability to skip non-essential questions to speed up processes
Allow the use of reference tables for clinical signs	In order to calculate z-scores and percentiles
Allow for cross-referencing of variables	To compute the BMI based on the weight and height of the patient, for instance
Allow conditioning of variables within the decision tree algorithm and for individual variables using specific filters	Variables only appear based on previous responses based on the decision tree logic, and based on certain filters (complaint categories)
Allow for management of multiple versions of different algorithms	Each version can be deployed to different users
Generation of data dictionary	Allow for future integration with alternative variable nomenclature (SNOMED, CID)
Algorithm validation mechanisms	An automatic validation process identifies errors in decision tree logic before an algorithm can be deployed
Modification restrictions to deployed algorithms	Restrictions to modify decision logic for algorithms that are implemented and in use (only minor modifications possible). New versions, however can make modifications and deployed allowing for HCW to understand the changes made.
Automatic conversion of the algorithm into a machine-readable code	Transforming "human-readable" drag and drop decision tree into machine-readable code for execution on the medAL-reader application
eCDSA platform (medAL-reader)	
Feature	Description / rationale / example
Multi-modal use on local network	Allow the use of different users, on different devices to manage a single patient
Ability for clinician using eCDSA to perform multiple, simultaneous consultations, with pause and resume capability	Allowing a health care provider to see another patient while sending another patient for laboratory investigations
Ability to accept, refuse, and add diagnoses and treatments proposed by the algorithm	To improve algorithms, monitor quality of care, and provide dosing for drugs not proposed by the algorithm.
To follow natural flow of consultation	First excluding emergency signs, evaluating the chief complaints, medical history, physical exam, investigations (laboratory tests), Diagnosis, treatment and management.
Option for user to move forward and backwards through the consultation process	To be able to update information from other stages if they are provided at a later stage
Follow-up questions/variables conditioned by root variables	Ex. Duration of cough, only to appear if cough present
Access to emergency management via an emergency button at any point during the consultation, even if for a different patient.	Without an emergency button to be able to press at any moment, a clinician will not be given immediate guidance for emergencies.
Alerts when clinician selects an emergency or danger sign	To be able to provide emergency management guidance if needed
Outline variables that would result in a referral	To motivate clinicians to assess danger signs with additional precaution
Division of medical history questions and physical exam signs by system	Organize consultation flow as clinicians are trained to; ie by system
Warning and error limit messages should advise clinicians of continuous values that are out of normal range, and out of feasible range.	To assure safety and quality of data inputted.
Provide option to give information and photos about each variable, diagnosis, drug and management.	Info buttons are placed beside each variable, diagnosis and management so that the clinician can get more information. The images will be notably helpful for helping diagnose skin rashes and other physical signs.
Ability for user to state that some medical history questions are "unknown", some physical exams or anthropometric measurements are "not feasible" to measure, and some tests are not available.	In order to prevent the user from being blocked from continuing the assessment and prevent the input of false data.
Alert for user if they have not answered an important/mandatory question	To assure that clinically relevant and important questions are answered
A case summary is provided at the end of the consultation with the most urgent and important diagnoses listed first	To have a short summary of the previous consultation when the patient comes back for a follow-up or new visit
Ability to retrieve patient information from previous consultations using patient registration information	To facilitate follow-up consultations
Calculate medication dosing according to weight, age and formulation	Reduce error in medication dosing.
Support for translation	Allow for use of the same clinical algorithm in different languages
Have online and offline capacity	Health care workers should be able to use the tool online/offline

Data collection and synchronization to a central server	Through secure (encrypted) channels
Destination of the data from the app must be configurable	In order to comply with national regulators

133

134 **S5 Appendix: Evaluation of ePOCT+ based on the characteristics set by the target product**
135 **profile for electronic clinical decision support algorithm as defined by expert consensus[14]**
136

General scope		
Characteristics	Minimal / Optimal requirements	ePOCT+ / medAL-reader
Intended use	Optimal	Captures diagnostic test results, patient clinical data to provide treatment and care recommendations
Target population	Optimal	Defined target population. Inclusion and exclusion criteria used when enrolling the patient
Setting	Optimal	Different algorithms used for different countries
Targeted end user	Optimal	Algorithms designed for use by nurses, physician assistants, but can also be used by medical doctors
Algorithm access	Optimal	medAL- <i>reader</i> app can be downloaded on android based devices
Algorithm content	Optimal and Planned	Based on WHO/international/local clinical care guidelines, peer-reviewed articles, and clinical experience/practice and clinical validation research.[2, 13, 15-18] For new algorithms clinical validation is planned in the form of cluster randomized trials.
Algorithm treatment recommendations	Optimal	Treatment recommendation based on international and national treatment guidelines, prioritizing medications available at the lowest level of care. Dosing calculated for clinicians. Treatment recommendations support antimicrobial stewardship.
Compatible POC tools	Optimal	POC tools used in routine care, and emerging diagnostic tools and devices relevant to the algorithm are included (CRP, Pulse oximetry)
Regulated toolkit components	Minimal	POC diagnostic tests and medical devices are regulatory approved, compliant with local regulations, and in the case of Tanzania included in the Standard medical laboratory equipment to be used at dispensary and health centre level (CRP, pulse oximetry, hemoglobin, HIV, malaria, syphilis, glucose)[19]
Compatible devices	Optimal	App is compatible with large smartphones, and tablets. (Compatible with computers through tablet mirroring)
Compatible operating systems	Optimal	medAL- <i>reader</i> compatible with android devices
Clinical decision support algorithm		
Characteristics	Minimal / Optimal requirements	ePOCT+ / medAL-reader
Content transparency	Optimal	The healthcare programme and end user have access to underlying evidence and methodology used to develop the algorithm
Quality control	Optimal	The algorithm underwent both analytical and semantical verification.
Algorithm validation	Planned	While many of the algorithms have previously been validated, new content will be validated through a cluster randomized controlled trial
Machine learning	Planned	Machine learning models were used to help validated the use of certain predictors in the algorithms. Following validation of the static ePOCT+ algorithms, machine learning models will be used to improve the algorithms, and validated in randomized controlled trials
POC data input	Optimal	POC data can be inputted in ePOCT+ / medAL- <i>reader</i>
Disease likelihood (POC tool)	Optimal	Prognostic positive/negative likelihood ration and pretest probability evaluated for all POC predictors (including Hemoglobin, glucose, pulse oximetry) in children presenting with fever from the community.[20] CRP: Based on Diagnostic positive/negative likelihood ratio and pretest probability from the setting of interest.[21] Also evaluated in randomized controlled trial.[15]
POC training	Optimal	Training was provided to all end-users for all new POC tests/tools not normally used in routine care
App		
Characteristics	Minimal / Optimal requirements	medAL-<i>creator</i> and medAL-<i>reader</i>
System validation	Optimal*	- Valid clinical association <i>And</i> clinical validation: Supported by well-established or novel evidence. *Cluster randomized trials will be conducted to assure validity for algorithms without established evidence. - Analytical validation: Multiple pathways for all algorithms were tested to assure that inputted data is processed correctly into expected output
System access	Minimal	Data access protected by authentication and authorization.
Context configuration	Optimal	Translation possible, country preferences for the algorithm can be configurable
Customisation	Optimal	Algorithms can be modified using medAL- <i>creator</i> including to updates to the list of medicines and POCs.

User access rights	Optimal	Roles can be assigned to provide different levels of data access
Expert support	No	Access to online/remote expert advice to assist in patient consultation is not possible
App training	Minimal	On-site training
Internet availability	Optimal	Works offline and can trigger alerts for synchronization
Clinical data entry	Minimal	Manual entry by the operator
Patient management recommendation	Minimal	Consultation data summarized and actionable recommendations provided. Interoperability with EMRs and HIS is planned.
Navigation	Optimal	Non-sequential: the user can move to a certain extent in any direction through an assessment and change input data to reach a final recommendation
Workflow requirements to enable time-delayed POC data input	Minimal	User can perform multiple, simultaneous consultations, with pause and resume capability, to allow clinical and laboratory data entry
Task management	Optimal	Multiple algorithms can be supported simultaneously in one application against a common data set
Follow-up	Optimal	Ability to retrieve patient information using patient registration information. However data from previous consultations cannot be automatically integrated within the algorithms for the new follow-up consultation
System malfunction protection	Optimal	System malfunctions are made clear to the user
Scalability	Optimal	The app allows for high transaction volumes with complex workflows to cover primary care workforce at a national scale
Updates and versioning	Optimal	Processes are in place to control any app changes (including algorithm version updates) and provide the appropriate and correct update to the user
Data		
Characteristics	Minimal / Optimal requirements	medAL-reader
Data capture	Optimal*	Can capture text, image, numeric, GPS, barcode. Does not capture audio, video or biometric
Data validation	Optimal	The warning and error alerts can be programmed to prevent errors of data input
Data ownership	Optimal	The healthcare programme of the country of implementation has ownership of the data
Data storage	Optimal	The healthcare programme can choose the destination of the app's data
Data recovery	Optimal	The system can be re-established to the desired state in the event of interruption or failure. Data is saved upon completion of each stage (registration, 1 st assessment, medical history and physical exam, tests, and diagnosis and management.)
Data flow	Optimal	The flow of data is determined by the healthcare programme
Data reporting	Optimal	Dashboards will be configured to present real-time data for reporting, benchmarking and monitoring
Data provenance	Optimal	Provides origin and processes applied to output data. When data are downloaded or shared, the version of the model is tagged so it is always clear how the data was obtained
Data dictionary	Planned	Data dictionary is automatically created by medAL-creator. Link to international reference standard terminology in development.
Data security and privacy	Optimal	The app operates under secure connectivity which meets data protection and regulations of individual countries to avoid loss and corruption of sensitive data, and mitigate cyberattacks, whether data are at rest or in transmission. Includes: ▶ Authorisation/access control ▶ De-identified data ▶ Data encryption ▶ Two-factor authentication

137 CRP, C-reactive protein; GPS, Global Positioning System; POC, point-of-care; WHO, World Health Organization

138

139 References

- 140 1. Hercik C, Cosmas L, Mogeni OD, Wamola N, Kohi W, Omballa V, et al. A diagnostic
141 and epidemiologic investigation of acute febrile illness (AFI) in Kilombero, Tanzania. PLoS
142 One. 2017;12(12):e0189712-e. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0189712. PubMed PMID:
143 29287070.
144 2. Keitel K, Kagoro F, Samaka J, Masimba J, Said Z, Temba H, et al. A novel electronic
145 algorithm using host biomarker point-of-care tests for the management of febrile illnesses in
146 Tanzanian children (e-POCT): A randomized, controlled non-inferiority trial. PLoS medicine.

- 147 2017;14(10):e1002411. Epub 2017/10/24. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002411. PubMed
148 PMID: 29059253; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5653205.
- 149 3. Mashoto KO, Astrøm AN, David J, Masalu JR. Dental pain, oral impacts and
150 perceived need for dental treatment in Tanzanian school students: a cross-sectional study.
151 Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2009;7:73-. doi: 10.1186/1477-7525-7-73. PubMed PMID:
152 19643004.
- 153 4. McHomvu E, Mbunda G, Simon N, Kitila F, Temba Y, Msumba I, et al. Diagnoses
154 made in an Emergency Department in rural sub-Saharan Africa. Swiss Med Wkly.
155 2019;149:w20018. Epub 2019/02/05. doi: 10.4414/smw.2019.20018. PubMed PMID:
156 30715723.
- 157 5. D'Acremont V, Kilowoko M, Kyungu E, Philipina S, Sangu W, Kahama-Maró J, et al.
158 Beyond malaria--causes of fever in outpatient Tanzanian children. The New England journal
159 of medicine. 2014;370(9):809-17. Epub 2014/02/28. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1214482. PubMed
160 PMID: 24571753.
- 161 6. MoHCDGEC-HMIS Unit. [cited 2020 11.02.2020]. 2019:[District Health Information 2
162 (DHIS) Tanzania]. Available from: <http://dhis.moh.go.tz/dhis-web-pivot/app/index.html>.
- 163 7. Chipwaza B, Mhamphi GG, Ngatunga SD, Selemani M, Amuri M, Mugasa JP, et al.
164 Prevalence of Bacterial Febrile Illnesses in Children in Kilosa District, Tanzania. Plos
165 Neglected Tropical Diseases. 2015;9(5). doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0003750. PubMed PMID:
166 WOS:000355303600020.
- 167 8. Sawe HR, Mfinanga JA, Mbaya KR, Koka PM, Kilindimo SS, Runyon MS, et al.
168 Trauma burden in Tanzania: a one-day survey of all district and regional public hospitals.
169 BMC Emergency Medicine. 2017;17(1):30. doi: 10.1186/s12873-017-0141-6.
- 170 9. Nkata H, Teixeira R, Barros H. A scoping review on sexual and reproductive health
171 behaviors among Tanzanian adolescents. Public Health Reviews. 2019;40(1):4. doi:
172 10.1186/s40985-019-0114-2.
- 173 10. Teshome A, Muche A, Girma B. Prevalence of Dental Caries and Associated Factors
174 in East Africa, 2000-2020: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Front Public Health.
175 2021;9:645091-. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2021.645091. PubMed PMID: 33996722.
- 176 11. Hansoti B, Jenson A, Keefe D, De Ramirez SS, Anest T, Twomey M, et al. Reliability
177 and validity of pediatric triage tools evaluated in Low resource settings: a systematic review.
178 BMC Pediatrics. 2017;17(1):37. doi: 10.1186/s12887-017-0796-x.
- 179 12. Fung JST, Akech S, Kissoon N, Wiens MO, English M, Ansermino JM. Determining
180 predictors of sepsis at triage among children under 5 years of age in resource-limited
181 settings: A modified Delphi process. PLoS One. 2019;14(1):e0211274. Epub 2019/01/29.
182 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0211274. PubMed PMID: 30689660; PubMed Central PMCID:
183 PMC6349330.
- 184 13. Tan R, Kagoro F, Levine GA, Masimba J, Samaka J, Sangu W, et al. Clinical
185 Outcome of Febrile Tanzanian Children with Severe Malnutrition Using Anthropometry in
186 Comparison to Clinical Signs. American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene.
187 2020;102(2):427-35. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.19-0553. PubMed PMID: WOS:000512881500035.
- 188 14. Pellé KG, Rambaud-Althaus C, Acremont V, Moran G, Sampath R, Katz Z, et al.
189 Electronic clinical decision support algorithms incorporating point-of-care diagnostic tests in
190 low-resource settings: a target product profile. BMJ Global Health. 2020;5(2):e002067. doi:
191 10.1136/bmjgh-2019-002067.
- 192 15. Keitel K, Samaka J, Masimba J, Temba H, Said Z, Kagoro F, et al. Safety and
193 Efficacy of C-reactive Protein-guided Antibiotic Use to Treat Acute Respiratory Infections in
194 Tanzanian Children: A Planned Subgroup Analysis of a Randomized Controlled
195 Noninferiority Trial Evaluating a Novel Electronic Clinical Decision Algorithm (ePOCT).
196 Clinical Infectious Diseases. 2019;69(11):1926-34. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciz080.
- 197 16. Rambaud-Althaus C, Shao A, Samaka J, Swai N, Perri S, Kahama-Maró J, et al.
198 Performance of Health Workers Using an Electronic Algorithm for the Management of
199 Childhood Illness in Tanzania: A Pilot Implementation Study. The American journal of tropical
200 medicine and hygiene. 2017;96(1):249-57. Epub 2017/01/13. doi: 10.4269/ajtmh.15-0395.
201 PubMed PMID: 28077751; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5239703.

- 202 17. Shao AF, Rambaud-Althaus C, Samaka J, Faustine AF, Perri-Moore S, Swai N, et al.
203 New Algorithm for Managing Childhood Illness Using Mobile Technology (ALMANACH): A
204 Controlled Non-Inferiority Study on Clinical Outcome and Antibiotic Use in Tanzania. PLoS
205 One. 2015;10(7):e0132316. Epub 2015/07/15. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0132316. PubMed
206 PMID: 26161535; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4498627.
- 207 18. Shao AF, Rambaud-Althaus C, Swai N, Kahama-Marro J, Genton B, D'Acremont V, et
208 al. Can smartphones and tablets improve the management of childhood illness in Tanzania?
209 A qualitative study from a primary health care worker's perspective. BMC health services
210 research. 2015;15:135-. doi: 10.1186/s12913-015-0805-4. PubMed PMID: 25890078.
- 211 19. Tanzania Ministry of Health CD, Gender, Elderly and Children. Standard Medical
212 Laboratory Equipment Guideline (SMLEG). Tanzania2018.
- 213 20. Chandna A, Tan R, Carter M, Van Den Bruel A, Verbakel J, Koshiaris C, et al.
214 Predictors of disease severity in children presenting from the community with febrile
215 illnesses: a systematic review of prognostic studies. BMJ Glob Health. 2021;6(1). Epub
216 2021/01/22. doi: 10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003451. PubMed PMID: 33472837.
- 217 21. Erdman LK, D'Acremont V, Hayford K, Rajwans N, Kilowoko M, Kyungu E, et al.
218 Biomarkers of Host Response Predict Primary End-Point Radiological Pneumonia in
219 Tanzanian Children with Clinical Pneumonia: A Prospective Cohort Study. PLoS One.
220 2015;10(9):e0137592. Epub 2015/09/15. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0137592. PubMed PMID:
221 26366571; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4569067.

222