

Community health workers for pandemic response: a rapid evidence synthesis

Author list: Bhaumik S^{1*}, Moola S¹, Tyagi J¹, Nambiar D¹, Kakoti M¹

1. The George Institute for Global Health, India

*Corresponding author

Abstract

Introduction: Coronavirus disease (COVID-19), a respiratory illness, first discovered in China in December 2019 has now spread to 213 countries or territories affecting millions across the globe. We received a request from National Health Systems Resource Centre, a public agency in India, for a Rapid Evidence Synthesis (RES) on community health workers (CHWs) for COVID-19 prevention and control.

Methods: We searched PubMed, websites of ministries, public agencies, multilateral institutions, COVID-19 resource aggregators and pre-prints (without language restrictions) for articles on the role, challenges and enablers for CHWs in pandemics. Two reviewers screened the records independently with a third reviewer resolving disagreements. One reviewer extracted data in a consensus data extraction form with another reviewer cross-checking it. A framework on CHW performance in primary healthcare not specific to pandemic was used to guide data extraction and narrative analysis.

Results: We retrieved 211 records and finally included 36 articles on the role, challenges and enablers for CHWs in pandemics. We found that CHWs play an important role in building awareness, countering stigma and maintaining essential primary healthcare service delivery. It is essential that CHWs are provided adequate Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and appropriately trained in its usage in the early stages of the pandemic. Wide range of policies and guidance is required to ensure health systems functioning. A clear guidance for prioritizing essential activities, postponing non-essential ones and additional pandemic related activities is crucial. CHWs experience stigmatization, isolation and social exclusion. Psychosocial support, non-performance-based incentives, additional transport allowance, accommodation, child-support, awards and recognition programs have been used in previous pandemics.

We also created inventories of resources with guiding notes for quick utility by decision makers on guidelines for health workers (n=24), self-isolation in the community (n=10) and information, education and counselling materials on COVID-19 (n=16).

Conclusions: CHWs play a critical role in pandemics like COVID-19. It is important to ensure role clarity, training, supportive supervision, as well as their work satisfaction, health and well-being. There is a need for more implementation research on CHWs in pandemics like COVID-19.

Keywords: COVID-19, pandemic, rapid review, rapid evidence synthesis, community health workers, pandemic, health systems, India

Competing interest: None

Acknowledgment: Dr. Rajani R. Ved and Dr. Neha Dumka from National Health Systems Resource Centre for inputs on scope of the RES to enhance utility in government decision making.

Funding: The rapid evidence synthesis platform in India is funded by the World Health Organisation, Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research. The funder had no role in design or content of the study. Opinions expressed might not necessarily reflect the official position of the funder or the requester.

Summary Box

What is already known?

- COVID-19 is a pandemic which has now strained health systems across the world. Community health workers (CHWs) are being deployed in many countries for COVID-19 prevention and control. However, there is no evidence synthesis on the issue.

What are the new findings?

- CHWs can play an important role in creating awareness, countering stigma, and maintaining essential primary healthcare delivery.
- Adequate provisions for personal protective equipment are essential for CHWs
- Governments should provide a clear guidance to CHWs for prioritizing essential activities, postponing non-essential ones and for additional pandemic related activities, while also ensuring their health and safety
- CHWs experienced stigmatization, isolation and were socially ostracized in previous pandemics. Psychosocial support, non-performance-based incentives, additional transport allowance, accommodation, child-support, awards and recognition programs have been used as enablers.

What do the new findings imply?

- Roles of CHWs in a pandemic context must be clear. Apart from clear guidance adequate training and support should be provided. requiring adequate training and guidance is useful. Contact listing and identification should be done by separate trained cadre.
- Countries without pre-existing CHWs program must consider applicability of available evidence before investing in ambitious new CHW programs.
- There is a need for more implementation research on CHWs in pandemics like COVID-19.

Introduction

The COVID-19 outbreak that originated in Wuhan City, China in December 2019 has emerged as a pandemic triggering a public health emergency worldwide. The disease now affects 213 countries or territories affecting millions across the globe. Several measures are being implemented by governments across the world to prevent and control COVID-19. Better health workforce utilisation and well-being is one of the key pillars governments across the world are dealing with to address the issue of health systems capacity. (1, 2) Community health workers (CHWs) constitute a significant frontline health workforce in many countries(3) and can potentially play an important role in control and prevention of COVID-19.

We received a request to examine the evidence to inform the potential role, enablers and barriers for CHWs (like Accredited Social health Activists or ASHAs in India) during COVID-19 prevention and control from the National Health Systems Resource Centre (NHSRC), India. The NHSRC is a public agency with the mandate to provide technical assistance to the National Health Mission. An inventory of resources which government decision makers and technical agencies could rapidly scan to help develop guidelines, standards of procedures, advisory notes and communication materials was also deemed to be a useful addendum by the requesters. We thus aimed to:

- understand key roles, issues, barriers and enablers for CHWs for pandemic response
- develop an inventory of resources that could be used to develop guidance, training manuals and IEC (information, education and communication) materials related to COVID-19 for CHWs

Methods

Approach for the study

Considering the urgency of evidence to inform decision making, we were provided a three-calendar day deadline by the requester. Based on an initial scoping, discussion with the requesters and the emergent nature of COVID-19, we expanded the scope to understand

what can be learnt from previous pandemics, i.e. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS), Swine Flu, Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) and Middle East Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV). We followed a Rapid Evidence Synthesis (RES) approach, wherein processes and methods of the traditional systematic review approach were tailored to ensure timeliness. (4) We took a broad scoping review approach for the RES to support the wide nature of decisions under consideration. There are no reporting guidelines specifically for rapid evidence synthesis, so we used the PRISMA checklist for scoping reviews.(5) The PRISMA checklist is presented in [Appendix 1](#).

Eligibility Criteria

We included studies which met the following criteria:

- Concept & context – studies or guidance related to roles, issues, challenges and enablers of CHWs during any phase of recent pandemics. The pandemics considered were SARS, Swine Flu, EVD, MERS-CoV & COVID 19.
- Types of participants- We did not use any specific definition of CHW recognising the fact that there are identified differently in different health systems across the world.
- Types of evidence sources – We included following types of evidence sources - primary research studies (of any design- qualitative or quantitative), any evidence synthesis, guidelines, training materials, advisories, standards of procedures, technical reports.

There were no language or date restrictions.

Search methods for identification of records

We searched PubMed given the need to complete the RES in three days (Search Strategy in [Appendix 2](#)). We screened the reference list of all included studies to identify additional records and hand searched (MK, JT) 18 websites of different government, multinational agencies and COVID-19 resource aggregators and pre-prints ([Appendix 3](#)).

Screening, Data collection and analysis

Two reviewers independently screened the titles and abstracts of studies for inclusion with a third author resolving consensus (SB, SM, JT). At the full text level, decision for inclusion or

exclusion was done with the consensus of three authors (SB, SM, JT). Data from included studies was extracted using a pre-defined template by one reviewer (SM, JT, SB, DN) and cross-verified by at least one another reviewer. Cross-verification was not possible for the two French studies that were identified because only one of the reviewers knew the language (DN). No assessment of methodological quality of the studies was conducted as a part of methodological tailoring to expedite review process. (4)

We adapted an existing conceptual framework for assessment of CHW performance in primary health care (6) to guide data extraction and narrative synthesis. The framework looks at inputs, programmatic processes, CHW-level and community level outputs to improve health outcomes in the context of economic evaluation and equity, gender and accountability. The framework is not specific to pandemic response; for ease of reading and clarity, some components of the framework were merged, and issues related to multiple aspects of the framework mentioned without repetition.

Results

Search Results and Study Selection

We searched PubMed on 21 March 2020 and retrieved 211 records. Following title and abstract screening, full text articles were retrieved for 36 potentially relevant studies. Seven records were excluded following full text examination, leaving 29 studies for inclusion. An additional seven studies were identified by screening reference lists of the initial 29 studies that were included. Overall, 36 studies were included in the rapid review. A PRISMA flowchart for the same is presented in [Figure 1](#). A list of studies excluded at full-text level is presented in [Appendix 4](#).

<Insert Figure 1>

Characteristics of included studies

A majority of the studies included in the review were qualitative (n=11) (7-17), followed by descriptive cross-sectional studies (n=9)(18-26), pre- and post-test studies (n=6) (27-32),

literature reviews (n=3)(33-35), mixed-methods studies (n=2)(36, 37), guidelines (n=2)(38, 39), one systematic review(40), one randomised controlled trial (41), and one case report(42). Key characteristics of the included studies are presented in [Table 1](#). Studies were conducted in Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Ghana, Guinea, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Southern Sudan, Uganda, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Iceland, Laos, Thailand, UK, and Vietnam. The two guidelines were published by the World Health Organization (WHO).

<Insert Table 1>

Summary of findings on role, issues, enablers and barriers for CHWs in pandemic response

The included studies examined the role of CHWs in disease outbreak situations, in addition to exploring the barriers and enablers of working in pandemic situations. Overall, the studies reported that CHWs had a role to play in terms of community engagement (mostly in rural areas) and creating awareness during pandemic responses. The key findings from the included studies are presented as per the elements of the conceptual framework.

Input in CHW programs during pandemic responses

Myriad inputs and planning were required to ensure effective pandemic response through CHWs. These are summarised in sub-domains below:

- **Policies related to CHW task/roles** - Policies and guidance related to specific roles and tasks for CHWs were reported in many studies.(9, 21, 30, 34, 37, 38) These policies largely aimed to distinguish tasks as essential (routine activities that need to be continued but with modifications for decreased transmission risk), non-essential (non-essential activities that could be postponed) and additional (activities that need to be carried out additionally owing to the pandemic) to bring accountability and enhance trust in health systems. CHWs have been involved in various pandemic control activities, including community engagement, community sensitisation, awareness and promotion and use of appropriate preventive practices. These were reported to be crucial for the purpose of bringing accountability and building trust in health systems. The World Health Organization's guidance on contact tracing recommends contact identification

and listing to be conducted by a trained epidemiologist or surveillance officer, while contact follow-up might be done through CHWs.(38) However, policies to involve CHWs in some aspects of contact tracing had been developed and implemented during EVD .(21, 22)

- **Logistics & funding for CHW programs.** Disruptions in drug and equipment supplies were common during pandemics and as such, policies and mechanisms to address them from an early phase of the outbreak were reported to be important. (5, 10, 16) As such this might be expected along with shortfalls in routine supportive supervision methods. Sustained investments in CHWs is required during pandemic response including revisiting financial investments (discussed subsequently) for optimal outcomes.(34)
- **Governance and Stakeholders** – A wide range of stakeholders in the community need to be engaged. The evidence base is mostly from countries with existing CHW programs where they were additionally engaged for COVID-19 activities and has been discussed in a subsequent domain
- **Information Management Systems for CHWs in Pandemics** - Operational support using information management systems and digital health technology had been used for supporting and monitoring CHW programs. Honesty, transparency of communication and reciprocity of information with CHWs was noted to be beneficial (9, 14, 21).

Programmatic Processes & Community health systems for CHWs in pandemic response

Programmatic process and health systems were crucial for effective service delivery by CHWs during pandemics.

Supportive systems, development, competency and well-being for CHWs

CHWs and their supervisors required appropriate training and supportive supervision for community sensitisation, awareness and risk communication during pandemic outbreaks and the lack of these was noted as a significant barrier to effective service delivery. (7, 9, 13, 16-18, 20, 21, 25, 29, 32, 34, 37, 38, 40) In most of these studies, it was reported that appropriate training in skills and knowledge related to disease outbreaks led to an improvement in awareness of the disease, screening and reporting. In qualitative studies, it

was reported that there was a change in perceptions of CHWs, leading to more proactive involvement in disease prevention and control. Appropriate training helped CHWs overcome fear and become more confident about providing and delivering care and helped them deal with a broad range of challenges. Transparency in communication that included sharing of information from supervisors motivated CHWs to be involved, and mitigated the fear frequently encountered during pandemics.

CHWs were reported to be at an increased risk of exposure due to lack of or insufficient or incorrect usage of personal protective equipment (PPE).(10, 40) In previous disease outbreaks, training sessions on pandemic preparedness were focussed on protocols, and the use of appropriate and adequate PPE, during patient care. There is some evidence that training and availability of PPE resulted in CHWs being more confident to cope with managing the disease outbreak.(10, 13, 16, 17, 20, 40, 42)

During previous pandemics, CHWs have faced stigmatisation, isolation and in some cases were even socially ostracized.(15, 33, 37) CHWs used several coping strategies including trying to isolate themselves to protect their loved ones, finding renewed purpose in continuing to serve the community, and turning to religion to guide strength.(15) Peer and family support (praying together before work or through social-medial platform like WhatsApp) were reported to enhance CHW well-being.(15) Further, workshops that provided emotional support and ways to deal with the social stigma helped CHWs cope with seeing patients and colleagues dying from the disease. Studies reported that improved working conditions, provision of housing allowance, equal training opportunities, transportation allowance, and improved salaries (paid on time and for a broad range of services), awards in high-profile public events contributed to better recruitment and retention of CHWs during pandemics.(13, 15, 16, 33, 34)

Support from community-based groups for community access and community-centred care

Community engagement and sensitisation were reported to address knowledge gaps related to disease outbreak and discourage discrimination and stigmatisation towards CHWs. (15, 33) Coercive laws against community members initiating discrimination and stigmatisation towards CHWs were not reported. Information sharing in the community as well as

engagement of community leaders were reported to help build trust in CHWs, leading to better access as well as satisfactory experience in care received.(8, 28, 33, 35, 37) Community elders and village heads should be engaged and involved to rebuild trust, leading to an increased use of services.

Community level outputs and health outcomes of CHW-led pandemic response

A study noted that the social standing (in terms of social status) of CHWs empowered them in terms of their participation in pandemic responses.(34) Community health policies for social mobilisation and community engagement strategies were found to build trust and increase utilisation of services, which were found to be useful in pandemic response.(8, 15, 33, 37) Engaging CHWs in the early phases of outbreaks potentially improved overall response procedures and adaptive resilience.(34) It was reported that CHW-led programs led to improved knowledge and awareness among farmers leading to improved motivation for reporting of avian influenza.(7) In another study, it was noted that reporting for malaria by CHWs improved from 59% (pre-outbreak) to 95% (during outbreak) and 98% (post-outbreak) owing to “sustained investments in CHWs through provision of incentives, supervision and provision of adequate reporting tools”.(22) In general, training of CHWs led to improved knowledge, service quality and well-being, as has been noted in preceding sections. One study from rural Uganda reported that CHW-delivered psychosocial support to build community trust and confidence was often not available for disadvantaged and poor families owing to lack of accountability measures.(12) As such it is important to build adequate governance and reporting structures and use an equity focussed approach in programming.

Equity, Gender, Accountability and Economic Evaluations

We did not find any economic evaluations related to CHWs in pandemic responses. Issues around equity, gender and accountability were seldom studied, including in relation to the populations to whom CHWs provided their services. Specific equity focussed studies were scarce but female CHWs had a different set of challenges, which has been discussed in an earlier section pertaining to CHW support and well-being.

Summary of inventory of resources to guide resource development

We created three inventories to guide and expedite resource development. The first inventory ([Appendix 5](#)) compiled 24 documents. Apart from guidance documents useful for health workers (not just CHWs) during pandemics the inventory also included resources for ensuring occupational safety and well-being and listing actions for local health departments and sub-national planning.

The second inventory included 10 guidelines ([Appendix 6](#)) and advisories on self-isolation practices which have been released by various government health departments to control COVID-19. They provide instructions for the 14-day home-quarantine in non-healthcare settings i.e., at home for those with close contact to COVID-19 cases, inbound travellers from affected areas, and people sharing the same home with a suspect or positive COVID-19 person.

The third inventory consisted of list of 16 different IEC resources ([Appendix 7](#)). They address frequently asked questions, list COVID-19 myths and facts, Dos and Don'ts for the general public, and specific communication messages for high-risk population and individuals showing symptoms.

Discussion

Summary of main results

The studies included in the review reported that CHWs had insufficient knowledge about disease outbreaks; however, showed positive perceptions of the prevention and control of disease transmission. The evidence from our RES pertains to settings where well-established CHW programs exist before a pandemic. The findings of this review suggest significant knowledge gaps between the amount of information available on disease outbreaks and the

depth of knowledge among CHWs, particularly about the mode of transmission, and the use preventive and control measures, such as the use of PPE measures.

Completeness and applicability of the evidence

In terms of the strengths of this review, a robust and transparent search strategy was utilised to identify relevant studies of interest. Broadening the scope to include multiple recent pandemics enabled us to get more meaningful evidence from a broader but relevant literature to inform decision making. We searched only one database, but we had extensively used other methods to identify other research. The identification of seven studies by other methods demonstrate the robust application and utility of the approach. We acknowledge that a few more studies on the topic might have not been retrieved but contend this would not have changed the results of the study majorly.

Implications for policy and practice

Evidence from our RES indicates that in countries with well-established CHW programs, this cadre can play a very important role in increasing awareness and countering stigma. CHWs should continue to maintain essential primary healthcare service delivery, with a separate trained cadre being used for contact identification and listing. This is crucial considering the larger body of evidence from previous pandemics showing consequences on population health owing to disruption in routine service delivery.(43-45) Disruption in supply-chain, logistics and supportive supervision is expected and a clear guidance (with requisite training) for prioritising essential activities, postponing non-essential ones is crucial. The CHWs should be provided adequate PPE and be appropriately trained in its usage in the early phases of the pandemic.

During previous pandemics, CHWs experienced stigmatisation, isolation and were socially ostracised, and the same might be expected during COVID-19. The government should thus make provisions for psychosocial support, move to a non-performance-based incentive model or regularisation of staff and institute awards and recognition programs. Provisions for additional transport allowance, accommodation, and child-support should also be considered owing to the need to protect families of CHWs from infection. As most CHWs are women, they are subject to gender norms that on the one hand may increase infection risk

(domestic work) as well as other gendered vulnerabilities and risks (like domestic violence)(46). Sustained investment together with governance and information systems support is important. Further, as argued elsewhere, CHWs are part of a larger ecosystem of health system wherein ensuring trust and accountability is essentially and more so during a pandemic(44).

Implications for introducing new CHW programs in the midst of a pandemic, as is being planned by the United Kingdom(47) is not well understood, but considerable challenges might be expected considering the larger body of literature around community trust, and systems integration being critical for success.(48-51)

Policy Impact and Stakeholder Engagement

We submitted the key policy considerations along with a shorter version of the RES to the requester and released it publicly on our institutional website considering the immediacy of decision making. The RES has been used for development of training, recommendation adoption in Odisha, a state in eastern India and been referred to in WHO policy note on violence against women (46) during COVID-19. The inventories have also been used extensively for preparation of checklists for rural and urban primary health centre preparedness to tackle COVID-19. (52, 53) Our detailed experience in relation to stakeholder engagement for uptake of RES will be captured in a separate paper.

Implications for research

We took a broad scoping approach in the RES to understand issues around CHWs in pandemic response. Conduct of research related to health workers during pandemics is extremely challenging and as such, high-quality evidence from trials may be neither feasible nor ethical. However, the use of cross-sectional surveys, before-and-after studies, time-series studies, and qualitative study designs is feasible. Implementation research related to key pandemic response functions like contact tracing, community awareness and anti-stigma programs is crucial to understand issues related to human resources for health and better pandemic control. Equity, gender and accountability dimensions together with economic evaluations are major gap in the literature that needs to be studied.

Conclusion

In conclusion and based on our findings, CHWs play an important role in the prevention and control of pandemics like COVID-19. This is relevant and feasible in countries which already have existing CHW programs. However, there is a need for role clarity, further training, and regulation to ensure preparedness of CHWs in pandemic-like situations. The use of CHWs in countries without pre-existing CHWs programs may be challenging considering the health systems re-orientation needs and the lack of established community relationships. Applicability of available evidence on CHWs for pandemic response should be considered by such countries before embarking on ambitious CHW programs amid a public health crisis.

References

1. Iserson KV. Augmenting the Disaster Healthcare Workforce. *West J Emerg Med*. 2020.
2. Adams JG, Walls RM. Supporting the Health Care Workforce During the COVID-19 Global Epidemic. *Jama*. 2020.
3. Hartzler AL, Tuzzio L, Hsu C, Wagner EH. Roles and Functions of Community Health Workers in Primary Care. *Ann Fam Med*. 2018;16(3):240-5.
4. Tricco AC, Langlois EV, Straus SE. Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: a practical guide: World Health Organization Geneva; 2017.
5. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2018;169(7):467-73.
6. Agarwal S, Sripad P, Johnson C, Kirk K, Bellows B, Ana J, et al. A conceptual framework for measuring community health workforce performance within primary health care systems. *Hum Resour Health*. 2019;17(1):86.
7. Farrell PC, Hunter C, Truong B, Bunning M. Control of highly pathogenic avian influenza in Quang Tri province, Vietnam: voices from the human-animal interface. *Rural Remote Health*. 2015;15(3):3044.
8. Gray N, Stringer B, Bark G, Heller Perache A, Jephcott F, Broeder R, et al. 'When Ebola enters a home, a family, a community': A qualitative study of population perspectives on Ebola control measures in rural and urban areas of Sierra Leone. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2018;12(6):e0006461.

9. Gunnlaugsson G, Hauksdottir IE, Bygbjerg IC, Pinkowski Tersbol B. 'Tiny Iceland' preparing for Ebola in a globalized world. *Glob Health Action*. 2019;12(1):1597451.
10. McMahon SA, Ho LS, Brown H, Miller L, Ansumana R, Kennedy CE. Healthcare providers on the frontlines: a qualitative investigation of the social and emotional impact of delivering health services during Sierra Leone's Ebola epidemic. *Health Policy Plan*. 2016;31(9):1232-9.
11. H. W, S. W, J. R. 'Fighting a battle': Ebola, health workers and the health system in Sierra Leone. UK: ReBUILD Research Programme Consortium 2016.
12. de Vries DH, Rwemisisi JT, Musinguzi LK, Benoni TE, Muhangi D, de Groot M, et al. The first mile: community experience of outbreak control during an Ebola outbreak in Luwero District, Uganda. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16:161.
13. Englert EG, Kiwanuka R, Neubauer LC. 'When I die, let me be the last.' Community health worker perspectives on past Ebola and Marburg outbreaks in Uganda. *Glob Public Health*. 2019;14(8):1182-92.
14. Ives J, Greenfield S, Parry JM, Draper H, Gratus C, Petts JI, et al. Healthcare workers' attitudes to working during pandemic influenza: a qualitative study. *BMC Public Health*. 2009;9:56.
15. Raven J, Baral S, Wurie H, Witter S, Samai M, Paudel P, et al. What adaptation to research is needed following crises: a comparative, qualitative study of the health workforce in Sierra Leone and Nepal. *Health Res Policy Syst*. 2018;16(1):6.
16. Wurie HR, Samai M, Witter S. Retention of health workers in rural Sierra Leone: findings from life histories. *Hum Resour Health*. 2016;14:3.
17. Witter S, Wurie H, Chandiwana P, Namakula J, So S, Alonso-Garbayo A, et al. How do health workers experience and cope with shocks? Learning from four fragile and conflict-affected health systems in Uganda, Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe and Cambodia. *Health Policy Plan*. 2017;32(suppl_3):iii3-iii13.
18. Attinsounon CA, Hounnankan CA, Dovonou CA, Alassani CA, Salifou S. [Knowledge and attitudes of community volunteers on Lassa and Ebola viral haemorrhagic fevers in the Donga Department (North Benin)]. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2017;26:229.
19. Sidibe S, Camara BS, Delamou A, Toure A, Bouedouno P, Samake AT, et al. [Knowledge, attitudes and practices of healthcare providers on suspected Ebola cases in Guinea]. *Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique*. 2018;66(6):369-74.
20. Delamou A, Sidibe S, El Ayadi AM, Camara BS, Delvaux T, Utz B, et al. Maternal and Child Health Services in the Context of the Ebola Virus Disease:

Health Care Workers' Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices in Rural Guinea. *Afr J Reprod Health*. 2017;21(1):104-13.

21. Hemingway-Foday JJ, Ngoyi BF, Tunda C, Stolka KB, Grimes KEL, Lubula L, et al. Lessons Learned from Reinforcing Epidemiologic Surveillance During the 2017 Ebola Outbreak in the Likati District, Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Health Secur*. 2020;18:S81-s91.

22. VanDi MA, van Griensven J, Chan AK, Kargbo B, eh JN, Alpha KS, et al. Ebola and community health worker services in Kenema District, Sierra Leone: please mind the gap! *Public Health Action*. 2017;7:S55-s61.

23. Plucinski MM, Guilavogui T, Sidikiba S, Diakite N, Diakite S, Dioubate M, et al. Effect of the Ebola-virus-disease epidemic on malaria case management in Guinea, 2014: a cross-sectional survey of health facilities. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2015;15(9):1017-23.

24. Reques L, Bolibar I, Chazelle E, Gomes L, Prikazsky V, Banza F, et al. Evaluation of contact tracing activities during the Ebola virus disease outbreak in Guinea, 2015. *Int Health*. 2017;9(2):131-3.

25. Siekmans K, Sohani S, Boima T, Koffa F, Basil L, Laaziz S. Community-based health care is an essential component of a resilient health system: evidence from Ebola outbreak in Liberia. *BMC Public Health*. 2017;17(1):84.

26. Bolkan HA, Bash-Taqi DA, Samai M, Gerdin M, von Schreeb J. Ebola and indirect effects on health service function in sierra leone. *PLoS Curr*. 2014;6.

27. Ameme DK, Nyarko KM, Afari EA, Antara S, Sackey SO, Wurapa F. Training Ghanaian frontline healthcare workers in public health surveillance and disease outbreak investigation and response. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2016;25:2.

28. Dickmann P, Kitua A, Apfel F, Lightfoot N. Kampala manifesto: Building community-based One Health approaches to disease surveillance and response-The Ebola Legacy-Lessons from a peer-led capacity-building initiative. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2018;12(4):e0006292.

29. Mc Kenna P, Babughirana G, Amponsah M, Egoeh SG, Banura E, Kanwagi R, et al. Mobile training and support (MOTS) service-using technology to increase Ebola preparedness of remotely-located community health workers (CHWs) in Sierra Leone. *Mhealth*. 2019;5:35.

30. Otu A, Ebenso B, Okuzu O, Osifo-Dawodu E. Using a mHealth tutorial application to change knowledge and attitude of frontline health workers to Ebola virus disease in Nigeria: a before-and-after study. *Hum Resour Health*. 2016;14:5.

31. Patel U, Pharr JR, Ihesiaba C, Oduenyi FU, Hunt AT, Patel D, et al. Ebola Outbreak in Nigeria: Increasing Ebola Knowledge of Volunteer Health Advisors. *Glob J Health Sci*. 2015;8(1):72-8.

32. Stehling-Ariza T, Rosewell A, Moiba SA, Yorpie BB, Ndomaina KD, Jimissa KS, et al. The impact of active surveillance and health education on an Ebola virus disease cluster - Kono District, Sierra Leone, 2014-2015. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2015;16(1):611.
33. Armstrong-Mensah EA, Ndiaye SM. Global Health Security Agenda Implementation: A Case for Community Engagement. *Health Secur.* 2018;16(4):217-23.
34. Boyce MR, Katz R. Community Health Workers and Pandemic Preparedness: Current and Prospective Roles. *Front Public Health.* 2019;7:62.
35. Perry HB, Dhillon RS, Liu A, Chitnis K, Panjabi R, Palazuelos D, et al. Community health worker programmes after the 2013-2016 Ebola outbreak. *Bull World Health Organ.* 2016;94(7):551-3.
36. Elston JW, Moosa AJ, Moses F, Walker G, Dotta N, Waldman RJ, et al. Impact of the Ebola outbreak on health systems and population health in Sierra Leone. *J Public Health (Oxf).* 2016;38(4):673-8.
37. Miller NP, Milsom P, Johnson G, Bedford J, Kapeu AS, Diallo AO, et al. Community health workers during the Ebola outbreak in Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone. *J Glob Health.* 2018;8(2):020601.
38. WHO-AFRO. Contact Tracing During an Outbreak of Ebola Virus Disease Brazzaville: World Health Organization African Region Office; 2014 [Available from: <https://www.who.int/csr/resources/publications/ebola/contact-tracing-during-outbreak-of-ebola.pdf>].
39. World Health Organization. Infection prevention and control during health care when novel COVID-19 is suspected 2020 [Available from: <https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/infection-prevention-and-control>].
40. Selvaraj SA, Lee KE, Harrell M, Ivanov I, Allegranzi B. Infection Rates and Risk Factors for Infection Among Health Workers During Ebola and Marburg Virus Outbreaks: A Systematic Review. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases.* 2018;218(suppl_5):S679-S89.
41. Nassar AF, Alemi F, Hetmyer A, Alemi Y, Olph LA, Ramey SL. Automated monitoring to detect H1N1 symptoms among urban, Medicaid-eligible, pregnant women: a community-partnered randomized controlled trial. *J Community Health.* 2014;39(1):159-66.
42. Bower H, Grass JE, Veltus E, Braut A, Campbell S, Basile AJ, et al. Delivery of an Ebola Virus-Positive Stillborn Infant in a Rural Community Health Center, Sierra Leone, 2015. *Am J Trop Med Hyg.* 2016;94(2):417-9.
43. Elston JW, Cartwright C, Ndumbi P, Wright J. The health impact of the 2014-15 Ebola outbreak. *Public Health.* 2017;143:60-70.

44. Schaaf M, Fox J, Topp SM, Warthin C, Freedman LP, Robinson RS, et al. Community health workers and accountability: reflections from an international “think-in”. *International Journal for Equity in Health*. 2018;17(1):66.
45. Quaglio G, Tognon F, Finos L, Bome D, Sesay S, Kebbie A, et al. Impact of Ebola outbreak on reproductive health services in a rural district of Sierra Leone: a prospective observational study. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(9):e029093.
46. WHO. COVID-19 and violence against women : What the health sector/system can do: World Health Organisation 2020 [Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/331699/WHO-SRH-20.04-eng.pdf?ua=1>].
47. Haines A, de Barros EF, Berlin A, Heymann DL, Harris MJ. National UK programme of community health workers for COVID-19 response. *The Lancet*. 2020;395(10231):1173-5.
48. Scott K, George AS, Ved RR. Taking stock of 10 years of published research on the ASHA programme: examining India's national community health worker programme from a health systems perspective. *Health Res Policy Syst*. 2019;17(1):29.
49. Jaskiewicz W, Tulenko K. Increasing community health worker productivity and effectiveness: a review of the influence of the work environment. *Hum Resour Health*. 2012;10:38.
50. Mishra A. 'Trust and teamwork matter': community health workers' experiences in integrated service delivery in India. *Glob Public Health*. 2014;9(8):960-74.
51. Pinto RM, da Silva SB, Soriano R. Community health workers in Brazil's Unified Health System: a framework of their praxis and contributions to patient health behaviors. *Soc Sci Med*. 2012;74(6):940-7.
52. COVID-19-PHC Action Group. COVID-19 Preparedness Checklist for Rural Primary Health Care and Community Settings New Delhi The George Institute for Global Health , India; 2020 [updated April 3 2020. version 1.1:[Available from: <https://www.georgeinstitute.org.in/covid-19-preparedness-checklist-for-rural-primary-health-care-community-settings>].
53. COVID-19-PHC Action Group. COVID-19 Preparedness Checklist for Urban Primary Health Centres in India Bengaluru: Institute of Public Health; 2020 [updated April 18 2020. version 0.9:[Available from: <https://iphindia.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/COVID-19-Preparedness-Checklist-for-Urban-Primary-Health-Centres-in-India-.pdf>]

Identification

Records retrieved by PubMed search
(n=211)

Screening

Records screened
(n=211)

Records excluded based
on title and abstract
screening (n=175)

Eligibility

Full texts assessed for
eligibility (n=36)


Records excluded on
full text examination
(n=7)

Included

Included after full-text
review (n=29)

Records identified
through other methods
(n=7)

Records included in the
final RES (n=36)



Citation	Name of Pandemic	Country & Setting	Study Design & Size	Description of study participants (if available)
Attinsounon et al 2017	VHF (Lassa and Ebola), 6 months after end of epidemic	North Benin (Donga département - Djougou, Ouaké, and Copargo towns)	Cross-sectional survey ; 58 volunteers.	Community volunteers (called relais communautaires) identified by their peers and in charge of health of under-five children
Sidibe et al 2018	EVD, during outbreak	Guinea, 4 highly affected (Macenta, Conakry, Guéckédou, Kérouané) and less affected (Labé, Fria, Gaoual, Mandiana) districts	Cross-sectional survey; 120 health facilities. No further details available.	CHWs are posted at health centres (5 per centre) and hold responsibility for primary health care and prevention activities
Farell et al 2015	Avian Influenza (H5N1)	Vietnam, Quang Tri province	Qualitative study - focus group discussions (FGDs) and in-depth interviews (IDIs) ; 62 village health workers (both animal and human	Village animal health worker (VAHW) and Village human health worker (VHHW) referred to as collaborators, selected by commune authorities and provided with training and ongoing support.
Gray et al 2018	EVD, Early phase and during the outbreak	Sierra Leone. Urban and rural locations of two districts.	Qualitative study – FGDs and IDI; 16 health workers	Not reported clearly.
Gunnlaugsson et al 2019	EVD, Post outbreak	Iceland, Landspítali University Hospital (LSH)	Qualitative case study, - IDI; exact number not reported	Frontline health professionals worked in the Emergency Room (ER) where persons exposed to EVD were most likely to first seek care in case of acute illness.

Vandi et al 2017	EVD, Before, during and after the outbreak	Sierra Leone, rural Kenema District	Retrospective cross-sectional study using programme data; 947 (pre-outbreak) to 1093 (post-outbreak).	CHW are volunteers whose clinical duties include symptom-directed screening for malaria, including performing RDTs for malaria; eliciting a history from care givers; performing basic examinations, such as recording respiratory count; and providing non-injectable treatment for malaria, diarrhoea and pneumonia
Mc Kenna et al 2019	EVD, phase not reported	Sierra Leone, Bo district	Pre and post interventional study; 125 CHWs	CHWs reporting to the Peripheral Health Unit (PHU)
McMahon et al 2016	EVB, during peak of outbreak	Sierra Leone, Bo and Kenema Districts	Qualitative study - IDIs ; 35 health workers	Front-line providers working in primary healthcare setting including community health officers, nurses, maternal child health aides, community health workers and laboratory technicians
Miller 2018	EVB, Post outbreak	Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone	A mixed methods study using IDIs, FGDs, and analysis of routine program data ; 102 participants (38 in Guinea, 29 in Liberia, and 35 in Sierra Leone	CHWs, traditional birth attendants (TBAs), community health committee (CHC), Traditional healers (TH)
Siekmans et al 2017	EVB, Post outbreak	Liberia	A observational study design used mixed methods; 60 CHWs	CHWs
Stekhling-Ariza et al 2016	EVB, during outbreak	Sierra Leone, Kono district	Pre- and post-test study; not reported	Disease surveillance officers, CHWs
Wurie et al 2016	EVD. Pre-outbreak to during outbreak	Sierra Leone. Rural areas	Qualitative study -IDIs ; 25 health workers	Frontline health workers including national mid and low level cadres of health workers (CHOs, nurse health assistants, community health assistant, community health nurse)

Elston et al 2015	EVD. During outbreak period	Sierra Leone. Rural areas	Mixed methods study ; 60 IDIs , Six FGDs ; survey in 15 health facilities	Community workers, social mobilisers
Ives et al 2009	influenza pandemic	West Midlands region of the United Kingdom	A qualitative study ; 5 CHWs	Community based HCWs
Otu et al 2016	EVD- pre - survey was done during epidemic and post-evaluation done after epidemic free	Ondo State, Nigeria.	Pre-post study design; 94 out of total 203 participants were CHWs (46.3%)	46.3% of participants were community health officers, 13% were nurses/midwives out of total 203 participants
Patel et al 2016	Ebola Virus Disease - in midst of outbreak	Enugu State, Nigeria	pre-post study design (immediately after training); 59 Voluntary health advisors(VHAs	VHAs are lay, trusted community members who volunteer their time to be trained by the program and act as their community source for health information. This is through churches or mosques but are run by government
Perry et al 2016	Ebola Virus Disease - post outbreak	West Africa (Ethopia, Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone)	Review/Commentary	All types of CHWS
Plucinski et al 2015	EVD during outbreak	Guinea	cross-sectional survey ; 219 CHWS	CHW who are required to treat malaria
Raven et al 2018	Ebola after outbreak*3-5 month	Nepal and Sierra Leon	Qualitative IDIs; 14 health workers in Nepal 25 frontline health workers in Seirra Leone	National health workers, namely doctors, nurses/midwives and health assistants, who were working in Ebola treatment centres

Reques et al 2013	EVD. Phase two of Ebola's response.	Guinea. Two rural prefectures	Descriptive cross sectional study; 24 supervisors, 22 community workers, 442 contacts	Community workers and supervisors. No further details reported.
Selvaraj et al 2018	EVD. Phase not reported clearly.	Angola, DRC, Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Uganda, Zaire, Zimbabwe	Systematic review; 94 studies from 17 different countries	CHWs, mother-and-child aides, contact tracers
Ameme et al 2016	EVD. Phase not reported clearly	Ghana	Pre- and post-test evaluation study ; 32 health workers	Frontline junior and mid-level healthcare workers including disease control officers, information officers, public health nurses and medical officers from the Ghana Health Service, and field technicians from the Veterinary Services Department of the Ministry of Agriculture
Armstrong-Mensah & Ndiaye 2018	EVD. Early and late phase but lacks clear details.	South East Asia (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Laos, Pakistan, Thailand, Vietnam), Nicaragua, Chad, Sub-Saharan Africa (Ethiopia, Mozambique, Southern Sudan, Uganda), Latin America (Brazil and Haiti). Community setting	Literature review ; 5 included studies	CHWs, village health volunteers, community health agents, community health volunteers, village health workers, and lay health visitors
Bower et al 2016	EVD (phase not reported)	Sierra Leone. Rural community health centre	Case report	Village traditional birth attendant (TBA)

Boyce et al 2019	EVD and Zika virus disease (Zika fever)	Countries and setting not reported clearly	Literature review; not clearly reported	CHWs - lay persons trained to assist in the communication or provision of health services
deVries et al 2016	EVD, Initial phase	Uganda. Rural areas	Qualitative study -FGDs and IDIs; 82	Local volunteers and local community health workers (VHTs) were recruited and trained to provide psychosocial support and built community trust and confidence.
Delamou A 2017	EVD. Post outbreak	Guinea. Public health facilities within ten rural health districts	Cross-sectional survey; 299 CHWs Nurses/health technicians - 145, midwives-70, managers-48, and physicians-36	CHWs providing maternal and child health services, who were employed in health centres/posts, and from district and regional level maternities
Dickmann et al 2018	EVD. Initial and late phase; however, was lacking more details	Uganda. Training was attended by participants from Uganda, Burundi, Zambia, Mali, DR Congo, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Ghana, and Tanzania.	Pre- and post-test study with 100 trainers	A mix of health professionals, community leaders, religious leaders, and traditional healers
Englert et al 2019	EVD. Post outbreak	Uganda. Rural areas	Qualitative study; n=4	Nurse aides/nurse assistants
Hemingway-Foday et al 2020	EVD. Late phase, Post outbreak	Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Rural area that is heavily forested	Descriptive surveillance study; 98 CHWs	CHWs were trained to support case finding and contact monitoring activities.

Nassar et al 2014	H1N1 epidemic	USA. Urban community free-standing birth center	Randomised controlled trial (RCT) 50 pregnant females; Daily-automated call group (n = 26) health information group (n = 24)	CHWs. No further details provided
Wurie et al 2016	EVD. Post outbreak	Sierra Leone. Hard to reach areas, and urban and rural health facilities.	Qualitative study- in-depth interviews ; 23 health workers	CHWs and community health officers (CHOs)
Witter et al 2017	EVD. Post outbreak	Sierra Leone, northern Uganda, Zimbabwe, and Cambodia. Urban and rural environments	Qualitative study -IDIs; Cambodia- 19 health workers Sierra Leone-23 Uganda-26 Zimbabwe-35	CHWs, nurse aids
WHO 2020	COVID-19. During outbreak	Global. Public health care facilities	Guideline report	CHWs
Bolkan et al 2014	Ebola- during pandemic	Sierra Leone	Retrospective study; not reported	Community Health Officers
WHO 2014	EVD in the midst of the outbreak	Global	Guideline report	CHWs