

1 **Strengthening government's response to COVID-19**  
2 **in Indonesia: a modified Delphi study of medical and**  
3 **health academics**

4 Yodi Mahendradhata<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Trisasi Lestari<sup>2</sup>, Riyanti Djalante<sup>3</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Health Policy and Management, Faculty of Medicine, Public Health and  
6 Nursing, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

7 <sup>2</sup>Center for Tropical Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Public Health and Nursing, Universitas  
8 Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

9 <sup>3</sup>United Nations University- Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability, Tokyo, Japan.

10 \*Corresponding Author:

11 Email: [ymahendradhata@ugm.ac.id](mailto:ymahendradhata@ugm.ac.id) (YM)

12

13

## 14 **Abstract**

15 The Indonesian government has issued various policies to control COVID-19. However,  
16 COVID-19 new cases continued to increase and there remains uncertainties as to the future  
17 trajectory. We aimed to investigate how do medical and health academics view the  
18 Indonesian government's handling of the COVID-19 and which area of health systems that  
19 need to be prioritized to improve government's response to COVID-19. We conducted a  
20 modified Delphi study adapting the COVID-19 assessment score card (COVID-SCORE) as  
21 the measurement criteria. We invited medical and health academics from ten universities  
22 across Indonesia to take part in the Delphi study. In the first round, participants were  
23 presented with 20 statements of COVID-SCORE and asked to rate their agreement with each  
24 statement using five-point Likert scale. All participants who have completed the first cycle  
25 were invited to participate in the second cycle in which they had the opportunity to revise  
26 their answer based on results of previous cycle and to rank a priority of actions to improve  
27 government response. We achieved consensus for 5 statements, majority agreements for 13  
28 statements and no consensus for 2 statements. The prioritization suggested that top priorities  
29 for improving government's response to COVID-19 in Indonesia, according to medical and  
30 health academics, encompass: (1) The authorities communicate clearly and consistently about  
31 COVID-19 and provide public health grounds for their decisions; (2) Everyone can get a free,  
32 reliable COVID-19 test quickly and receive the results promptly; (3) Contact tracing is  
33 implemented for positive cases; (4) Public health experts, government officials, and academic  
34 researchers agree on COVID-19 nomenclature and clearly explain the reasons for public  
35 health measures; and (5) Government communications target the entire diverse population.  
36 Ultimately, our study highlights the importance of strengthening health system functions

37 during the pandemic and to improve health system resilience for dealing with future public  
38 health emergencies.

## 39 **Introduction**

40 The COVID-19 pandemic is an unprecedented global crisis in the 75-year history of the  
41 United Nations [1]. As of 25 October, over 42 million COVID-19 cases and 1.1 million  
42 deaths have been reported globally [2]. Most governments had not anticipated the rapid  
43 spread of COVID-19 spread and were mostly reactive in their crisis response [3].

44 Governments' failures to suppress the epidemic is disappointing and costly. One reason for  
45 failure to prevent the spread of SARS-CoV-2 is medical populism; politicians downplaying  
46 the pandemic, promoting simplistic solutions, or popularizing their responses to crisis [4].

47 Many governments are over relying on the rapid development of a vaccine against COVID-  
48 19, while immediate priorities should go to well-tested public-health measures for controlling  
49 outbreaks [5]. Control measures must cover all health system building blocks, such as service  
50 delivery, medical products and technologies, health information systems, health workforce,  
51 financing leadership and governance [6]. COVID-19 response has clearly highlighted the  
52 need for governments to improve their outbreak response by incorporating a comprehensive  
53 health-systems approach.

54 Indonesia is the world's largest archipelago and world's fourth most populated country, with  
55 more than 260 million people; its size and diversity puts it in a challenging position that very  
56 few other countries face [7]. The first two COVID-19 cases in Indonesia were confirmed on  
57 March 1, 2020, two months after SARS-CoV-2 was first reported on December 31, 2020 in  
58 Wuhan, China [8]. The initial zero case reported by Indonesia prior to the first two confirmed  
59 cases, was questioned by many. During this period, the government did not issue any form of  
60 travel restrictions and specific quarantines of travellers coming in/coming back to Indonesia,

61 despite reports of increasing numbers of COVID-19 cases in neighbouring countries [9]. The  
62 Indonesian government only issued a travel restriction on January 27, 2020 from Hubei  
63 province, while at the same time evacuated 238 Indonesians from Wuhan.

64 After the initial and subsequent reports of infections, the Indonesian government started to  
65 realize the seriousness of the situation [9]. Still, the regulation on the large scale social  
66 distancing that restrict non-essential population mobility was only enacted a month after the  
67 first cases were reported, and subsequently implemented in the capital, Jakarta, on April 10,  
68 2020 [10]. The government has since issued various policies and actions to tackle COVID-19  
69 such as appointing general hospitals as COVID-19 Referral Hospitals [9]. However, the trend  
70 of COVID-19 new cases continued to increase. By 25 October 2020, Indonesia has reported  
71 392,934 cases and 774 deaths [2]. There remains uncertainties and concern as to the future  
72 trajectory of COVID-19 in the country [7]. The impact on Indonesia's vulnerable health  
73 system will be devastating, if COVID-19 continues the trajectory as has been observed in  
74 other countries. In the meanwhile, the economic, social, and non-COVID-19-related health  
75 system impact has already taken a great toll on Indonesia.

76 Clearly, coordinated and comprehensive actions to suppress the COVID-19 epidemic in  
77 Indonesia need to be enhanced. The government need to prioritise advice from medical and  
78 health professionals [4]. The overall aim of this study is to consolidate advises from medical  
79 and health professionals for the government to enhance COVID-19 response in Indonesia.  
80 The study objectives are twofold. First, to investigate how do medical and health academics  
81 view the government of Indonesia's handling of the COVID-19 epidemic. Second, to identify  
82 which area of health systems that need to be prioritized to improve government's response to  
83 COVID-19 and strengthen health system resilience. This manuscript describes the modified  
84 Delphi method employed to achieve the study objectives, presents consolidated assessments

85 by medical and health professionals on government's COVID-19 response, ranked priorities  
86 for improvement, and elaborates their implications.

## 87 **Materials and Methods**

### 88 **Research design**

89 We conducted a modified Delphi study to address the study objectives. The Delphi method is  
90 commonly use in developing consensual guidance on best practice and exploration of a field  
91 beyond existing knowledge and the current conceptual framework [11]. In the context of  
92 COVID-19 in Indonesia, there are ongoing debates whether the government is actually  
93 capable to control the epidemic, whether appropriate measures have been taken, is the health  
94 system responding in coordinated manner. Therefore, Delphi method is suitable to build  
95 consensus of experts on those issues.

96 We adapted the COVID-19 assessment score card (COVID-SCORE) as the measurement  
97 criteria for the modified Delphi study [5]. COVID-19 SCORE is a recently developed  
98 measurement tool that could be used to assess government accountability in managing Covid-  
99 19 epidemic or other disease outbreaks. The tool was created based on the elements of  
100 Pandemic Health System Framework, which was adapted from the WHO's health system  
101 framework [6]. The COVID-SCORE consists of twenty policy statements about improving  
102 public health communication and health literacy, facilitating robust surveillance and  
103 reporting, developing pandemic preparedness, strengthening health system, ensuring health  
104 and social equity, and ensuring comprehensive confinement and de-confinement strategies.  
105 The twenty statements from COVID-SCORE were then modified into three types of  
106 questionnaires: Likert scale survey, short comment, and ranking scale. The investigators in

107 this study reviewed the adopted statements, assessed content validity, construct validity and  
108 approved changes.

109 The adopted COVID-SCORE questionnaire was tested to six medical and health academics  
110 who are not working in the institutions participating in the study. Pilot test participants filled  
111 out the questionnaires and provided comments on face validity and clarity of statements in  
112 the end of pilot study. The questionnaire was then revised accordingly.

### 113 **Study population**

114 We adopted Cambridge Dictionary's definition of academic: a person who teaches in a  
115 college or university [12]. To be considered as participant in this study each candidate has to  
116 fulfil the following criteria: (1) Hold a master or PhD degree in public health or clinical  
117 fields, (2) A researcher or lecturer in a reputable public university, and (3) Working at least  
118 two years at the selected institution.

119 We aimed to have regional representativeness of academics in the panel. Thus, we started  
120 with purposively selecting potential universities to represent four regions of Indonesia:  
121 Sumatera, Java, Kalimantan, and Eastern Indonesia. More than half of Indonesian population  
122 reside in Java island and majority of universities are also located in Java. Thus, higher  
123 proportion of participants was allocated to universities in Java island. To ensure that  
124 respondents have the capacity and capability to participate in the survey, we asked senior  
125 lecturers to recommend a list of academics from their university.

126 The Delphi group size depend on group dynamics for arriving at consensus among experts  
127 rather than on statistical power [13]. Since Delphi method is an iterative online process, there  
128 is a high risk of non-respond participant at every phase of study. To ensure enough number of  
129 participants is available at the last stage, we recruited at least double the number of

130 participants needed at the last stage (about 30). An overview of the recruitment process is  
131 presented in **Fig 1**.

132 **Fig 1. Recruitment process for the modified Delphi study**

### 133 **Data collection**

134 We sent invitation by email to 118 academics from 10 universities in Indonesia to participate  
135 in the first round of online Delphi Survey. The email contained a short description of the  
136 background and aims of the study, the process of two cycle Delphi survey, and a link to an  
137 online questionnaire on Qualtrics Research Suite platform.

138 In the first round, participants were presented with 20 statements of COVID-SCORE and  
139 asked to rate their agreement with each statement using five-point Likert scale: (1)  
140 completely disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, and (5) completely agree. All  
141 statements were written in Bahasa Indonesia and in English. Participants could optionally add  
142 short comments or reflection relating to each statement in free text format. Participants had 7  
143 days (20 to 26 July 2020) to fill out the questionnaire. A reminder was sent two days before  
144 the due date and we extended the first cycle for one day. A total 71 academics participated in  
145 the first cycle.

146 All participants who have completed the first cycle were invited to participate in the second  
147 cycle of Delphi survey which took place between 28 July to 3 August 2020. Summary of  
148 results from the first cycle was re-administered to all participants. Analysed data reflected  
149 more objective view on each statement and provided more confident and solid direction for  
150 panel review. After reading the results, participants had a chance to revise their original  
151 responses so the end results should be closer to a satisfactory degree of consensus. All experts  
152 in the panel were kept anonymous to each other, but not to the researcher, throughout the  
153 process. Based on the result of the first cycle, participants were asked to rank priority of

154 actions to improve government response to COVID-19 pandemic. A reminder was sent two  
155 days before the due date and a final reminder was sent on the last day of data collection.  
156 Result of the second cycle was analysed and feedback to all participants a week later.

## 157 **Analysis**

158 Participant profile, i.e. age, gender, profession, and region were coded. Percentages of score  
159 for each statement were calculated. “Strong Consensus” was defined as  $\geq 95\%$  agreement in  
160 the rating of the single statements by the panellists; “consensus” was defined as agreement of  
161 75–94%, “majority agreement” was defined as agreement of 50-74%, and “no consensus”  
162 was recorded if the agreement was  $< 50\%$ . Agreement was if the panellists replied either  
163 “agree” or “strongly agree” and disagreement if “disagree” or “strongly disagree”. In the  
164 second cycle, respondent had the opportunity to revise their answer. Although it was not  
165 compulsory, the panellists also had the opportunity to provide comments on the statements or  
166 reasons for their assessment. For ranking score, each priority action will be scored according  
167 to its sum of rank. The lowest total score will be the highest priority. After completion of  
168 preliminary analysis, all experts in the panel were invited to a webinar to discuss the research  
169 brief which summarized the process and interpretation of findings from the Delphi survey.  
170 The research brief has also been shared with the National Planning Development Agency.

## 171 **Research Ethic**

172 Informed consent was required before a participant could start filling the online  
173 questionnaire. Anonymity is one of the main features that characterized this study method.  
174 Participant did not meet with each other and did not get any information about other  
175 participants involved in the study. Therefore, they can freely submit their ideas, unbiased by  
176 identities or pressures of other. All participants were coded in the analysis; thus, their opinion  
177 and comments are also anonymous to the investigators. The study was reviewed and granted

178 ethical approval by the Medical and Health Research Ethics Committee Faculty of Medicine,  
179 Public Health and Nursing Universitas Gadjah Mada/Dr. Sardjito General Hospital (Protocol  
180 ID KE/FK/0743/EC/2020).

## 181 **Results**

182 Out of 118 academics invited to participate in this study, 75 responded to the invitation. Two  
183 individuals declined to participate and three did not finish the survey. In total, 70 academics  
184 from 10 public universities completed the first cycle of online Delphi survey (response rate  
185 59%), ensuring representation from four Indonesia's regions (Sumatera: 1 university, 7  
186 participants (10.0%); Kalimantan: 1 university, 5 participants (7.1%); Eastern Indonesia: 2  
187 Universities, 16 participants (22.8%); and Java: 6 universities, 42 participants (60.0%).  
188 Gender was equally represented in this study (35 males and 35 females). Age ranged from 27  
189 to 71 years, and median 46 years. One third of participants hold a master degree (22, 31.5%)  
190 and the rest hold a doctoral degree (48, 68.5%). Most participants were from the public health  
191 field (48, 69.0%), and the rest were from clinical field (12, 16.9%), health nutrition (5, 7.0%),  
192 nursing (3, 4.2%) and biomedical science (3, 4.2%). Most participants (53, 75.7%) were not  
193 directly involved with COVID-19 response team. It was not compulsory for respondent to  
194 provide comments for each of the Likert statements, but 50 (71%) were willing to share their  
195 opinions.

196 We sent invitation to participate in the second cycle of Delphi survey to 68 respondents. Two  
197 respondents from the first cycle were excluded because they did not provide contact details. It  
198 was recorded that 58 respondents access the survey, but only 51 completed the survey (75.0%  
199 response rate). About 60% of respondent (31 individuals) revised their response to Likert  
200 scale questions and 47 (92%) proposed priority rank of actions.

201 Result of the online Delphi survey is summarized in **Table 1**. Out of 20 survey statements,  
202 we achieved consensus for 5 statements, 13 majority agreements and no consensus for 2  
203 statements. Compare to the first circle, agreement was improved for 15 statements and  
204 reduced for 4 statements. Majority of respondent agreed to 11 statements and disagreed to 9  
205 statements.

206

207 **Table 1.** Consensus on policy statements and ranked priorities

No	COVID-SCORE statements	First cycle (N: 70)				Second cycle (N: 70)				p-value	Comments				Rank		
		Agreement	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagreement	Agreement / disagreement proportion	Agreement	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagreement	Agreement / disagreement proportion		Interpretation	Significance change	Total	Positive sentiment	Negative sentiment	Mixed sentiment	Total score
1	The authorities communicate clearly and consistently about COVID-19 and provide public health grounds for their decisions.	26	10	34	48.5% disagree	24	10	36	51.4% disagree	Majority agreement	0.37	42	3	33	6	224	1
2	Government communications target the entire population in all its diversity (e.g. language, culture, education, and socioeconomic level).	20	10	40	57.1% disagree	14	8	48	68.5% disagree	Majority agreement	0.08	44	5	31	8	305	5
3	Public health experts, government officials, and academic researchers agree on COVID-19 nomenclature and clearly explain the reasons for public health measures	23	18	29	41.4% disagree	19	13	38	54.2% disagree	Majority agreement	0.07	37	6	20	11	288	4

		First cycle (N: 70)				Second cycle (N: 70)				p-value	Comments				Rank		
		Agreement	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagreement	Agreement / disagreement proportion	Agreement	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagreement	Agreement / disagreement proportion		Interpretation	Significance change	Total	Positive sentiment	Negative sentiment	Mixed sentiment	Total score
4	Everyone can get a free, reliable COVID-19 test quickly and receive the results promptly	6	10	54	77.1% disagree	7	8	55	78.6% disagree	Consensus	0.41	42	1	39	2	267	2
5	Contact tracing is implemented for positive cases	46	11	13	65.7% agree	53	9	8	75.7% agree	Consensus	0.10	37	7	24	6	279	3
6	Public health bodies maintain robust national, subnational, and local epidemiological databases, updated and reported daily	47	10	13	67.1% agree	50	11	9	71.4% agree	Majority agreement	0.29	36	10	18	8	379	8
7	There are enough qualified health workers and medical equipment (e.g. ventilators and face masks) to meet national needs	21	10	39	55.7% disagree	18	5	47	67.1% disagree	Majority agreement	0.08	35	5	30	0	354	7
8	The government can require private	50	10	10	71.4% agree	50	9	11	71.4% agree	Majority agreement	0.5	29	18	10	1	518	11

	manufacturers to produce critical equipment rapidly, if needed																
9	A pandemic preparedness team that includes public health and medical experts is coordinating the national response	40	16	14	57.1% agree	39	14	17	55.7% agree	Majority agreement	0.43	30	8	17	5	382	10
10	Infection prevention and care guidelines and protocols are comprehensive and up to date	41	21	8	58.6% agree	43	20	7	61.4% agree	Majority agreement	0.2	30	8	11	11	347	6
11	Health systems have sufficient funding and infrastructure to care for all COVID-19 patients.	13	17	40	57.1% disagree	12	13	45	64.3% disagree	Majority agreement	0.19	33	3	21	9	380	9
12	Everyone has uninterrupted access to regular health services	16	16	38	54.3% disagree	14	11	45	64.3% disagree	Majority agreement	0.11	34	4	27	3	554	13
13	Primary care services and social services are coordinating and collaborating with each other during the pandemic	25	12	23	35.7% agree	23	23	24	34.3% disagree	No consensus	0.43	30	10	16	4	562	14
14	Mental health outreach services have been expanded to meet increased demand	11	26	33	47.1% disagree	11	12	37	77,1% disagree	Consensus	0.00	28	8	19	1	760	20
15	Task-sharing, task-shifting and telehealth are being used to optimize the delivery of health care	26	20	24	52% agree	29	17	24	52.9% agree	Majority agreement	0.46	29	6	17	6	651	18

	services																
16	Appropriate measures have been taken to protect members of vulnerable groups such as the elderly, the poor, migrants, and the homeless	16	16	38	54.3% disagree	10	27	43	61.4% disagree	Majority agreement	0.19	35	5	28	2	543	12
17	COVID-19 efforts are focused on densely populated, low-resource areas	23	20	27	38.6% disagree	19	20	31	44.3% disagree	No consensus	0.25	30	8	22	0	625	16
18	Public health measures have been implemented to protect people in institutions and other confined settings	34	15	21	61.8% agree	33	10	27	55,0% agree	Majority agreement	0.22	28	8	14	6	676	19
19	The government is addressing the health and socioeconomic impacts of instituting and easing containment measures	34	25	11	77.3% agree	37	11	12	75,5% agree	Consensus	0.41	28	7	16	5	611	15
20	The government is collaborating with other countries, WHO, and other international bodies in responding to the pandemic	48	13	9	84.2% agree	49	14	7	87,5% agree	Consensus	0.30	24	11	10	3	638	17

208

209

## 210 **Statements with consensus**

211 Consensus was achieved for the following statements: (1) the government has maintained  
212 partnership with the WHO, other countries and international NGOs in responding to the  
213 pandemic (87.5% agree), (2)the government has tried to address the health and  
214 socioeconomic impact of instituting and easing containment measures (75.5% agree), (3)  
215 contact tracing is implemented for positive cases (75.7% agree); (4) everyone can get a free,  
216 reliable COVID-19 test quickly and receive the results promptly (78.6% disagree), (5) Mental  
217 health outreach services have been expanded to meet increased demand (77.1% disagree).

## 218 **Government collaboration with other countries, WHO and international** 219 **bodies**

220 Most respondent agreed that the government has maintained partnership with the WHO, other  
221 countries and international NGOs in responding to the pandemic (consensus, 87.5% agree).  
222 However, several respondents criticized that the form of partnership is not clear and lack of  
223 publication about activities that has been done for the partnership. Range of collaboration was  
224 also not broad enough, and a respondent suggest to expand the collaboration with countries in  
225 Europe or United States. It was also suggested that adaptation of international guidelines or  
226 recommendations must be adjusted to local context and availability of resources in the  
227 country.

## 228 **Contact tracing for positive cases**

229 Majority of participant agreed that contact tracing has been implemented and it ranked third  
230 on priority action recommendation (consensus, 75.7% agree). We received 37 comments on  
231 contact tracing, out of it 28 respondents expressed their concerns regarding delayed initiation,  
232 coverage of contacts screened, unclear procedure, implementation variation at local level,

233 coordination and resources needed when caseload continue to increase. There was also issue  
234 of patient honesty, and induced stigma due to staff visit to contact's house. Six respondents  
235 mentioned that contact identification and tracings were not yet done for some positive cases.

### 236 **Addressing the health and socioeconomic impacts of containment measures**

237 Half of respondents agreed that the government has tried to address the health and  
238 socioeconomic impact of instituting and easing containment measures (consensus, 75.5%  
239 agree). The respondents were aware that the government has provided incentives and  
240 financial relief for vulnerable people who are affected by the pandemic. However, several  
241 respondents criticized that the measures were more focused on social and economic impact  
242 rather than health. Several respondents also suggested that weak monitoring and easing of  
243 confinement measures has created false perception that the situation is getting better. There  
244 was no sanction for people who did not wear face mask or did not adhere to infection  
245 prevention measures when in public.

### 246 **Free, reliable COVID-19 test**

247 Almost all respondents disagreed that COVID-19 test was available for free and result can be  
248 received promptly (consensus, 78.6% disagree). Respondent acknowledge that COVID-19 test  
249 is available for free for those with COVID-19 symptoms or have immediate contact to  
250 COVID-19 patient. However, people who didn't meet the diagnostic criteria must pay for any  
251 COVID-19 tests. At the beginning of the pandemic, diagnostic kits were scarce, and many  
252 people who wanted to be tested were rejected. Local government often conducted free mass  
253 screening but only in selected area, such as market and confined settings. When people get  
254 tested, often they had to wait for days or weeks before getting the test result. There were also  
255 concerns about sensitivity and specificity of rapid tests available in many healthcare facilities.

256 Rapid test is often needed for administrative purposes, e.g. when people want to travel to  
257 another province, they need to show a rapid test result.

## 258 **Mental health outreach services**

259 Only 15% of respondents agreed that mental health outreach service was expanded during the  
260 pandemic (consensus, 77.1% disagree). Majority of respondent comments that they were not  
261 aware if such service is existing. However, many of respondent agreed that mental health  
262 outreach service is needed and should be expanded to reach people in high risk of suffering  
263 from mental illness due to the crisis. Information about availability of mental health service  
264 should be shared with the community.

## 265 **Statements with majority agreement**

266 Majority of respondents agreed or disagreed that: the government has tried to maintain robust  
267 epidemiological databases at national and local levels (71.4% agree), the government should  
268 involve in country private manufacturers to produce critical equipment rapidly as part of  
269 corporate social responsibility (67.1% agree), a pandemic preparedness team that includes  
270 public health and medical experts is coordinating the national response (55.7% agree);  
271 infection prevention and care guidelines and protocols are comprehensive and up to date  
272 (61.4% agree); task sharing, task shifting and telehealth are being used to optimize the  
273 delivery of health care services (52.9% agree); public health measures have been  
274 implemented to protect people in institutions and other confined settings (55.0% agree), the  
275 government has target the entire population (68.5% disagree), there were enough qualified  
276 healthcare workers and medical equipment to meet national needs (67.1% disagree), the  
277 government has communicate clearly and consistently about COVID-19 (51.4% disagree),  
278 the government have enough funding and infrastructure to care for all COVID-19 patients,  
279 particularly in the long run (64.3% disagree), public health experts, government officials, and

280 academic researchers agree on COVID-19 nomenclature and has clearly explain the reason  
281 for public health measures (54.2% disagree), access to regular health services was  
282 uninterrupted (64.3% disagree), and that appropriate measures have been taken to protect  
283 members of vulnerable groups, such as the elderly, the poor, migrants, and the homeless  
284 (61.4% disagree).

### 285 **Updated and reported epidemiological databases**

286 It was acknowledged that the government has tried to maintain robust epidemiological  
287 databases at national and local levels (majority agreement, 71.4% agree). It ranked 8 on  
288 priority recommended actions. There were 36 comments on this issue which mostly indicate  
289 that epidemiological data was available and accessible. Nevertheless, respondents also  
290 highlighted the importance of accuracy, validity, accessibility, transparency, consistency,  
291 timely reporting, synchronization, utilisation, presentation and interpretation of data. It is  
292 believed that these issues have created confusion in the community and affected public trust  
293 to published epidemiological data.

### 294 **Private manufacturers roles in the pandemic**

295 Respondents generally agreed that the government should involve domestic private  
296 manufacturers to produce critical equipment rapidly as part of corporate social responsibility  
297 (majority agreement, 67.1% agree). It ranked 11 on priority recommendation action.  
298 Respondents who provided comments also indicated that the central and local government  
299 has not optimized the opportunity to collaborate with private manufacturers. The initiative to  
300 involve private sector was considered to start too late. Concern on product quality was also  
301 raised, thus guidance and supporting policy are needed to attract investors to collaborate with  
302 the government and ensure public trust to products quality. A respondent suggest that focus

303 should be put on manufacturing and expanding access to fast, efficient, accurate and  
304 affordable diagnostic tool for COVID-19.

### 305 **Pandemic preparedness team**

306 Majority of respondent agree that the pandemic preparedness team has included public health  
307 and medical experts (Majority agreement, 55.7% agree). It ranked 10 on the list of  
308 recommended action. Implementation, however, this is varied between regions, depending on  
309 local governments. Three respondents mentioned that involvement of public health experts  
310 only started a month before the survey, which was considered late. Respondents also  
311 identified public health experts who provided recommendation on personal basis and did not  
312 represent their institution. Recommendation from public health experts was not always  
313 accepted and resulted in policy that is inappropriate from public health point of view. Thus,  
314 to what extent does public health experts have been involved in the response team remains  
315 questionable. Several respondents highlighted the importance of improving coordination and  
316 collaboration of the response team with public health and medical experts, at national and  
317 local level.

### 318 **Infection prevention and care guideline**

319 Majority respondent agreed that infection prevention and care (IPC) guideline is available  
320 and updated (majority agreement, 61.4% agree). The Ministry of Health has released the 5<sup>th</sup>  
321 revision of the IPC guideline when the survey was conducted. Comments on the IPC  
322 guideline was mainly related with frequent update of the guideline, but not followed with  
323 appropriate dissemination and training of the new guideline. Various institutions and  
324 professional organizations were also releasing IPC guideline, which potentially inconsistent  
325 with the national IPC guideline. Monitoring and supervision for the IPC implementation also

326 had not existed, and in many areas, materials needed for infection control was scarce. All of  
327 these led to diverse application of IPC guideline in the field.

### 328 **Task sharing, task shifting, and telehealth**

329 Less than half of respondent agreed that task-sharing, task-shifting and telehealth were used  
330 in healthcare services (majority agreement, 52.9% agree). In many health facilities,  
331 particularly private health facilities, telehealth has been used for some time. However,  
332 respondents were concerned that policy to guide the implementation of a wide range of  
333 telehealth services in the country was not available. Reporting and recording of patient case  
334 using telehealth system was not standardized, and resources to run telehealth was not  
335 available in many areas, particularly in rural area. Payment for telehealth services was also  
336 another issue that need to be discussed by policy makers. While telehealth is generally  
337 understood, several respondents commented that task-sharing and task-shifting were not well  
338 implemented and rarely discussed.

### 339 **Protection of people in institutions and other confined settings**

340 Almost half of respondent agreed that public health measures have been implemented to  
341 protect people in institutions or other confined settings (majority agreement, 55.0% agree).  
342 Local government has published policy to guide people who work from office or other  
343 working places. Intervention includes mandatory face mask, social distancing, and hand  
344 washing. Several respondents mentioned that protection of people in institutions is depend on  
345 institutions policy, and implementation was varied. There was no evaluation whether the  
346 policy is implemented or not and there was no sanction for breaking the rules. One  
347 respondent highlights the importance of adjusting ventilation system to ensure safe air  
348 circulation in a building.

## 349 **Communication of COVID-19**

350 Half of respondent disagreed that the government has communicated clearly and consistently  
351 about COVID-19 (majority agreement, 51.4% disagree). Respondents acknowledged that the  
352 government has used various communication channel to provide information on COVID-19  
353 to community. There are several official websites providing updated daily caseload data,  
354 policy and recommendations and become the main source of information. However, many  
355 respondents criticized inconsistencies of information, particularly in the early pandemic  
356 phase. There were ministries and institutions provided conflicting information and create  
357 confusion in the community. Information were often unclear, ambiguous and public health  
358 background of policy decisions was often not explained. All of these lead to various  
359 interpretation and confusion, even among highly educated people. Presentation of data was  
360 monotone and didn't show a sense of urgency. Lack of coordination in the delivery of  
361 information was also felt. A respondent suggested that government need to create innovation  
362 in their way of delivering information, to ensure its rapid distribution to the whole population.  
363 Since the establishment of national response team, communication has been getting more  
364 coordinated, clearer and more consistent.

## 365 **Communications target the entire population in all its diversity**

366 Most respondent did not agree that the government has targeted the entire population  
367 (majority agreement, 68.5% disagree). Other than the fact that Indonesia is the largest  
368 archipelagic country in the world with hundreds of tribes and languages, respondents also  
369 raised the importance to deliver information to the poor and disable. Health campaign has  
370 been produced by various institutions, and several campaigns have been made using local  
371 language. Respondents suggested that language use for the campaigns should be  
372 understandable by people with low literacy and adapting local wisdom. Use of internet and

373 social media to share information has discriminated population living in rural without access  
374 to internet or television. Some respondents also doubted that flow of information has reached  
375 the lowest level of community group (the neighbourhood or RT/RW). There was a concern  
376 that information only reached those with direct link to the response team. Thus, it is  
377 important to involve community or religious leader in delivering information.

### 378 **COVID-19 nomenclature**

379 More than half of respondent disagreed that public health experts, government officials, and  
380 academic researchers agreed on COVID-19 nomenclature and has clearly explained the  
381 reason for public health measures (majority agreement, 54.2% disagree). Respondents  
382 commented that many people did not understand the nomenclature, regarding the different  
383 terms, people without symptoms (OTG), people in surveillance (ODP) and patient on  
384 surveillance (PDP), and what level of surveillance entails for each category. This issue was  
385 not only faced by the community, but also by officials who worked directly for COVID-19.  
386 Another confusion started when the nomenclatures and definitions were updated into eight  
387 new terms in mid-July. There were also issue regarding terms use for infection control,  
388 disease transmission and treatment. The government need to create a strategy to effectively  
389 informed the community about the updated nomenclature and their use.

### 390 **Availability of qualified health workers and medical equipment**

391 Majority of respondent disagreed that there were enough qualified healthcare workers and  
392 medical equipment to meet national needs (majority agreement, 67.1% disagree). In every  
393 part of the country, medical personal protective equipment was still so scarce and price is  
394 skyrocketing after months of COVID-19. With increasing number of cases, hospital beds and  
395 ventilators will not be enough. The shortage of PPE and medical equipment is more  
396 pronounced outside Java, where more hospitals located in rural areas. Increasing number of

397 infected health workers is concerning, especially when case load is also increasing. In  
398 previous outbreaks, there were special hospitals assigned to manage cases. Thus, many  
399 hospitals were not prepared to handle infectious disease pandemic. Many healthcare workers  
400 were not appropriately trained and competent to handle infectious disease patient.

#### 401 **Funding and infrastructure for COVID-19**

402 Majority of respondent disagreed that the government have enough funding and infrastructure  
403 to care for all COVID-19 patients, particularly in the long run (majority agreement, 64.3%  
404 disagree). Several respondents commented that funding is available and that the government  
405 has tried to fulfil the need for health infrastructure, but the use of fund was hampered by  
406 bureaucracy. Delays in the payment of hazard incentives for frontline healthcare workers  
407 hints that the procedure to release the funds is still complicated.

#### 408 **Access to regular health services**

409 Majority of respondent disagreed that access to regular health services was uninterrupted  
410 (majority agreement, 64.3% disagree). During the pandemic, many healthcare facilities  
411 limited their services, such as by reducing opening hours, reducing daily patient quota,  
412 postponing elective surgery, and lengthening the interval of follow up visit for chronic  
413 disease patient. On the other hand, many people were afraid to visit healthcare facilities for  
414 fear of exposure COVID-19 cases and stigma associated with COVID-19. Several  
415 respondents commented that access to healthcare was available as usual, but the community  
416 was not well informed about it.

#### 417 **Protection of vulnerable groups**

418 Only ten respondents agreed that appropriate measures have been taken to protect members  
419 of vulnerable groups, such as the elderly, the poor, migrants, and the homeless (majority

420 agreement, 61.4% disagree). The government have released financial incentives for the poor  
421 and encourage elderly people and young children to stay at home. Many non-governmental  
422 organizations and philanthropic raise funds to support those affected by the COVID-19  
423 pandemic, including the poor, elderly, as well as frontline healthcare worker. But many  
424 respondents commented that specific intervention or campaign targeting vulnerable  
425 population is still inadequate and can be optimized.

#### 426 **Statements with no consensus**

427 There was no consensus on whether primary care services and social services are  
428 coordinating and collaborating with each other during the pandemic and whether COVID-19  
429 efforts are focused on densely populated, low-resource areas.

#### 430 **COVID-19 efforts on densely populated, low resource area**

431 Almost half of respondent disagreed that COVID-19 efforts are focused on densely  
432 populated, low resource area (no consensus, 44.3% disagree, 27.1% agree). Many  
433 respondents were not aware if the government has been focusing the efforts on this specific  
434 population. However, many agreed to this recommendation due to high risk of transmission  
435 in such setting. Implementation of this recommendation will depend on the local government  
436 decision.

#### 437 **Coordination and collaboration of primary care services and social 438 services.**

439 Only one third of respondent agreed that there were coordination and collaboration between  
440 primary care services and social services (no consensus, 34.3 disagree, 32.8% agree). Many  
441 NGOs are actively involved in the COVID-19 response and primary healthcare facilities  
442 usually collaborate with social services in their coverage area. However, several respondent

443 commented that the role of primary healthcare and social services can be optimized through  
444 better coordination and collaboration. The local government plays important role in building  
445 this collaboration, as shown in several provinces.

## 446 **Discussion**

447 Our study highlighted consensus among Indonesian medical and health academics in regard  
448 to that: (1) the government has maintained partnership with the WHO, other countries and  
449 international NGOs in responding to the pandemic; (2) the government has tried to address  
450 the health and socioeconomic impact of instituting and easing containment measures; (3)  
451 contact tracing has been implemented for positive cases ; (4) Not everyone can get a free,  
452 reliable COVID-19 test quickly and receive the results promptly; and (5) Mental health  
453 outreach services have not been expanded to meet increased demand.

454 Our findings accordingly highlighted that the top priorities for improving government's  
455 response to COVID-19 in Indonesia encompass: (1) The authorities communicate clearly and  
456 consistently about COVID-19 and provide public health grounds for their decisions; (2)  
457 Everyone can get a free, reliable COVID-19 test quickly and receive the results promptly; (3)  
458 Contact tracing is implemented for positive cases; (4) Public health experts, government  
459 officials, and academic researchers agree on COVID-19 nomenclature and clearly explain the  
460 reasons for public health measures; and (5) Government communications target the entire  
461 population in all its diversity (e.g. language, culture, education, and socioeconomic level).  
462 These recommendations are discussed in more details in the following paragraphs.

463 **Communication** is considered to be critical for effective government response by our Delphi  
464 study participants, highlighting three communications goals within the top five priorities  
465 (Priority rank 1;4 and; 5). There have been numerous government communication problems  
466 that have occurred across multiple countries, including Indonesia [14]. Ineffective risk

467 communication for instance clearly impeded the emergency response in Wuhan’s outbreak  
468 management [15]. The Wuhan government did not integrate scientific risk communication  
469 into policy decision, the local government even delayed reporting and handled the  
470 information publicity in an ambiguous way which diminished public perception associated  
471 with COVID-19, and the government failed to manage uncertainty and different levels of risk  
472 perception of COVID-19. Communication discordance not only signifies the failure of  
473 governmental systems, which greatly diminishes public trust in the government but also  
474 considerably increases public confusion and fear about COVID-19 risks [14]. It has often  
475 been challenging for the public to differentiate between evidence-based and less scientifically  
476 reliable information during the COVID-19 pandemic, partly due to poor communication by  
477 government officials [16]. Failure by governments to communicate effectively can seriously  
478 undermine their responses to COVID-19.

479 Arguably, Indonesia and many other countries have paid high costs due to COVID-19,  
480 which could have been prevented and addressed much more effectively if governments had  
481 more responsive and strategic risk communication [14]. Communication is a substantial  
482 action, not just a precursor to an action [17]. Policy makers should cautiously consider the  
483 quality of information circulated through private sources and social networks [18].  
484 Furthermore, when disseminating crucial health information, a variety of information sources  
485 should be used to ensure that heterogenous populations have timely access to essential  
486 knowledge. Governments thus need to improve their efforts on disseminating information on  
487 the pandemic, as well as employ strategies for improved communication management to  
488 citizens through social media as well as mainstream information sources [19]. As the  
489 epidemic evolves, merely sharing situation updates and policies may be inadequate to capture  
490 public attention [20]. Thus, governments should adopt a more inclusive and empathic  
491 communication style to address public concerns. Consistent, credible and targeted

492 communication is critical in encouraging people to comply to COVID-19 control measures  
493 [16].

494 Our Delphi participants also emphasized the importance of **enhancing testing and contact**  
495 **tracing**. A test, trace and isolate strategy remains the most effective method of controlling the  
496 COVID-19 outbreak, until an effective vaccine has been developed [21]. The participants  
497 accordingly suggested that government should prioritize efforts to ensure that everyone can  
498 get a free, reliable COVID-19 test quickly and receive the results promptly. Timely and  
499 accurate laboratory testing is evidently essential to manage the COVID-19 pandemic [22].  
500 Serological tests have the main shortcoming of a late positivity during the disease course,  
501 although attractive due to their lower cost and ease of implementation [22]. Many questions  
502 remain unanswered regarding the role of serological testing in COVID-19 diagnosis and  
503 monitoring. Reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) thus remains the  
504 gold-standard for SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis, but several operational issues significantly limit  
505 the test use. Indonesia has been facing a hard time to rapidly scale-up laboratory capacity for  
506 RT-PCR [23]. Although the number of reference lab increases, the daily number of testing  
507 results remains fluctuated and unstable. This reflects operational challenges such as:  
508 readiness and capacity between labs; availability of swab collection officers; availability of  
509 reagents in the lab; rules for lab officers and swab collection officers; and transportation for a  
510 specimen from health facility to the referral lab.

511 In complement to enhancing testing, **contact tracing** for all positive cases should be a top  
512 priority for the Indonesian government, according to medical and health academics. Contact  
513 tracing prevent transmission of infectious diseases by identifying, assessing and managing  
514 people who have been in close contact with an infected individual [20]. A recent  
515 mathematical modelling exercise highlighted that contact tracing is a key component of the  
516 most rational scenario to control COVID-19 in Indonesia [24]. Another modelling exercise

517 estimated that a high proportion of contacts need to be successfully traced to ensure an  
518 effective reproduction number lower than 1 in the absence of other measures [25]. Combined  
519 with moderate physical distancing measures, contact tracing and self-isolation would be more  
520 likely to achieve control of SARS-CoV-2 transmission. Contact tracing has been used  
521 extensively in previous emerging infectious disease outbreaks [26]. Recent studies suggested  
522 that the effectiveness of contact tracing could also be enhanced through app-based digital  
523 tracing [27]. The effectiveness of contact tracing and the extent of resources required to  
524 implement it successfully will ultimately depend on the social interactions within a  
525 population [28]. A recent review suggest that COVID-19 contact tracing systems could be  
526 facilitated by: clear communication about contact tracing; involvement of stakeholders in the  
527 development of contact tracing systems, particularly, digital applications; evaluation and  
528 quality assurance of the contact tracing system [21].

529 The key strength of this work was the ability to achieve consensus relating to government's  
530 response to an ongoing pandemic from a considerable number of participants from multiple  
531 geographical regions across Indonesia. The process was done in the middle of a global  
532 pandemic over a relatively short period of time (six weeks), without the ability to hold face-  
533 to-face meetings.

534 Notwithstanding, our Delphi process had key limitations. Firstly, the scope of the work  
535 precluded inclusion of academics beyond medicine and health (e.g. economics, public policy,  
536 public administration) and non-academics (e.g. public health practitioners, clinical  
537 practitioners, policy makers, community leaders) in the process. Seeking opinions from a  
538 broader category of participants, would have been preferable had time and the need to ensure  
539 expertise of participants not been such pressing factors. Secondly, the statements assessed  
540 here were all developed based on expert opinions [5]. As the output and recommendations  
541 from a Delphi process can only be as robust as the statements that are assessed, higher levels

542 of evidence and further experiences should be incorporated as they become available to  
543 ensure that the recommendations remains relevant.

## 544 **Conclusions**

545 The COVID-19 pandemic has caused a global crisis that may endure for more than a year  
546 [29]. Citizens look to governments for leadership and credible information [30]. Pressure on  
547 governments to act decisively is enormous. To revamp COVID-19 response in Indonesia, the  
548 government urgently need to strengthen capacity to communicate clearly and consistently,  
549 based on commonly agreed COVID-19 nomenclature and target the entire diverse population.  
550 The government also need to ensure universal access to reliable COVID-19 test by expanding  
551 lab infrastructure and facilitating operational readiness. Finally, the government need to boost  
552 contact tracing implementation capacity and facilitate contact tracing for all positive cases,  
553 adopting tested innovative strategies (e.g. digital apps).

554 The recommendations from this Delphi study were primarily intended for the Indonesian  
555 government. Notwithstanding, governments of other countries may also benefit from this  
556 study by considering conducting similar exercise, utilizing modified Delphi method for  
557 rapidly assessing their response to COVID-19. Ultimately, our study highlights the  
558 importance of strengthening health system functions during the pandemic and to improve  
559 health system resilience for dealing with future public health emergencies.

## 560 **Acknowledgements**

561 We would like to thank Ari Probandari, Bagoes Widjanarko, Chatarina Umbul Wahyuni,  
562 Dewi Susanna, I Wayan Gede Artawan Eka Putra, Mohammad Bakhriansyah, Rahayu Lubis,  
563 Sukri Palutturi, and Trevino Pakasi for their contribution to identify and recommend the  
564 potential participants for the modified Delphi study.

## 565 **Author Contributions**

566 **Conceptualization:** Yodi Mahendradhata, Trisasi Lestari, Riyanti Djalante

567 **Formal analysis:** Trisasi Lestari

568 **Methodology:** Yodi Mahendradhara, Trisasi Lestari

569 **Investigation:** Yodi Mahendradhata, Trisasi lestari

570 **Supervision:** Riyanti Djalante

571 **Writing – Original Draft:** Yodi Mahendradhata, Trisasi Lestari

572 **Writing – review & editing:** Riyanti Djalante

573

## 574 **References**

- 575 1. United Nations. Shared responsibility, global solidarity: Responding to the socio-  
576 economic impacts of COVID19. New York: UN; 2020 [cited 2020 Nov 4]. Available  
577 from: [https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-03/SG-Report-Socio-Economic-](https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-03/SG-Report-Socio-Economic-Impact-of-Covid19.pdf)  
578 [Impact-of-Covid19.pdf](https://unsdg.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-03/SG-Report-Socio-Economic-Impact-of-Covid19.pdf)
- 579 2. WHO. COVID-19 Weekly Epidemiological Update – 27 October 2020. Geneva: WHO;  
580 2020.
- 581 3. Pak A, Adegboye OA, Adekunle AI, Rahman KM, McBryde ES, Eisen DP (2020).  
582 Economic Consequences of the COVID-19 Outbreak: the Need for Epidemic  
583 Preparedness. Front Public Health. 2020 May 29; 8: 241. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2020.00241
- 584 4. The Lancet COVID-19 Commissioners, Task Force Chairs, and Commission Secretariat.  
585 Lancet COVID-19 Commission Statement on the occasion of the 75th session of the UN

- 586 General Assembly. *Lancet*. 2020 10-16 October; 396(10257): 1102–1124. doi:  
587 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31927-9
- 588 5. Lazarus JV, Binagwaho A, El-Mohandes AAE, Fielding JE, Larson HJ, Plasència A,  
589 Andriukaitis V, Ratzan SC. Keeping governments accountable: the COVID-19  
590 Assessment Scorecard (COVID-SCORE). *Nat Med*. 2020 Jul;26(7):1005-1008. doi:  
591 10.1038/s41591-020-0950-0.
- 592 6. WHO. Everybody business: strengthening health systems to improve health outcomes:  
593 WHO’s framework for action. Geneva: WHO; 2007.
- 594 7. Gedela K, Januraga PP, Luis H, Wignall FS, Irwanto I. COVID-19 Lockdown in  
595 Indonesia: Greater Investment Will Be Needed to Mitigate the Impact on People Living  
596 With HIV. *Asia Pac J Public Health*. 2020 Oct 19; 1010539520962611. doi:  
597 10.1177/1010539520962611. Online ahead of print.
- 598 8. Setiawaty V, Kosasih H, Mardian Y, Ajis E, Prasetyowati EB, Siswanto, Karyana M,  
599 Sars-CoV-Reference Laboratory Ministry of Health Indonesia (2020). The Identification  
600 of First COVID-19 Cluster in Indonesia. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2020 Oct 12. doi:  
601 10.4269/ajtmh.20-0554. Online ahead of print.
- 602 9. Djalante R, Lassa J, Setiamarga D, Sudjatma A, Indrawan M, Haryanto B, et al. Review  
603 and analysis of current responses to COVID-19 in Indonesia: Period of January to March  
604 2020. *Progress in Disaster Science*. 2020; 6:1-9
- 605 10. Ariawan I, Jusril H. COVID-19 in Indonesia: Where Are We? *Acta Med Indones*. 2020  
606 Jul;52(3):193-195
- 607 11. Junger S, Payne SA, Brine J, Radbruch L, Brearley SG. Guidance on Conducting and  
608 REporting DElphi Studies (CREDES) in palliative care: Recommendations based on a  
609 methodological systematic review. *Palliat Med*. 2017;31(8):684-706.

- 610 12. Cambridge University Press [Internet]. Cambridge Dictionary. 2020 [cited 2020  
611 November 4]. Available from:  
612 <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/academic>
- 613 13. Okoli C, Pawlowski SD. The Delphi method as a research tool: an example, design  
614 considerations and applications. *Information & Management*. 2004;42(1):15-29.
- 615 14. Kim DKD, Kreps GI. An Analysis of Government Communication in the United States  
616 During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Recommendations for Effective Government Health  
617 Risk Communication. *World Medical and Health Policy*. 2020 Aug 2.  
618 [doi.org/10.1002/wmh3.363](https://doi.org/10.1002/wmh3.363)
- 619 15. Zhang L, Li H, Chen K. Effective Risk Communication for Public Health Emergency:  
620 Reflection on the COVID-19 (2019-nCoV) Outbreak in Wuhan, China. *Healthcare*  
621 (Basel). 2020 Mar; 8(1): 64. doi: 10.3390/healthcare8010064
- 622 16. Lazarus JV, Ratzan S, Palayew A, Billari FC, Binagwaho A, Kimball S, Larson HJ,  
623 Melegaro A, Rabin K, White TM, El-Mohandes A. COVID-SCORE: A global survey to  
624 assess public perceptions of government responses to COVID-19 (COVID-SCORE-10).  
625 *PLoS One*. 2020 Oct 6;15(10):e0240011. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0240011. eCollection  
626 2020. PMID: 33022023
- 627 17. Giddens A. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure, and Contradiction in*  
628 *Social Analysis*. Los Angeles: University of California Press; 1979.
- 629 18. Fridman I, Lucas N, Henke D, Zigler CK. Association Between Public Knowledge About  
630 COVID-19, Trust in Information Sources, and Adherence to Social Distancing: Cross-  
631 Sectional Survey. *JMIR Public Health Surveill*. 2020 Sep 15;6(3):e22060. doi:  
632 10.2196/22060.
- 633 19. Al-Hasan A, Yim D, Khuntia J. Citizens' Adherence to COVID-19 Mitigation  
634 Recommendations by the Government: A 3-Country Comparative Evaluation Using

- 635 Web-Based Cross-Sectional Survey Data. *J Med Internet Res.* 2020 Aug  
636 11;22(8):e20634. doi: 10.2196/20634.
- 637 20. Liao Q, Yuan J, Dong M, Yang L, Fielding R, Lam WWT. Public Engagement and  
638 Government Responsiveness in the Communications About COVID-19 During the Early  
639 Epidemic Stage in China: Infodemiology Study on Social Media Data. *J Med Internet*  
640 *Res.* 2020 May 26;22(5):e18796. doi: 10.2196/18796.
- 641 21. Megnin-Viggars O, Carter P, Melendez-Torres GJ, Weston D, Rubin GJ. Facilitators and  
642 barriers to engagement with contact tracing during infectious disease outbreaks: A rapid  
643 review of the evidence. *PLoS One.* 2020 Oct 29;15(10):e0241473. doi:  
644 10.1371/journal.pone.0241473. eCollection 2020.
- 645 22. Cota G, Freire ML, de Souza CS, Pedras MJ, Saliba JW, Faria V, et al. Diagnostic  
646 performance of commercially available COVID-19 serology tests in Brazil. *Int J Infect*  
647 *Dis.* 2020 Oct 9. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.10.008 [Epub ahead of print]
- 648 23. Sucahya PK (2020). Barriers to Covid-19 RT-PCR Testing in Indonesia: A Health Policy  
649 Perspective. *Journal of Indonesian Health Policy and Administration.* 2020 May; 5(2): 36  
650 - 42
- 651 24. Sasmita NR, Ikhwan M, Suyanto S, Chongsuvivatwong V. Optimal control on a  
652 mathematical model to pattern the progression of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19)  
653 in Indonesia
- 654 25. Kucharski AJ, Klepac P, Conlan AJK, Kissler SM, Tang ML, Fry H, et al. Effectiveness  
655 of isolation, testing, contact tracing, and physical distancing on reducing transmission of  
656 SARS-CoV-2 in different settings: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect Dis.*  
657 2020 June 16; 20: 1151–60. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(20\)30457-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30457-6)
- 658 26. Saurabh S, Prateek S. Role of contact tracing in containing the 2014 Ebola outbreak: a  
659 review. *Afr health sci.* 2017; 17(1): 225–36. pmid:29026397

- 660 27. Ferretti L, Wymant C, Kendall M, et al. Quantifying SARS-CoV-2 transmission suggests  
661 epidemic control with digital contact tracing. *Science*. 2020; 368: eabb6936.
- 662 28. Keeling MJ, Hollingsworth TD, Read JM. The efficacy of contact tracing for the  
663 containment of the 2019 novel coronavirus (COVID-19). *MedRxiv* 2020; published  
664 online Feb 17. DOI:10.1101/2020.02.14.20023036 (preprint)
- 665 29. Scudellari M. How the pandemic might play out in 2021 and beyond. *Nature*. 2020  
666 Aug;584(7819):22-25. doi: 10.1038/d41586-020-02278-5. PMID: 32760050
- 667 30. Eggers W, Flynn M, O’Leary J, Chew B. Governments’ response to COVID-19: from  
668 pandemic crisis to a better future. London: Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu; 2020.

## 669 **Supporting information**

### 670 **S1 Checklist. CREDES checklist.**

671 (Docx)

### 672 **S1 Appendix. Delphi study data**

673 (Excel)

### 674 **S2 Appendix. Delphi study code book**

675 (Docx)

676

677

678

