**TITLE:**

# A target product profile for electronic clinical decision support algorithms combined with point-of-care diagnostic test results to support evidence-based decisions during patient consultations by health workers

**AUTHORS:**

Karell G. Pellé1*, Clotilde Rambaud-Althaus2, Valérie D'Acremont3,4, Gretchen Moran5, Rangarajan Sampath1, Zach Katz1, Francis Moussy6, Garrett L. Mehl7, Sabine Dittrich1

**AUTHORS INSTITUTIONS**:

1. Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics, Chemin des Mines 9, 1202 Geneva Switzerland
2. Doctors Without Borders (MSF), Operational Centre Geneva, Rue de Lausanne 78, 1202 Geneva Switzerland
3. Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, University of Basel, 4002 Basel, Switzerland
4. Centre for Primary Care and Public Health, University of Lausanne, Switzerland
5. eHealth Africa, 4-6 Independent Road, Kano Nigeria
6. Department of Essential Medicines and Health Products, World Health Organization, 20 Avenue Appia, 1211 Geneva Switzerland
7. Department of Reproductive Health and Research, World Health Organization, 20 Avenue Appia, 1211 Geneva Switzerland

***CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:**

Karell G. Pellé, PhD

24 Foundation for Innovative New Diagnostics

25 Chemin des Mines 9, 1202 Geneva Switzerland

26 Email: Karell.Pelle@finddx.org

27

28 **WORD COUNT:** 3498

29

30 **KEYWORDS**

31 Target Product Profile, Clinical Guideline, Algorithm, Clinical Decision Support System, Diagnostics,

32 Point of Care

**ABSTRACT**

Health workers in low-resource settings often lack the support and tools to follow evidence-based clinical recommendations for diagnosing, treating and managing sick patients. Digital technologies, by combining patient health information and point of care diagnostics with evidence-based clinical protocols, can help improve the quality of care, the rational use of resources (humans, diagnostics and medicines) and save patient lives. The development of a target product profile for electronic clinical decision support algorithms (CDSAs) aimed at guiding preventive or curative consultations, and that integrate diagnostic test results will help align developer and implementer processes and specifications with the needs of end-users, in terms of quality, safety, performance and operational functionality. To identify characteristics for a CDSA, experts from academia, research institutions, and industry as well as policy makers with expertise in diagnostic and CDSA development, and implementation in LMICs were convened. Experts discussed the critical characteristics of a draft TPP which was revised and finalised through a Delphi process to facilitate consensus building. Experts were in overwhelming agreement that, given that CDSAs provide patients' management recommendations, the underlying clinical algorithms should be available in human readable format and evidence-based. Whenever possible, the algorithm output should take into account pre-test disease probabilities, diagnostic likelihood ratios of clinical or laboratory predictors and disease probability thresholds to test and to treat. Validation processes should at a minimum ensure the CDSA are implementing faithfully the evidence-based algorithm they are based on (internal validation through clinical association and analytical validation). Additionally, clinical validation, bringing practice evidence about the impact of the CDSA use on health outcomes, was recognized as a good to have. The CDSAs should be designed to fit within clinic workflows, connectivity challenges and high volume settings. Data collected through the tool should conform to local patient privacy regulations and international data standards.

58 **INTRODUCTION**

59 Health workers at primary health care (PHC) have the greatest challenge in ensuring appropriate
60 care for their communities. One way to support health workers is through the provision of clinical
61 guidance in the form of clinical practice guidelines or clinical decision support algorithms (CDSA).
62 Clinical practice guidelines are a set of recommendations on diagnostic and treatment modalities
63 based on systematic review of evidence and assessment of the benefits and harms for the patients.
64 The World Health Organisation (WHO) developed several simple clinical decision guidelines to
65 support health workers in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) in the evaluation and
66 management of clinical problems, with the ultimate goal of improving quality of care[1]. This
67 includes the Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI) designed in the 1990s for common
68 diseases affecting children younger than 5 years of age[2], which was later adapted for use at the
69 community as the integrated Community Case Management guideline (iCCM)[3]. Other guidelines
70 have been developed and either take an integrated management approach similar to IMCI, such as
71 the Integrated Management of Adolescent and Adult Illness (IMAI[4]), or a disease-specific approach
72 (i.e. WHO's dengue guidelines for diagnosis, treatment, prevention and control[5]).

73 While the global health community awaits updated and more comprehensive clinical algorithms, the
74 Fourth Industrial Revolution[6] is seeing developing economies "leapfrogging"[7] mobile
75 technologies across multiple sectors and including for health. As a result, a plethora of digital clinical
76 decision support systems (CDSS) have been implemented in LMICs. CDSS are defined as "digitised
77 job aids that combine individual's health information with the health worker's knowledge and
78 clinical protocols to assists health workers in making diagnosis and treatment decisions"[8]. It is well
79 recognized that adherence to standardized clinical practice guidelines is a measurement of quality of
80 care[9,10], and that improving adherence to evidence-based guidelines is associated with better
81 health outcomes[11]. By digitalizing clinical guidelines such as IMCI and iCCM, into electronic CDSAs

82 in its simplest form, a decision tree, several groups have shown significant increase in health worker
83 adherence to guidelines compared to routine care (paper-based IMCI)[12, 13,14].
84 However, based on IMCI/iCCM, today these CDSAs carry the same limitations than the main
85 guidelines, and still lack point of care (POC) diagnostic tests that could improve the accuracy of
86 diagnoses and treatment recommendations. The only diagnostic test widely used with IMCI/iCCM
87 guidelines is a malaria rapid diagnostic test (mRDT) and while this inclusion was important in the
88 context of "test-and-treat"[15], it is limited to ruling in or out one pathogen alone. Acute febrile
89 illness can be caused by bacterial or viral respiratory infections, or seasonal, geographically localised
90 pathogens, like dengue. Hence, the inclusion of additional simple wet and digital diagnostics into
91 adapted algorithms can reduce antimicrobial over-prescriptions as well as patient outcome[16, 17].
92 With the growing development of CDSAs, especially related to the management of sick children in
93 LMICs (**Supplemental File 1**), it is important to ensure that new tools meet the needs of the end-user
94 and take into consideration the emerging landscape of diagnostic tools that might be included in
95 new algorithms forming a toolkit consisting of CDSA and diagnostics.
96 The aim of this work was to define a target product profile (TPP) to inform developers and
97 implementers alike of the requirements for CDSAs aimed at guiding health workers during a
98 preventive or curative consultation with any type of patient, and that have the ability to incorporate
99 diagnostic test results, especially when diagnostics tests have been implemented in pre-existing
100 guidelines.

101

102 **1. METHODS**

103

104 **1.1. Draft Target Product Profile**

105 A draft TPP (version 0) for CDSAs combined with POC test results was developed (by: KP, SD, RS, ZK,
106 GLM, FM) based on standard procedure at FIND and WHO, where characteristics are defined as
107 "minimal" and "optimal" criteria (**Supplemental File 2**). "Minimal" is used to refer to the lowest
108 acceptable output for a characteristic and "optimal" for the ideal target of a characteristic.
109 Comments are used to explain or provide examples for the characteristics. As this TPP is for a multi-
110 component toolkit, CDSA and POC diagnostics, the structure of the TPP was adapted to cover the
111 different components and for the purpose of clarity. These sections included: Scope General, Scope
112 Toolkit, Electronic Clinical Decision Algorithm, Point of Care Tools, App, Data and Procurement.

113

114 **1.2. Expert Meeting**

115 To discuss selected aspects of the draft TPP (algorithm validation, performance, machine learning,
116 diagnostic data, disease prediction, clinical workflow and application functionality) (**Supplemental**
117 **File 2**), a meeting on this subject was convened by FIND and WHO involving 39 experts from
118 academic institutions, industry, private and public sectors from 11 countries[18]. Experts were
119 selected based on their experience in relevant areas of work directly related to digital health (clinical
120 decision support or other digital tools targeting resource-challenges settings) and/or diagnostics
121 (wet and digital). Following the expert meeting the TPP was updated based on expert feedback
122 (version 1.0) (**Supplemental File 3**).

123

124 **1.3. Delphi Process**

To facilitate consensus building for the TPP, we followed a Delphi-like process where the TPP version 1.0 was reviewed. For this, a three- part online survey was developed. The first part of the survey collected professional information for survey respondents as well as experience with clinical practice/research, diagnostic development, software development, implementation of healthcare programs in LMICs, and health information systems. The second part of the survey allowed for rating of both minimal and optimal criteria for all TPP characteristics. Agreement was scored on a Likert scale from 1- 5, where 1 corresponds to fully disagree, 2-mostly disagree, 3-neither agree nor disagree, 4-mostly agree and 5- fully agree. Disagreement with a criterion was based on a rating from 1 to 3 and required a comment/suggestions by the survey respondent. To reach consensus, more than 75% of survey respondents should provide a rating of at least 4 (agreement) on the Likert scale. The third part of the survey provided an opportunity for respondents to share comments/feedback/ideas on the TPP if not covered in the characteristics section. The survey was developed with the online software SurveyGizmo (SurveyGizmo LLC, Boulder CO, USA). Survey analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel 2013 (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, USA).

**Patient and public involvement statement**

At no point in this work were patients or the public involved in the design of this study or reporting and dissemination of the results.

## RESULTS

### 1. Expert Consensus on the Target Product Profile through a Delphi Process

In the first round, the online survey was sent to 77 experts (including workshop participants) and 28 responded to the survey (response rate, 36.4%), with some respondents submitting a coordinated response for their institution. Twenty-five percent of respondents were from LMICs (7/28), however the majority of respondents, (22/28, 78%), had experience working in Africa and 57% (16/28) in South East Asia. More than 85% of respondents (24/28) had more than 5 years of experience in clinical practice and research, 50% (14/28) in health programme implementation in LMICs, 39% (11/28) in health information systems, 21% (6/28) in software development and 14% (4/28) in diagnostic product development **(Supplemental File 4)**. Most participants work in international organizations (7/28, 25%) and academic institutions (10/28, 35.7%). In the first round, at least 50% agreement was reached for all criteria for all characteristics and feedback was taken into consideration to develop TPP version 1.1 for the second round of the Delphi survey (**Supplemental File 5**). In this new version, the characteristic "Encounter" was removed as several participants expressed it was redundant with the characteristic "Workflow". Therefore version 1.1 had 40 characteristics.

A second online survey was sent to the 28 respondents from round 1. In this round, 23 participants responded to the survey (response rate, 82%). Most participants were from academia (7/23, 30%), non-profit international organizations (7/23, 30%) and had a similar profile than respondents from round 1 (**Supplemental File 4**). In this round of review, at least 75% of participants agreed with the minimal and optimal criteria for all TPP characteristics. On average, 91% of survey respondents agreed with the minimal and optimal criteria (**Figure 1**) and the TPP was finalized (version 2).

### 2. Final Target Product Profile

167

168 **Scope General and Scope Toolkit Components.** This TPP defines a toolkit composed of CDSAs and
169 POC diagnostics intended to support evidence-based clinical decisions taken by health workers
170 during a preventive or curative consultation, by capturing patient clinical and context-specific data,
171 as well as diagnostic test results to provide recommendations on diagnosis and patient management
172 (including preventive & curative treatment, counseling, etc.). The clinical algorithm integrates POC
173 diagnostic results and is embedded in an App. POC diagnostics in this toolkit should be regulatory
174 approved for use in the setting of implementation.

175 The experts agreed that the CDSA should first define its target i.e. i) patients (e.g. age group), ii)
176 medical problems (e.g. syndrome or disease), iii) end users (e.g. minimally trained health worker or
177 trained clinician) and iv) level of care (e.g. community or health facility) for which the clinical
178 recommendations are meant and relevant. These specifications should be clearly communicated to
179 the end-user at the beginning of the algorithm. The health worker should immediately be warned if
180 information she or he enters in the system does not fit with these specifications. In cases where an
181 App proposes different algorithms for different use cases (i.e. antenatal care, management of
182 childhood illness), the specifications shall be clearly available for each individual algorithm (**Table 1**).

183 **Table 1: Minimal and optimal target product profile characteristics focused on the scope of the toolkit and toolkit component characteristics, as defined**

184 **by expert consensus process.**

| **Scope General** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CHARACTERISTIC** | **MINIMAL REQUIREMENT** | **OPTIMAL REQUIREMENT** | **COMMENT** |
| Intended Use | The toolkit, composed of an electronic clinical decision support algorithm(s) and point of care diagnostic tests, is intended to increase **evidence-based** treatment decisions by capturing diagnostic test results, patient clinical data (e.g. exposures, signs including vital signs) and context specific data (e.g. disease incidence, seasonality) to provide treatment and care recommendations | | |
| Target Population | The algorithm shall define the target population<br>Inclusion and exclusion criteria are used at the encounter to enrol the patient | | The system can be modular i.e. composed of discrete algorithms such that one can be used for a specific population based on pre-defined criteria |
| Setting (level of implementation in the healthcare system) | Defined by the algorithm | | The system can be modular i.e. composed of discrete algorithms such that one can be used for a specific healthcare setting based on the infrastructure, workforce knowledge and skills, point of care tools available |
| Targeted End User | Defined by the algorithm | | The end user shall have the required training/skills to use the App appropriately |
| **Scope Toolkit Components** | | | |
| Algorithm Access | The electronic clinical decision-support algorithm is accessible through an App downloaded on compatible target devices | | The App can be a web app, a native app or a hybrid app |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Algorithm Content | Built on:<br>— well-established clinical evidence based on WHO/international/local clinical care guidelines, peer-reviewed articles (systematic reviews, original clinical research), clinical experience/practice; **and/or**<br>— appropriate clinical validation research* | | * See FDA's SaMD Clinical Evaluation for guidance[20] |
| Algorithm Treatment Recommendations | Therapeutic recommendations shall be compliant with national treatment guidelines and national EML and support antimicrobial stewardship | Same and evidence based medicine to support optimal treatment recommendations | Recommendations support the appropriate selection, dosage and duration of antimicrobial and any other kind of treatment and management, causing the least harm to the patient |
| Compatible Point of Care Tools | POCs or other relevant medical devices prompted for use by the App shall be locally relevant, i.e. recommended by EDL or relevant national equivalent, or country program | Same, plus emerging diagnostic tools and medical devices relevant to the algorithm and implementation setting | |
| Regulated Toolkit Components | POC diagnostic tests and medical devices are regulatory approved and compliant with local regulations | Same, and if the software is a medical device, the App shall also have regulatory approval | |
| Compatible Devices | The App is compatible with any device including:<br>— Smartphones<br>— Tablets<br>— Computers | | Computers are included as it may be necessary for health facility supervisors to access data collected at the facility level to make informed decisions (i.e. restocking medical supplies) |
| Compatible Operating Systems | OS agnostic | Same as Minimal | |

185

186 **Clinical Decision Support Algorithms.** Regarding the algorithm medical content, the working group
187 agreed that it must be evidence-based. Whether newly developed or adapted from existing
188 guidelines, the algorithm medical content should be developed following international standards for
189 the development or adaptation of evidence-based clinical guidelines, to ensure it implements the
190 best available evidence. This evidence can originate from well-established clinical guidelines such as
191 WHO/international/local clinical care guidelines, or from peer-reviewed articles, clinical practice
192 and/or validation research and the level of evidence and the strength of recommendations in the
193 target context should ideally be communicated. In line with this, recommendations should cause the
194 least harm to the patient and to the community. For example, algorithms related to treatment and
195 management of patient suffering from infectious diseases should also support antimicrobial
196 stewardship to avoid unnecessary side effects for the patient and the development of resistance in
197 the community and at global level. In addition, the algorithm should be validated both analytically
198 and semantically to ensure that the algorithm output is accurate and reproducible, doesn't deviate
199 from expert content/evidence and that there are no interactions or conflicts in the logic.

200 Further, important characteristics were content quality, machine learning (ML). With the rise of ML
201 also in this domain of CDSAs to analyse the data captured through algorithms and then for example
202 augment algorithm diagnostic or prognostic accuracy, workshop experts thought it important to
203 address this in the TPP. It was agreed that an algorithm that recommends treatment decisions and
204 management of patients should be at a minimum human interpretable, meaning one should
205 understand how input data are processed into output data. Changes to the algorithm logic based on
206 ML analyses should also be validated (**Table 2**).

207 **Table 2: Minimal and optimal target product profile characteristics focused on the electronic clinical decision-support algorithm and point of care tools,**

208 **as defined by expert consensus process.**

| **Clinical Decision-Support Algorithm** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CHARACTERISTIC** | **MINIMAL REQUIREMENT** | **OPTIMAL REQUIREMENT** | **COMMENT** |
| Content Transparency | The algorithm is "human interpretable". The healthcare programme and end user can comprehend the algorithm decision-making processes | The healthcare programme and end user have access to underlying evidence and methodology used to develop the algorithm | Human interpretable: a human can understand the choices taken by the model in the decision-making process, i.e. how output variables are generated based on input variables. Visual representations (e.g.. decision trees, Principle Component Analyses, protocol charts, etc.) and performance metrics can be used to support content transparency |
| Quality control | The algorithm has been A) analytically and B) semantically tested:<br>A) Analytical verification: the algorithm output is accurate and reproducible<br>B) Semantical verification: the algorithm doesn't deviate from expert content/evidence and there are no interactions or conflicts in the logic | | A) and B) answer the question "did I build the model right?" (See FDA's SaMD Clinical Evaluation for current guidance[20]) |
| Algorithm Validation | The algorithm has been validated. The level of validation will depend on the CDSS status as a Software as a Medical Device (SaMD)<br>Refer to upcoming rulings from regulatory bodies such as the FDA or the European Commission | | Answers the question "did I build the right model"? (See FDA's SaMD Clinical Evaluation for current guidance[20]) |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Machine Learning | None. The algorithm is static | ML is applied to generate data on the algorithm performance, improve content, inform healthcare system processes, etc.<br>Changes in the algorithm based on ML shall be validated | |
| **Point Of Care Tool** | | | |
| POC Data Inputs | Any kind of data (qualitative data such as positive/negative/invalid lateral flow test results and quantitative data such as data provided by haemoglobinometers and glucometers) | | |
| Disease Likelihood | Based on:<br>— pre-test probability (in the absence of POC or POC performance data); **or**<br>— POC positive/negative likelihood ratio | Based on:<br>— pre-test probability; **and**<br>— POC positive/negative likelihood ratio | The test performance (eg. likelihood ratio) is known and performance data ideally previously determined through independent studies in relevant settings<br><br>The test brand should ideally also be considered so as to account for changes between manufacturers |
| POC Training | On-site training performed by local authority or implementer | | |

209

210 **Point of Care Tools**. Experts agreed that the post-test probability or the likelihood of a disease being
211 present, should be assessed based on the pre-test probability—the prevalence of the disease in the
212 corresponding patient population—and the diagnostic positive/negative likelihood ratio—how good
213 a test predicts the presence or absence of disease—of all clinical information i.e. signs, symptoms,
214 and POC diagnostic test results (**Table 2**). Clinical diagnosis often lacks accuracy and therefore
215 diagnostic tests that have the proven added value for patient management should be integrated
216 within algorithms. These tests can be wet diagnostics such as pathogen-specific RDTs or hand-held
217 devices such as haemoglobinometers, and do not exclude digital diagnostics such as digital
218 thermometers.

219

220 **App**. An important characteristic in this section is System Validation. Today, there is no standard
221 process to validate and assess performance accuracy of CDSAs. There is also a severe lack of
222 evidence and peer-reviewed publications on both the development and the performance of these
223 tools in LMICs. While some groups have performed randomised controlled trials (RCTs) to measure
224 patient outcome and other parameters that impact patient health, such as the reduction of
225 antibiotic over-prescription[16, 17], others have assessed the performance of their tool by
226 measuring health worker adherence to guidelines[12,13,14]. The level of validation ultimately
227 depends on the type of algorithm. The USFDA has provided some guidance to developers and
228 implementers on the kind of evidence that needs to be provided[19]. The TPP criteria are inspired by
229 this guidance. The minimal criteria guarantee that the App has a CDSA that is based on evidence
230 (clinical association) and that input data is processed correctly (analytical validation). The optimal
231 criteria include clinical validation in addition to clinical association and analytical validation. Through
232 clinical validation, the App has been assessed for the intended outcome (i.e. improved clinical
233 outcome, better quality of care, rational use of resources and reduction of antibiotic over-
234 prescription, etc.) (**Table 3**).

235 **Table 3: Minimal and optimal target product profile characteristics focused on App characteristics, as defined by expert consensus process.**

| **App** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CHARACTERISTIC** | **MINIMAL REQUIREMENT** | **OPTIMAL REQUIREMENT** | **COMMENT** |
| System Validation | The App has been validated in the intended implementation setting. There is evidence demonstrating:<br>— Valid Clinical Association (clinical output based on input data is supported by well-established or novel evidence) **and**<br>— Analytical Validation (input data is processed correctly into expected output data) | The App has been validated in the intended setting. There is evidence demonstrating:<br>— Valid Clinical Association (clinical output based on input data is supported by well-established or novel evidence), **and**<br>— Analytical Validation (input data is processed correctly into expected output data), **and**<br>— Clinical Validation (clinical safety or other meaningful outcome relevant to the intended use) | There is evidence that the system is based on evidence and working to achieve the intended use for the intended setting<br><br>See FDA's SaMD Clinical Evaluation for current guidance[20] |
| System Access (public API) | Publicly available application programming interface (API) for data access protected by authentication and authorization. At a minimum, technical standards are adhered to | Optimally, HIE/HL7 standards are adhered to | |
| Context Configuration | — Language: UN official languages<br>— Local time<br>— Local weights and measures | Same as minimal and<br>— Option to customise to local official language<br>— Other country preferences | Language can be a major barrier for the proper use of the tool for patient management and can lead to errors and misinterpretation |
| Customization | Changes to the App, such as updates to the list of medicines and POCs available in the setting, can be made by the healthcare programme. Validation of this change shall be provided. | Same as Minimal | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| User Access Rights | Appropriate data access is provided based on specific roles | | Roles may include data manager (facility supervisor) or data entry person (nurse) |
| Expert Support | None | Built-in access to online/remote expert advice to assist in patient consultation via SMS, audio call, video conferencing | |
| App Training | On-site training | Same and remote training and/or remote "Train the Trainer" | |
| Internet Availability | — Functions offline (allows for service delivery and key workflows)<br>— Allows automatic resynchronisation | Same and trigger alerts on user device when data has not been synchronised for a long time | Internet connection can be very unstable therefore the tool should work in offline mode so as to not disrupt the workflow of the user |
| Clinical Data Entry | Manual entry by the operator | Same, plus automatic upload of digital data (e.g. from biosensors, medical devices) | Optimal: This allows external integration of other App modules, built-in and third party Apps and devices |
| Patient Management Recommendation | Consultation data is summarised and actionable recommendations provided (e.g. treatment, referral, home care or follow up) | Same **and** recommendations are integrated in EMRs and HIS | |
| Navigation | Sequential: the user follows a strict sequence of data input to reach a final recommendation | Non-sequential: the user can move in any direction through an assessment and change input data to reach a final recommendation | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Workflow requirements to enable time-delayed POC data input | Ability for a user to perform multiple, simultaneous consultations, with pause and resume capability, to allow clinical and laboratory data entry | Same as minimal plus ability to disable simultaneous workflow feature in settings with minimally skilled workers | This is particularly relevant for implementation in settings where testing and clinical consultations are performed in different locations |
| Task Management | Multiple algorithms can be supported simultaneously in one application against a common dataset | | Can accommodate task-shifting capability i.e. multiple consultations can be opened at a time and patient profiles can be accessed using pre-set user access rights |
| Follow up | None | Ability to retrieve patient information using patient registration information | The optimal implies data recoverability, also covered below in Data Characteristics section |
| System Malfunction Protection | System malfunctions are made clear to the user | | |
| Scalability | The App shall allow high transaction volumes with complex workflows to cover primary care workforce at a national scale | | |
| Updates and Versioning | Processes are in place to control any App change (including algorithm version updates) and provide the appropriate and correct update to the user | | |

236

237

238 In May 2017, a new regulation (EU 2017/745) on medical devices, to which CDSA pertain by
239 definition[20] was adopted by the European Commission, that will be applied starting spring
240 2020[21]. This regulation includes a reinforcement of the rules on the clinical evidence that should
241 be provided by developers and manufacturers, at least if based in Europe. While waiting for LMICs to
242 have their own regulations, this new regulation will certainly impact development and validation by
243 European developers.

244 Experts also called for Application Programming Interface (API) to allow other software to 'talk to'
245 and interact with the tool through commonly known programming languages. The App should be
246 protected by authorisation and authentication that as a minimum requirement adhere to usual
247 technical standards, and optimally would adhere to HIE (Health Information Exchange) and/or
248 Health Level 7 International[22] medical standards. It was noted that adherence to HL7 can be
249 expensive, hence this was proposed as an optimal rather than a minimal requirement. The App
250 should also be designed to integrate with patient care pathways and health worker workflows with
251 limited disruption. The CDSA accordingly has pause and resume capability to allow time for
252 diagnostic tests to be performed and results entered in the algorithm. POC diagnostic tests such as
253 mRDTs can require up to 20 min for results to be read, depending on the manufacturer.

254

255 **Data**. Digital tools have the potential to amass enormous amount of data. With CDSA, patient
256 personal data is captured, stored and potentially used for other operational (i.e. supply chain
257 management) and algorithm development purposes. Many countries have personal data privacy and
258 protection laws in place to protect citizens from the abuse of their personal information. In the
259 European Union this is known as the General Data Protection Regulation[23]. However, there are
260 still many countries around the world that do not have a national eHealth strategy or personal data
261 legislation. This called for the need to address personal data handling with CDSA for security and

262 accountability purposes. Experts agreed that the implementer, who would be considered as the data
263 controller, is responsible for the data and should comply with local data policies and legislations. No
264 specific legislation was mentioned as these differ by country and region. In addition, the historic of
265 the processes that are applied to data as well as the origin of data should be documented (Data
266 Provenance) and the App should function under secure connectivity to avoid loss and corruption of
267 sensitive data, and mitigate cyber-attacks, whether data is at rest or in transmission **(Table 4).**
268
269

270 **Table 4: Minimal and optimal target product profile characteristics focused on data characteristics, as defined by expert consensus process.**

| **Data** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **CHARACTERISTIC** | **MINIMAL REQUIREMENT** | **OPTIMAL REQUIREMENT** | **COMMENT** |
| Data Capture | Text, numeric, image, audio, video | Same, and GPS, barcode, biometric | |
| Data Validation | The system validates data entry to prevent errors that diminish value of the data or the outcome | | |
| Data Ownership | Ownership shall be determined by the healthcare programme | | The healthcare programme is responsible for compliance with any country law, policy and regulation |
| Data Storage | The healthcare programme shall be able to choose the destination of the App's data | Same as Minimal | |
| Data Recovery | Data can be recovered or the system can be re-established to the desired state in the event of interruption or failure | | |
| Data Flow | The flow of data shall be determined by the healthcare programme | Same as Minimal | |
| Data Reporting | Data export available from all target devices | Pre-built data reporting, analytics and dashboards are available with the App | The level of data manipulation, aggregation and reporting should be sensitive to the device the App is running on i.e. the computer App can be rich in functionality, the mobile App is optimised for data collection and exchange only |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Data Provenance | Included | Same | Provides origin and processes applied to output data. When data is downloaded or shared, the version of the model is tagged so it is always clear how the data was obtained |
| Data Dictionary | Available, referencing standards used (eg. International Classification of Diseases, Systematized Nomenclature of Medicine) | | Ensures indicators reported are uniform across different health programs |
| Data Security & Privacy | The App operates under secure connectivity, which meet data protection and regulations of individual countries to avoid loss and corruption of sensitive data, and mitigate cyber-attacks, whether data is at rest or in transmission.<br><br>Conforms to national privacy laws. Includes processes such as:<br>— Two factor authentication<br>— Authorization/Access Control<br>— De-identified data<br>— Data encryption | | Encourages GDPR (should no national data security policies exist) to ensure a system that:<br>— preserves data integrity<br>— identifies & mitigates risks<br>— provides relevant parties security processes |

## DISCUSSION

In this work, our aim was to develop a TPP to enable the development of a toolkit that includes CDSAs that are based on evidence and designed to integrate results of diagnostics performed at POC to guide rational clinical decisions. The use of such toolkit would aid in strengthening healthcare particularly at the community and primary care echelons, and help address health workers difficulties to differentiate diseases and syndromes without diagnostic tests and the aid of formalised diagnostic processes that can be provided through algorithms.

In terms of TPP characteristics, "Data" and "Validation" emerged as key topics of discussion. Data generated from CDSA require storage and connectivity and are therefore vulnerable to abuse, loss or unlawful purposes. Although many countries have enacted personal data protection legislation, many fall short on enforcing these and others are still drafting bills. For example, in the African region, in 2017, 17 (out of 54) African countries had put in place comprehensive personal data protection legislation[24]. Several regimes in the region are starting to draft legislation regarding processing and movement of personal data[25], however funding attrition and the lack of regulators cripple the process. That said, there are continent-wide initiatives that promise to set data protection framework such as EU's GDPR. The African Network of Personal Data Protection Authorities (RAPDP), a cooperation of 8 African countries seeks to draft data protection laws, formulate opinions on specific issues and establish a consultative framework on data protection. There are also regional conventions for data protection and privacy that have been enacted such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Model Law[26] for the south and the Act on Personal Data Protection within ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States) for the west[27]. Unlike their southern and western counterparts, east African nations have not adopted similar regional frameworks, which can set cross-border and data portability limitations. In addition, some countries national laws fall short in setting the required safeguards for data privacy breach and data portability and lack bodies such as Data Protection Authorities to enforce these legislations[24].

297 This is just the African scenario, but every country and region will have their own set of policies.
298 Therefore, the healthcare programme and data controllers have an important responsibility to
299 manage the programme in compliance with local laws or, where lacking, consult with government
300 authorities on which regulation to abide by to foremost protect patient rights. Regulation of CDSS is
301 also very contentious topic. Groups will have to watch this space, FDA and European Commission
302 regulations, closely to determine whether their tool fits the definition of a Software as a Medical
303 Device (SaMD) and what data they will need to generate for regulatory approval.

304 In terms of "Validation", the big question was how to ensure CDSAs are safe for use. Developers and
305 implementers should aim for clinical association, analytical validation and clinical validation.
306 However clinical validation can require significant amount of financial resources and time. As an
307 example, e-POCT was developed in 2014 to incorporate the latest scientific evidence to expand the
308 medical content of IMCI. Its safety and efficacy was determined in a RCT in Tanzanian outpatient
309 clinics[17]. However, in 2019 the tool has yet been implemented at scale or evaluated in non-
310 controlled settings. Efforts like e-POCT to optimise CDSA content and assess its impact on patient
311 health outcomes are needed to grow the evidence for CDSA's role in improving patient safety. But
312 providing these tools to patient also demands that we put our efforts in studies to measure the
313 effectiveness of CDSA while in the hands of the end-user and in the setting of intended use. Indeed,
314 there may be factors when CDSAs are implemented as part of routine practice that affect the overall
315 effectiveness and impact of the tool. This includes a lack of or poor health worker training, lack of
316 connectivity, software malfunctions, poor design leading to low usability and acceptability of the
317 tool by health workers. Cycles of evaluation and improvement can be sought to perfect these tools
318 in intended settings.

319 In addition, digital data obtained from CDSA validation can be used in turn to dynamically improve
320 the tool itself faster than development improvements in classic wet diagnostics. CDSA also have the

321 potential to serve as platforms to support the evaluation or development of new content or
322 guidelines. These can be faster adapted to geographies to conform to local policies.

323

324 The call for the development of PHC during the declaration of Astana revived the global commitment
325 to provide quality health services to all[28]. Achieving universal health coverage will therefore
326 require that digital health interventions are quality assured and evidence-based. Indeed, the WHO
327 has begun developing frameworks to create a common digital language and synthetizing the
328 evidence around emerging mobile-based digital health technologies through two recent
329 publications[29, 88]. These resources are meant to guide the global health community in assessing
330 digital interventions that will improve quality of care, meaning interventions that are safe, effective,
331 timely, efficient, equitable and people-centred, and this include CDSAs[30].

332 The management of patients in low-resource settings with complex epidemiology is extremely
333 challenging without clinical algorithms and accurate and portable rapid diagnostic tests.
334 Consequences of suboptimal quality of care can go even beyond the patient's health to include
335 public health considerations such as the development of antimicrobial resistance due to the over-
336 prescribing of medicines. The aim of the proposed TPP is to support developers and implementers of
337 these toolkits aimed at guiding health workers throughout clinical assessment, to give them
338 confidence in clinical decisions and actions, whether it is sending a patient to a hospital or not,
339 prescribing or not prescribing antibiotics or recommending rehydration at home.

340

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We would like to thank all the experts who participated in the FIND/WHO workshop to discuss the first draft of the TPP, as well as Rigveda Kadam, Wallace White and Mo Tobin (FIND) for discussions on TPP development. We would also like to thank the online reviewers who provided feedback to develop the final consensus-driven TPP characteristics.

**FUNDING**

This work was funded by the Fondation Botnar and supported by the Global Antimicrobial Resistance Innovation Fund (GAMRIF), a UK aid programme. The funders had no role in the study design, data collection and analysis, or preparation of the manuscript.

351 **REFERENCES**


1 Tunçalp Ö, Were WM, MacLennan C, et al. Quality of care for pregnant women and newborns—the WHO vision. BJOG 122(8):1045-9. doi: 10.1111/1471-0528.13451. Epub 2015 May 1. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1471-0528.13451/full

2 World Health Organisation. Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (WHO) 2014 [May 2019]. Retrieved from http://apps. who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/104772/16/9789241506823_Chartbook_eng.pdf.

3 World Health Organisation. Integrated management of childhood illness: caring for newborns and children in the community. 2011. World Health Organization. [May 2019]. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/iris/handle/10665/44398

4 World Health Organisation. Integrated Management of Adolescent and Adult Illness (IMAI). [May 2019]. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/3by5/publications/documents/imai/en/.

5 WHO and TDR. Dengue: Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment, prevention and control: new edition. 2009 (WHO/HTM/NTD/DEN/2009.1). [May 2019]. Retrieved from https://www.who.int/tdr/publications/training-guideline-publications/dengue-diagnosis-treatment/en/

6 Klaus Schwab (2015). The Fourth Industrial Revolution: what it means, how to respond. [May 2019]. Retrieved from https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2015-12-12/fourth-industrial-revolution.

7 Goldemberg José. Leapfrog energy technologies. Energy Policy1998; 26(10):729–741.

8 World Health Organisation guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening. Executive summary. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2019. (WHO/RHR/19.8). Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

9 Darling G. The impact of clinical practice guideline and clinical trial on treatment decisions. Surg Oncol. 2002 Dec; 11.

10 Armstrong Schellenberg J, Bryce J, de Savigny D, et al. The effect of Integrated Management of Childhood Illness on observed quality of care of under-fives in rural Tanzania. Health Policy Plan. 2004;19

11 Rowe AK, Labadie G, Jackson D, et al. Improving health worker performance: an ongoing challenge for meeting the sustainable development goals. BMJ 2018;362:k2813.

12 Mitchell M, Hedt-Gauthier BL, Msellemu D, et al. Using electronic technology to improve clinical care - results from a before-after cluster trial to evaluate assessment and classification of sick

children according to Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI) protocol in Tanzania. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak. 2013;13:95. Published 2013 Aug 27. doi:10.1186/1472-6947-13-95

13 Bernasconi A, Crabbé F, Raab M, et al. Can the use of digital algorithms improve quality care? An example from Afghanistan. PLOS ONE 13(11): e0207233.https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0207233

14 Sarrassat S, Blanchet K, Lewis J et al. Integrated eDiagnosis Approach (IeDA) for the management of illness in under-five children at the primary health care level in Burkina Faso: Findings from a stepped-wedge cluster randomised trial.

15 World Health Organization (2010). Guidelines for the Treatment of Malaria. 2nd edition. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

16 Shao AF, Rambaud-Althaus C, Samaka J, et al. New Algorithm for Managing Childhood Illness Using Mobile Technology (ALMANACH): A Controlled Non-Inferiority Study on Clinical Outcome and Antibiotic Use in Tanzania. PLoS One. 2015 Jul 10;10(7):e0132316. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0132316.

17 Keitel K, Kagoro F, Samaka J, et al. A novel electronic algorithm using host biomarker point-of-care tests for the management of febrile illnesses in Tanzanian children (e-POCT): A randomized, controlled non-inferiority trial. PLoS Med. 2017 Oct 23;14(10):e1002411. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002411. eCollection 2017 Oct.

18 FIND and WHO. Electronic clinical decision support algorithms_ Workshop report.2018. Available from: https://www.finddx.org/mal-fev/ecdm-toolbox/

19 U.S. Food & Drug Administration. "Software as a Medical Device (SAMD): Clinical Evaluation. Guidance for Industry and Food and Drug Administration Staff". December 8, 2017. [October 2018]. Retrieved from https://www.fda.gov/downloads/MedicalDevices/DeviceRegulationandGuidance/GuidanceDocuments/UCM524904.pdf

20 European Commission. Guidance document Medical Devices – Scope, field of application, definition – Qualification and Classification of standalone software – MEDDEV 2.1/6. [May 2019]. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/17921/attachments/1/translations

21 European Commission. (2017) Regulation (EU) 2017/745 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 5 April 2017 on medical devices, amending Directive 2001/83/EC, Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 and Regulation (EC) No 1223/2009 and repealing Council Directives 90/385/EEC and 93/42/EEC (Text with EEA relevance)Text with EEA relevance. [July 2019] Retrieved from http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2017/745/2017-05-05

22 HL7 International. Retrieved from https://www.hl7.org/

23 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). [May 2019]. Retrieved from https://gdpr-info.eu/

24 Cynthia Rich. A look at New Trends in 2017: Privacy laws in Africa and the Near East (16) 6 Blomberg BNA. [May 2019]. Retrieved from https://media2.mofo.com/documents/170911-privacy-africa.pdf

25 UNCTAD. Data Protection and Privacy Legislation Worldwide. [May 2019]. Retrieved from https://unctad.org/en/Pages/DTL/STI_and_ICTs/ICT4D-Legislation/eCom-Data-Protection-Laws.aspx. Accessed May 14 2019.

26 ITU. (2013) Establishment of harmonized policies for the ICT market in the ACP Countries. Data protection: Southern African Development Community (SADC) Model Law. [May 2019]. Retrieved from https://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Projects/ITU-EC-ACP/HIPSSA/Documents/FINAL%20DOCUMENTS/FINAL%20DOCS%20ENGLISH/sadc_model_law_data_protection.pdf

27 ECOWAS (2010). [May 2019]. Supplementary Act A/SA.1/01/10 on Personal Data Protection within ECOWAS. https://www.statewatch.org/news/2013/mar/ecowas-dp-act.pdf

28 The Lancet. The Astana Declaration: the future of primary health care? Lancet 2018;392(10156):1369. doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32478-

29 Classification of digital health interventions. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2018(WHO/RHR/18.06). Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO

30 World Health Organisation. Quality of Care: A Process for Making Strategic Choices in Health Systems. Geneva: WHO, 2006. [July 2019]. Retrieved from https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/43470

**Figure 1. Target product profile second and final survey results**

| Section | Characteristic | Agreement Min | Agreement Opt | Agreement with Min (100% 75% 50% 25% 0%) | Agreement with Opt (100% 75% 50% 25% 0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scope General | Intended use | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| | Target Population | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| | Setting (level of implementation in the hea | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| | Targeted End User | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Algorithm Access | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| Scope Toolkit | Algorithm Content | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| | Algorithm Treatment Recommendations | 96% | 91% | 96% | 91% |
| | Compatible Point of Care Tools | 91% | 91% | 91% | 91% |
| | Regulated Toolkit Components | 91% | 87% | 91% | 87% |
| | Compatible Devices | 83% | 87% | 83% | 87% |
| | Compatible Operating Systems | 87% | 87% | 87% | 87% |
| Electronic CDS | Content Transparency | 87% | 91% | 87% | 91% |
| | Quality control | 91% | 91% | 91% | 91% |
| | Algorithm Validation | 91% | 91% | 91% | 91% |
| | Machine Learning | 96% | 87% | 96% | 87% |
| Point of Care Tools | POC Data Inputs | 87% | 87% | 87% | 87% |
| | Disease Likelihood | 83% | 87% | 83% | 87% |
| | POC Training | 87% | 87% | 87% | 87% |
| App | System Validation | 83% | 83% | 83% | 83% |
| | System Access (public API) | 91% | 96% | 91% | 96% |
| | Context Configuration | 87% | 91% | 87% | 91% |
| | Customization | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | User Access Rights | 100% | 96% | 100% | 96% |
| | Expert Support | 87% | 87% | 87% | 87% |
| | App Training | 91% | 91% | 91% | 91% |
| | Internet Availability | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| | Clinical Data Entry | 87% | 96% | 87% | 96% |
| | Patient Management Recommendation | 96% | 100% | 96% | 100% |
| | Navigation | 96% | 83% | 96% | 83% |
| | Workflow | 83% | 83% | 83% | 83% |
| | Task Management | 87% | 91% | 87% | 91% |
| | Follow up | 100% | 96% | 100% | 96% |
| | System Malfunction Protection | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| | Scalability | 91% | 91% | 91% | 91% |
| | Updates and Versioning | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | Data Capture | 83% | 91% | 83% | 91% |
| | Data Validation | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| | Data Ownership | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| | Data Storage | 91% | 91% | 91% | 91% |
| | Data Recovery | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Data Flow | 87% | 87% | 87% | 87% |
| | Data Reporting | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| | Data Provenance | 96% | 96% | 96% | 96% |
| | Data Dictionary | 91% | 96% | 91% | 96% |
| | Data Security & Privacy | 87% | 91% | 87% | 91% |
| Procurement | Procurement Models | 91% | 87% | 91% | 87% |
| | Average | 91% | 91% | 91% | 91% |

Legend:

≥50% ≥75%

- Fully agree
- Mostly agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Mostly disagree
- Fully disagree