

1 **Accessibility, inclusivity, and implementation of COVID-19 clinical management guidelines**
2 **early in the pandemic: a global survey**

3 Authors: Caitlin Pilbeam, Deborah Malden, Katherine Newell, Andrew Dagens, Kalynn Kennon, Melina
4 Michelen, Nina Gobat, Louise Sigfrid

5
6 **Caitlin Pilbeam**, Postdoctoral Researcher, DPhil, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health
7 Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK caitlin.pilbeam@phc.ox.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0001-7247-
8 7674

9 **Deborah Malden**, Early Career Research Fellow, DPhil, Nuffield Department of Population Health,
10 University of Oxford, Oxford, UK deborah.malden@trinity.ox.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0003-0567-8294

11 **Katherine Newell**, Global Health Epidemiologist, DPhil, Nuffield Department of Population Health,
12 University of Oxford, Oxford, UK katherine.newell@kellogg.ox.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0003-2303-9242

13 **Andrew Dagens**, Clinical Academic, MRCP, International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging
14 Infection Consortium (ISARIC) Global Support Centre, Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global
15 Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
16 drewdagens@doctors.org.uk, ORCID: 0000-0003-4982-6690

17 **Kalynn Kennon**, Head of Data Engineering, Infectious Diseases Data Observatory (IDDO), Centre for
18 Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford,
19 UK kalynn.kennon@ndm.ox.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0003-3531-0298

20 **Melina Michelen**, Research Assistant, MSc, International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging
21 Infection Consortium (ISARIC) Global Support Centre, Centre for Tropical Medicine and Global
22 Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
23 melina.michelen@ndm.ox.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0003-3659-7788

24 **Nina Gobat**, Senior Researcher, PhD, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences,
25 University of Oxford, Oxford, UK nina.gobat@phc.ox.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0002-1558-557X

26 **Louise Sigfrid**, Clinical Research Fellow, MD, PhD, International Severe Acute Respiratory and
27 Emerging Infection Consortium (ISARIC) Global Support Centre, Centre for Tropical Medicine and
28 Global Health, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
29 louise.sigfrid@ndm.ox.ac.uk, ORCID: 0000-0003-2764-1177

30
31
32
33
34

Corresponding author: Dr Louise Sigfrid, E-mail: louise.sigfrid@gmail.com

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

35 **Abstract**

36 **Background:** With a rapidly changing evidence base, high-quality clinical management guidelines
37 (CMGs) are key tools for aiding clinical decision making and increasing access to best available
38 evidence-based care. A rapid review of COVID-19 CMGs found that most lacked methodological
39 rigour, overlooked many at-risk populations, and had variations in treatment recommendations.
40 Furthermore, social science literature highlights the complexity of implementing guidelines in local
41 contexts where they were not developed and the resulting potential to compound health inequities.
42 The aim of this study was to evaluate access to, inclusivity of, and implementation of Covid-19 CMGs
43 in different settings.

44 **Methods:** A cross-sectional survey of clinicians worldwide from 15 June to 20 July 2020, to explore
45 access to and implementation of Covid-19 CMGs and treatment and supportive care
46 recommendations provided. Data on accessibility, inclusivity, and implementation of CMGs. were
47 analyzed by geographic location.

48 **Results:** Seventy-six clinicians, from 27 countries responded, 82% from high-income countries, 17%
49 from low-middle income countries. Most respondents reported access to Covid-19 CMG and
50 confidence in implementation of these. However, many respondents, particularly from LMICs
51 reported barriers to implementation, including limited access to treatments and equipment. Only
52 20% of respondents reported having access to CMGs covering care for children, 25% for pregnant
53 women and 50% for older adults (>65 years). Themes emerging were for CMGs to include
54 recommendations for different at-risk populations, and settings, include supportive care guidance,
55 be readily updated as evidence emerges, and CMG implementation supported by training, and
56 access to treatments recommended.

57 **Conclusion:** Our findings highlight important gaps in Covid-19 CMG development and
58 implementation challenges during a pandemic, particularly affecting different at-risk populations
59 and lower resourced settings., to improve access in evidence-based care recommendations during
60 an emergency. The findings identifies an urgent need for an improved framework for CMG

61 development, that is inclusive and adaptable to emerging evidence and considers

62 contextual implementation support, to improve access to evidence-based care globally.

63

64 **Keywords:** COVID-19, clinical management guidelines, evidence-based care, access, inclusivity,

65 implementation, equity

66

67 **Protocol registration:** <https://osf.io/5mexc/>

68 **Abstract:** 297 words

69 **Manuscript:** 2129 words

70

71 **Introduction**

72 The Covid-19 pandemic is a global health emergency, with over 120 million cases and more than 2.7
73 million deaths worldwide (as of 30 March 2021) (1). Amidst considerable uncertainty, particularly at
74 the beginning of the pandemic, clinicians looked toward national and international organisations,
75 such as the World Health Organization (WHO), for clinical management guidance. For emerging
76 infections, the main treatment early on is supportive care, such as oxygen, fluids, electrolyte balance
77 and management of complications. To this end, expert bodies have produced evidence-based
78 recommendations and clinical management guidelines (CMGs), for use by frontline clinicians.
79 Developing evidence-based CMGs is resource intensive, and past studies show that in practice, many
80 clinicians across the world may use CMGs produced by international organisations rather than local
81 CMGs. However, recommendations produced in one context may not be directly applicable to other
82 settings, with different risk factors, and available resources. (2,3)

83
84 CMGs are defined as “systematically developed statements to assist practitioner and patient
85 decisions about appropriate healthcare for specific clinical circumstances.” (4) In practice, the
86 implementation of CMGs aims to standardise best available evidence-based care and improve
87 quality, effectiveness, and outcomes (5,6). In specific cases, evidence suggests that guidelines have
88 measurable impacts on improving patient outcomes, morbidity, and mortality (7,8). However,
89 literature also highlights the complexity of guideline implementation, some studies indicating
90 disappointingly low adherence to guideline recommendations, and others highlighting how
91 guidelines may also add to inequities experienced by disadvantaged groups (9–11). To be effective
92 and context-appropriate, CMGs need to be evidence-based, accessible, high-quality, inclusive of the
93 whole population, and their recommendations applicable to local context and resources. Recent
94 studies highlight that CMGs produced during public health emergencies often fall short of the gold
95 standard of guideline development (12,13).

96

97 A rapid review of Covid-19 guidelines in the early stages of the pandemic found that these CMGs
98 were limited in their methodological rigour and lacked coverage of at-risk populations, including
99 those with lower immune response due to age, illness, or medication (2). There were also wide
100 variations in recommendations for empirical antimicrobial, antiviral, and experimental treatment.
101 The majority of Covid-19 CMGs identified were produced in upper-middle and higher income
102 countries, there were no Covid-19 CMG identified from lower income countries (LMICs) (2).

103
104 The knowledge of implementation of high consequence infectious diseases during public health
105 emergencies in different resource settings is limited. The aim of this study is to address these gaps.
106 his study is to our knowledge the first study presenting data on clinician's experience of accessibility,
107 inclusivity, and challenges in implementing Covid-19 CMGs including recommendations on
108 treatment and supportive care early in the pandemic.

109

110 **Methodology**

111 **Study design**

112 We conducted a cross-sectional survey of frontline clinicians in primary and secondary care settings
113 globally. The survey was open from 15 June to 20 July 2020.

114 The survey explored clinicians' perception and experiences, including access to and challenges in
115 implementation, of Covid-19 CMGs. Survey questions focused on clinicians' confidence and recent
116 experiences, including availability, quality, inclusivity, and implementation of Covid-19 CMGs.

117

118 **Data collection**

119 The survey was developed by a multidisciplinary team of clinicians, epidemiologists, clinical and
120 social science researchers with experience in outbreak research and response.

121 Using convenience sampling, we disseminated the survey to a range of clinicians in different
122 countries via clinical networks, including the Platform for European Preparedness Against (Re-)

123 emerging Epidemics (PREPARE) (14), the International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging
124 Infection Consortium (ISARIC) (15), and through informal clinical networks, in order to capture
125 diverse experiences, priorities, and different context that may influence the use and perception of
126 different guidelines and to gain a geographically representative sample. The survey was
127 programmed onto the REDCap database (16,17), hosted at the University of Oxford, and circulated
128 as an online link with two follow-up reminders to non-responders. The survey was disseminated via
129 direct e-mails, newsletters, and social media for wide reach and inclusivity. The survey was designed
130 to be brief to facilitate uptake by frontline clinicians, during the pandemic (Supplemental File 1).

131

132 **Data analysis**

133 Most answers were structured as a seven point Likert scale response. Positive Likert scale responses
134 (either agree or strongly agree) were coded as 1, and non-responses or negative responses (neither
135 agree nor disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree) were coded as 0. Dichotomous responses of yes
136 or no were coded as 1 or 0, respectively. Proportions were calculated whereby a total acceptability
137 score was estimated as a percentage of interviewees providing a positive response (18). All analysis
138 was conducted in R version 3.4.2. The data is presented in a narrative form. Income classifications
139 are based on World Bank income brackets (19).

140

141 **Public and Patient Involvement**

142 This study is part of a wider project to assess availability, quality, and inclusivity of CMGs for high
143 consequence infectious diseases, including systematic reviews of Covid-19 CMGs. The study
144 protocols and interpretations of the findings have been informed by patient groups.

145

146

147

148

149 **Ethics**

150 Responses were anonymized, all participants consented to sharing of their anonymized data. This
151 research was performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and was given an exemption
152 from ethical review by the Oxford Tropical Research Ethics Committee (OXTREC) on 16 April 2020.

153

154 **Results**

155 Of the 76 respondents (51% male), caring for patients in 27 different countries, across six continents
156 (Fig.1), most were doctors and 87% worked in a hospital, of which 18% worked in an intensive care
157 unit (Table 1). Fifty-three percent of respondents reported having taken on more responsibility
158 during the pandemic and 40% that they had to work in a different clinical role to support the Covid-
159 19 response, with most supporting Covid-19 care, with some supporting research, public health or
160 diagnostics, and 20% reported stepping up into a more senior clinical role.

161

162 **Accessibility and implementation of CMGs**

163 Most of the respondents (67%) reported having used a Covid-19 CMG to guide clinical decision-
164 making within the last two weeks. A majority of the respondents, 87% (44/51) used a local or
165 national CMG, and 27% (14/51) also the WHO CMG to guide clinical decision making. About a third
166 (38%, 27/73) reported a need for additional or updated CMGs, particularly for critically ill people in
167 hospital (96%), people treated at home (73%), children and for pregnant women. Just over half
168 (57%, 40/70) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they had received sufficient training in
169 caring for Covid-19 patients and 77% (43/65) that they felt confident in implementing the
170 recommendations in the available Covid-19 CMGs, but only 58% (41/71) to having access to the
171 treatment and equipment needed to implement the recommendations. This proportion was higher
172 amongst respondents based in LMICs, reporting limited access to oxygen, ventilators, observational,
173 specimen collection and personal protective equipment (Fig 3).

174

175 **Inclusivity of CMGs**

176 The responses show good access to CMGs providing recommendations for adults, but limited access
177 to evidence-based recommendations for other risk groups, with only 20% (15/76) of respondents
178 reporting having access to CMGs that covered guidance on treatment decisions for children, 25% for
179 pregnant women, 32% for people who are immunosuppressed and 50% for older adults (>65) years
180 presenting with suspected or confirmed COVID-19. None of the respondents from LMIC reported
181 having access to CMGs for care of children or pregnant women with Covid-19 (Fig.4).

182

183 **Recommendations on improvements of CMG development**

184 Themes that were identified from the respondents were a need to harmonize international CMG
185 development, to use resources effectively, minimize guidelines variations, and during uncertainty
186 and limited evidence, formulate recommendations through international consensus. Guideline
187 transparency was recommended, highlighting where the evidence base is limited or uncertain.

188 Many respondents called for CMGs to include recommendations for different at-risk groups, such as
189 children, and to be applicable to lower resourced settings. There were also calls for supportive care
190 and treatment recommendations to be more comprehensive, and cover follow up care.

191 Importantly, implementation of CMGs needs to be supported with sufficient training, access to
192 recommended treatment as well as personal protective equipment for staff. Moreover, to facilitate
193 implementation, CMGs should be brief and supported with clear flowcharts. Some respondents
194 reported that the available CMGs were out of date, a living guideline approach, for readily updating
195 CMGs as new evidence emerges was recommended.

196

197 **Discussion**

198 These findings highlight crucial areas for improvement when developing infectious disease CMGs for
199 emerging pathogens during public health emergencies. Our data shows that despite good access to
200 CMGs for COVID-19, there were gaps in scope, applicability and inclusivity, including limited access

201 to CMGs containing recommendations for children, pregnant women and older people. For COVID-
202 19 and other infectious diseases, these groups may present different risks regarding epidemiology,
203 severity and complications, and may present with different symptomatology, which must be
204 considered for timely identification and diagnosis and optimal management and treatment
205 strategies. Similar gaps in scope and inclusivity have been identified in systematic reviews of CMGs
206 for other viral infectious diseases. These vulnerable risk groups may be disproportionately affected
207 in health crises (20), and require care appropriate to their needs throughout the response to
208 safeguard against potentially avoidable deaths (11). Further, this survey identified that limited
209 access to evidence based recommended medical treatments and equipment was a critical barrier to
210 the implementation of available COVID-19 CMGs, especially affecting LMIC settings. This highlights
211 the discordance between guideline development, often undertaken by stakeholders in HICs (2), and
212 clinical practice in varied contexts subject to suboptimal resource availability. Further, the lack of
213 attention to considering the realities of guideline implementation, especially in low resource
214 contexts.

215
216 Our data also highlights that during an emergency frontline staff may have to task-shift, support
217 other specialties and step up to take on new responsibilities. Clinicians rely on CMGS to turn the best
218 available evidence into clinical practice to improve patient outcomes. To do so requires ready access
219 to high-quality guidelines applicable to relevant patient groups and contexts. In emergencies, where
220 time and evidence are limited, strict guideline development standards may seem inflexible and
221 unnecessary. Nevertheless, clinicians must trust that available CMGs are evidence-based, as well as
222 relevant to implementation in their local context. Our data demonstrate that directly transferring
223 CMGs between contexts, specifically those developed in HICs to LMICs, may not always be
224 appropriate or effective. The COVID-19 pandemic has generated new evidence at unprecedented
225 speed, highlighting that CMG developers need to consider tools for rapidly updating and re-
226 disseminating CMGs as new evidence emerges.

227

228 Whilst there is a definite role for leadership bodies that can widely disseminate guidelines, well-
229 resourced organisations such as WHO need to engage diverse stakeholders from different resourced
230 settings to ensure that CMGs address the needs of different risk populations. A previous study
231 showed that fewer guidelines and less locally-relevant trial evidence are produced in LMICs (3).
232 Other studies have shown that local guidelines developed in collaboration with local stakeholders
233 are more likely to be effectively implemented, as these better account for available resources,
234 specialist skills, and cultural influences; thus promoting ownership and focusing on specific
235 contextual needs (3,21). As Atkins et al. (22) put it: “Evidence does not form recommendations on its
236 own.” Guideline development requires multiple inputs beyond scientific evidence, including expert
237 opinion and previous experiences, especially for new emerging diseases like COVID-19 where
238 evidence is limited. Social science literature further emphasises the interaction of these aspects, and
239 the importance of understanding the social processes of how guideline development committees
240 with different backgrounds and priorities interact and communicate, influencing how evidence is
241 considered (23).

242

243 *De novo* guideline development is resource-intensive and all setting may not have the resources to
244 develop CMGs during a novel epidemic or pandemic, yet more adaptable approaches require
245 existing CMGs to be high-quality and up-to-date (24). Following Dagens *et al.* (2), a ‘living guidelines’
246 approach as recently adopted by WHO may better adapt to rapidly evolving emerging outbreaks
247 (25,26). This should include a flexible tiered approach, with recommendations tailored to different
248 resourced health systems, enabling sites to switch between tiers as resources becomes available or
249 depleted. Local prioritisation processes in the form of rapid research needs appraisals could also
250 identify key contextual areas to update (27,28).

251

252 Whilst the survey was disseminated widely, the response rate was limited by the ongoing pandemic
253 response. Despite these limitations, the responses represent a wide range of settings globally, and
254 identifies critical gaps and a unique cross-sectional insight into the access, inclusivity, and
255 implementation of CMGs early on during a pandemic response.

256

257 This study highlights gaps in inclusivity of and access to COVID-19 CMGs for different resourced
258 settings and populations, and challenges in implementation during an emergency. The findings
259 highlight a need for a new evidence-based framework for infectious diseases CMG development.
260 This framework should include stakeholders from different resourced settings, to ensure locally
261 relevant challenges and priorities are addressed. CMGs needs to be flexible, and adaptable to new
262 emerging evidence and situations, considering implementation support for different settings. A living
263 review framework addressing implementation facilitators were recommended. A failure to invest in
264 an updated framework for infectious disease CMG development risks widening health inequalities.

265

266 **Acknowledgments**

267 ISARIC members, PREPARE colleagues, and clinicians worldwide that responded to the survey. Dr.
268 Terrence Epie and Dr. Mais Tattan for piloting and disseminating the survey through local networks
269 in sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East. Sarah Moore, Romans Matulevics and Melina Michelen in
270 the ISARIC Global Support Centre for invaluable administrative support.

271 **Authors' contributions**

272 Conceptualisation and design of the project (LS, CP, DM, KN, NG), survey design and piloting (LS, CP,
273 DM, KN, NG), survey programming (KK), survey dissemination (KK, LS, CP, DM, KN), data analysis and
274 interpretation (LS, CP, DM, KN, KK, AD), manuscript writing (CP, LS, DM, KN, AD, MM). All authors
275 reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

276 **Funding**

277 This work was supported by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, Wellcome
278 [215091/Z/18/Z], and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation [OPP1209135]; and PREPARE funded by
279 the European Commission framework 7 [602525]. CP is funded by the UKRI/NIHR 2019-nCoV Rapid
280 Response Call (Grant No. NIHR200907). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not
281 necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care or Public Health
282 England.

283 **Availability of data and materials**

284 The full dataset generated and analysed during the current study is available from the corresponding
285 author on reasonable request.

286 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

287 All participants were given online information about the study, and the opportunity to ask questions
288 via email of the authors, before completing the survey. Informed consent was given by all
289 participants through their completion of the survey online.

290 **Consent for publication**

291 Not applicable

292 **Competing interests**

293 We declare no competing interests

294 **Funding**

295 This work was supported by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office and Wellcome
296 [215091/Z/18/Z], the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation [OPP1209135] and with the financial support
297 of the EU FP7 project PREPARE (602525). CP is funded by the UKRI/NIHR 2019-nCoV Rapid Response
298 Call (Grant No. NIHR200907). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily
299 those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care or Public Health England.

300

301

302 **Role of Funding Source**

303 The study sponsor had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation,
304 writing of the report, or the decision to submit the paper for publication.

305

306

307 **References**

- 308 1. WHO. WHO Coronavirus Dashboard: Weekly epidemiological update 16 February 2021 [cited
309 2021 Feb 17]. Available from: <https://covid19.who.int/>
- 310 2. Dagens A, Sigfrid L, Cai E, Lipworth S, Cheung V, Harris E, et al. Scope, quality, and inclusivity
311 of clinical guidelines produced early in the covid-19 pandemic: Rapid review. Vol. 369, The
312 BMJ. BMJ Publishing Group; 2020 [cited 2020 Sep 18].
- 313 3. English M, Irimu G, Nyamai R, Were F, Garner P, Opiyo N. Developing guidelines in low-
314 income and middle-income countries: Lessons from Kenya. Arch Dis Child [Internet]. 2017
315 Sep 1 [cited 2020 Oct 8];102(9):846–51.
- 316 4. Institute of Medicine. Clinical Practice Guidelines We Can Trust. In: Graham R, Mancher M,
317 Wolman D, editors. Clinical Practice Guidelines We Can Trust. National Academies Press;
318 2011 [cited 2020 Oct 9].
- 319 5. Medves J, Godfrey C, Turner C, Paterson M, Harrison M, MacKenzie L, et al. Systematic review
320 of practice guideline dissemination and implementation strategies for healthcare teams and
321 team-based practice. Vol. 8, International journal of evidence-based healthcare. John Wiley &
322 Sons, Ltd; 2010 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. 79–89.
- 323 6. Woolf SH, Grol R, Hutchinson A, Eccles M, Grimshaw J. Clinical guidelines. Potential benefits,
324 limitations, and harms of clinical guidelines Vol. 318, British Medical Journal. BMJ Publishing
325 Group; 1999 [cited 2020 Jun 22]. p. 527–30.
- 326 7. Lee JC, Rittenhouse K, Bupp K, Gross B, Rogers A, Rogers FB, et al. An analysis of Brain Trauma
327 Foundation traumatic brain injury guideline compliance and patient outcome. Injury. 2015
328 May 1;46(5):854–8.
- 329 8. Hubbard IJ, Harris D, Kilkenny MF, Faux SG, Pollack MR, Cadilhac DA. Adherence to clinical
330 guidelines improves patient outcomes in australian audit of stroke rehabilitation practice.
331 Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2012 Jun 1;93(6):965–71.
- 332 9. Fischer F, Lange K, Klose K, Greiner W, Kraemer A. Barriers and Strategies in Guideline

- 333 Implementation—A Scoping Review. *Healthcare*. 2016 Jun 29 [cited 2020 Jul 15];4(3):36.
- 334 10. Rycroft-Malone J, Seers K, Crichton N, Chandler J, Hawkes CA, Allen C, et al. A pragmatic
335 cluster randomised trial evaluating three implementation interventions. *Implement Sci*. 2012
336 Aug 30 [cited 2020 Oct 15];7(1):80.
- 337 11. Mizen LAM, Macfie ML, Findlay L, Cooper SA, Melville CA. Clinical guidelines contribute to the
338 health inequities experienced by individuals with intellectual disabilities. *Implement Sci*. 2012
339 May 11 [cited 2021 Feb 18];7(1):42.
- 340 12. Norris SL, Sawin VI, Ferri M, Sastre LR, Porgo T V. Correction: An evaluation of emergency
341 guidelines issued by the World Health Organization in response to four infectious disease
342 outbreaks(*PLoS ONE* (2018)13:5 (e0198125) DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0198125). *PLoS One*.
343 2018 Aug 16 [cited 2020 Sep 28];13(8):e0202782.
- 344 13. Zhao S, Cao J, Shi Q, Wang Z, Estill J, Lu S, et al. A quality evaluation of guidelines on five
345 different viruses causing public health emergencies of international concern. *Ann Transl Med*.
346 2020 Apr [cited 2020 Sep 28];8(7):500–500.
- 347 14. Platform for European Preparedness Against (Re-) emerging Epidemics [Internet]. [cited 2020
348 Nov 13]. Available from: <https://www.prepare-europe.eu/>
- 349 15. International Severe Acute Respiratory and Emerging Infection Consortium [cited 2020 Nov
350 13]. Available from: <https://isaric.org/>
- 351 16. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data
352 capture (REDCap)-A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing
353 translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009 Apr 1;42(2):377–81.
- 354 17. Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliott V, Fernandez M, O’Neal L, et al. The REDCap consortium:
355 Building an international community of software platform partners. Vol. 95, *Journal of*
356 *Biomedical Informatics*. Academic Press Inc.; 2019. p. 103208.
- 357 18. Pinket AS, Van Lippevelde W, De Bourdeaudhuij I, Deforche B, Cardon G, Androustos O, et al.
358 Effect and process evaluation of a cluster randomized control trial on water intake and


- 359 beverage consumption in preschoolers from six European countries: The ToyBox-study. PLoS
360 One. 2016 Apr 1 [cited 2020 Oct 15];11(4).
- 361 19. World Bank. World Bank Country and Lending Groups. World Bank Data Help Desk. 2020
362 [cited 2020 Nov 13]. Available from:
363 [https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)
364 [and-lending-groups](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)
- 365 20. Marmot M. Social determinants of health inequalities. Lancet 2005 Mar 19 [cited 2021 Feb
366 18];365(9464):1099–104.
- 367 21. Olayemi E, Asare E V., Benneh-Akwasi Kuma AA. Guidelines in lower-middle income
368 countries. Vol. 177, British Journal of Haematology. 2017 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. 846–54.
- 369 22. Atkins L, Smith JA, Kelly MP, Michie S. The process of developing evidence-based guidance in
370 medicine and public health: A qualitative study of views from the inside. Implement Sci. 2013
371 Sep 4 [cited 2020 Oct 8];8(1):101.
- 372 23. Chartres N, Grundy Q, Parker LM, Bero LA. “It’s Not Smooth Sailing”: Bridging the Gap
373 Between Methods and Content Expertise in Public Health Guideline Development. Int J Heal
374 Policy Manag. 2020 Aug 1 [cited 2020 Oct 8];9(8):335–43.
- 375 24. McCaul M, Clarke M, Bruijns SR, Hodkinson PW, de Waal B, Pigoga J, et al. Global emergency
376 care clinical practice guidelines: A landscape analysis. African J Emerg Med. 2018 Dec
377 1;8(4):158–63.
- 378 25. Akl EA, Meerpohl JJ, Elliott J, Kahale LA, Schünemann HJ, Agoritsas T, et al. Living systematic
379 reviews: 4. Living guideline recommendations [Internet]. Vol. 91, Journal of Clinical
380 Epidemiology. 2017 [cited 2020 Sep 28]. p. 47–53.
381 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28911999/>
- 382 26. Vogel JP, Dowswell T, Lewin S, Bonet M, Hampson L, Kellie F, et al. Developing and applying a
383 “living guidelines” approach to WHO recommendations on maternal and perinatal health.
384 BMJ Glob Health 2019 Aug 1 [cited 2020 Jul 15];4(4):1683.

- 385 27. El-Harakeh A, Lotfi T, Ahmad A, Morsi RZ, Fadlallah R, Bou-Karroum L, et al. The
386 implementation of prioritization exercises in the development and update of health practice
387 guidelines: A scoping review. PLoS One. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 8];15(3):
388 /pmc/articles/PMC7083273/?report=abstract
- 389 28. Sigfrid L, Moore C, Salam AP, Maayan N, Hamel C, Garritty C, et al. A rapid research needs
390 appraisal methodology to identify evidence gaps to inform clinical research priorities in
391 response to outbreaks - Results from the Lassa fever pilot. BMC Med 2019 Jun 11 [cited 2020
392 Nov 13];17(1):1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-019-1338-1>
- 393
394
395

396 **Figure 1. Geographic distribution of survey respondents**

397 The map shows the number of respondents by country

398




400 **Table 1: Characteristics of survey respondents**

Characteristics	Responses n (%)
Gender	
Male	39 (51.3)
Female	35 (46.1)
Not stated	1 (1.3)
<i>Missing</i>	1 (1.3)
Age (years)	
25-34	8 (10.5)
35-44	23 (30.3)
45-54	27 (35.5)
55-64	15 (19.7)
65-70	3 (3.9)
Profession	
Senior medical doctor	50 (65.8)
Junior medical doctor	6 (7.9)
Nurse	6 (7.9)
Other (undefined)	11 (14.6)
Region	
East Asia and Pacific	6 (7.9)
Europe and Central Asia	55 (72.4)
Latin America and Caribbean	1 (1.3)
Middle East and North Africa	1 (1.3)
South Asia	2 (2.6)
Sub-Saharan Africa	3 (3.9)
North America	7 (9.2)
<i>Missing</i>	1 (1.3)
Setting	
ICU setting	14 (18.4)
Other hospital setting	52 (68.4)
Primary care	6 (7.9)
Other healthcare service	2 (2.6)
<i>Missing</i>	2 (2.6)

401

Figure 2. Accessibility, quality, and implementation of COVID-19 clinical management guidelines by setting



Abbreviations: CMGs: Clinical management guidelines

Figure 3. Access to treatment and equipment for Covid-19 clinical care

The figure presents the proportions of respondents reporting different level of access to Covid-19 treatment and equipment at their site.





Figure 4. Access to recommendations for different at-risk populations

The proportion of respondents reporting that the available Covid-19 CMGs includes evidence-based treatment recommendations for different at-risk populations by different resourced settings.



Abbreviations: CMGs: Clinical management guidelines; LMICS: low-middle income countries, HICs: high income countries

Supplemental file 1. Covid-19 CMG Survey

Variable	Format options
Age	Range: 18 – 24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, 65 - 70, >70 , Prefer not to say
Gender	Female, Male, Non-binary, Prefer not to say
Country of work (if more than one, select the one currently/mainly working in)	
Job role	Healthcare assistant, Nurse, Paramedic, Senior medical doctor, junior medical doctor, Other (specify)
Type of specialty (specify):	
Type of healthcare service* (tick all that apply):	Primary care, Hospital, Accident and Emergency Unit, Intensive care unit, Rehabilitation, Palliative care unit, Care Home/Nursing Home, other: Specify:)
Are you currently or have you been working in a different clinical role in order to support the COVID-19 response?	Yes/ No If yes, please specify:
“During the COVID-19 pandemic I have been taking on a higher level of responsibility than would normally be expected of me”	Yes/No/NOT SURE
Over the past 2 weeks, have you personally provided treatment or care for patient(s) with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 infection in a clinical setting?	Yes /No / N/A

Please identify the extent to which you agree or not with the following statements:

Response option Q2-4: 7 point Likert scale: strongly disagree – disagree – somewhat disagree – neither agree nor disagree – somewhat agree – agree – strongly agree or N/A

Implementation indicators

1a. Over the past 2 weeks, I have used clinical management guidelines to guide my clinical decision-making on care and treatment to patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19. Yes / No /N/A

IF YES: Which organization developed these guidelines? (Tick all that apply)

- Local hospital
- Local public health
- National public health agency
- A Centre for Disease control (e.g. US CDC, ECDC, Africa CDC, China CDC)
- WHO
- Other organization: (please specify):

1b. In your setting, Is there a need for additional or updated clinical management guidelines to guide care and treatment decisions for people with COVID-19 patients? Yes No Not Sure. If yes, please list type of clinical guidelines needed (tick all):

- For care of people with COVID-19 in hospital
- For care of people with mild COVID-19 at home
- For care of more severely ill people with COVID-19 at home (including palliative care)
- For care of people with COVID-19 in primary care
- For care of people with COVID-19 in care homes
- For care of people with COVID-19 in ICU
- For care of children with COVID-19
- Other (specify):

2. I feel I have received sufficient training in the clinical management of patients presenting with suspected or confirmed COVID-19.

3. Over the past 2 weeks, I have felt confident in following the information provided in written guidelines to inform my clinical decision-making about providing care and treatment to patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19.

4. I can easily access the equipment and materials needed to follow recommended guidelines on treatment of patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19.

5. Over the past week, to what extent were the following materials for COVID-19 clinical management available? [Response options: not at all – limited amount – moderate amount – full amount – Not Sure - Not applicable]

- Personal protective equipment e.g. surgical masks, gloves, eye shields, goggles etc.
- Infection control materials e.g. alcohol hand wash, soap, running water, disinfectant
- Specimen/sample collection equipment – e.g. swabs
- Observation equipment e.g. temperature probe, Blood pressure (BP) cuff, Oxygen Saturation probe
- Supplementary oxygen: e.g. Nasal oxygen, Venturi mask oxygen, CPAP, HFNO, IN ITU
- Ventilators (if part of your practice), In-line suction catheters, Capability to undertake prone positioning, Neuromuscular blockade drugs, Vasopressors
- Intravenous fluids including cannulation equipment
- Medications, including antivirals if recommended and empirical antibiotics where needed
- Other

Views on guideline availability, credibility, and inclusivity

Response option Q7 – 8 and 10: 7 point Likert scale: strongly disagree – disagree – somewhat disagree – neither agree nor disagree – somewhat agree – agree – strongly agree or N/A

3. The available written or online clinical management guidelines to guide treatment decisions for patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 are easily available.
4. The available written or online clinical management guidelines to guide treatment decisions for patients with COVID-19 are evidence-based.

5. The available written clinical management guidelines to guide treatment decisions for patients with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 sufficiently address the needs of (tick all that apply) – drop down list of options:
 - a. Infants <12 months of age
 - b. Children
 - c. Pregnant women,
 - d. Older adults (over 65yrs)
 - e. Frail older adults
 - f. Those who are immunosuppressed,
 - g. Those with comorbidities,
 - h. Transient communities (e.g. traveller, migrants).

6. Please mention any other comments on how the clinical management guidelines for COVID-19 could be improved: