

# 1 Availability and Use of Mobile Health Technology for Disease Diagnosis and Treatment Support by 2 Health Workers in the Ashanti Region of Ghana: A Cross-sectional Survey

3  
4 Ernest Osei<sup>1</sup>, Kwasi Agyei<sup>3</sup>, Boikhutso Tlou<sup>1</sup>, Tivani P. Mashamba-Thompson<sup>1,2</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Discipline of Public Health Medicine, School of Nursing and Public Health, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

6 <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

7 <sup>3</sup>Spiritan University College, Kumasi, Ghana

8 **Corresponding Author:** Ernest Osei

9 **Address:** 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor of George Campbell Building, Department of Public Health Medicine, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Howard College  
10 Campus, Durban, 4001, South Africa

11 **Email address:** [ernestosei56@gmail.com](mailto:ernestosei56@gmail.com) or [218086551@stu.ukzn.ac.za](mailto:218086551@stu.ukzn.ac.za)

12 **Tel:** [+233242012953](tel:+233242012953)

13 **Email address of co-authors**

14 Kwasi Agyei ([a.kwes2@yahoo.com](mailto:a.kwes2@yahoo.com))

15 Boikhutso Tlou ([Tlou@ukzn.ac.za](mailto:Tlou@ukzn.ac.za))

16 Tivani P. Mashamba-Thompson ([tivani.mashamba-thompson@up.ac.za](mailto:tivani.mashamba-thompson@up.ac.za) or [Mashamba-Thompson@ukzn.ac.za](mailto:Mashamba-Thompson@ukzn.ac.za))

17

18

19

20

21

22

## 23 **Abstract**

24 **Background:** Mobile health (mHealth) technologies have been identified as promising strategies for improving access to healthcare delivery and  
25 patient outcomes. However, the extent of availability and use of mHealth among healthcare professionals in Ghana is not known. The main  
26 objective of this study is to determine the availability and use of mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support by health professionals in  
27 the Ashanti Region of Ghana.

28 **Methods:** A cross-sectional survey was carried out among 285 healthcare professionals across 100 primary healthcare clinics in the Ashanti  
29 Region, Ghana. We obtained data on the participants' background, available health infrastructure, healthcare workforce competency, ownership  
30 of a mobile wireless device, usefulness of mHealth, ease of use of mHealth, user satisfaction, and behavioural intention to use mHealth.  
31 Descriptive statistics were conducted to characterize healthcare professionals' demographics and clinical features. Multivariate logistic  
32 regression analysis was performed to explore the influence of the demographic factors on the availability and use of mHealth for disease  
33 diagnosis and treatment support. STATA version 15 was used to compute all the statistical analyses.

34 **Findings:** Out of the 285 healthcare professionals, 62.8% indicated that mHealth applications are available to them, while 37.2% had no access  
35 to mHealth. Of the 185 healthcare professionals who had access to mHealth, 98.4% are currently using mHealth to support healthcare delivery.  
36 Logistic regression model analysis significantly ( $p < 0.05$ ) identified factors associated with the availability and use of mHealth applications for  
37 disease diagnosis and treatment support. There was a significant association between the availability and use of mHealth for disease diagnosis  
38 and treatment support from the chi-square test analysis.

39 **Conclusion:** The findings demonstrate a low-level use of mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support by healthcare professionals at the  
40 rural primary healthcare clinics. We encourage policymakers to promote the implementation of mHealth in rural primary health clinics.

41 **Key questions**

42 **What is already known**

- 43 • Digitizing healthcare systems with mobile health technologies have been identified as essential tools for improving access to healthcare  
44 delivery in sub-Saharan Africa.  
45 • In Ghana, mobile phones and their applications' availability and utilization as of 2018 was estimated to be about 52% and is expected to  
46 increase steadily.  
47 • Ghana has given considerable attention to mobile health technologies and applications' role in transforming healthcare delivery.

48 **What are the new findings**

- 49 • The study reveals that 63% of healthcare professionals indicated that mHealth applications are available to them, while 37% do not have  
50 access to mHealth applications.  
51 • The study results illustrate that healthcare professionals primarily use mHealth applications to screen or diagnose existing many disease  
52 conditions in Ghana.  
53 • The study findings demonstrate that healthcare professionals in this part of Ghana use mHealth applications to treat HIV, TB,  
54 hypertension, diabetes, and malaria conditions.  
55 • The study results show a low-level use of mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support by healthcare professionals at  
56 the rural primary healthcare clinics.

57 **Recommendations for policy**

- 58 • Our study encourages policymakers to deliberately implement mHealth technologies and applications at rural primary health clinics to  
59 support disease diagnosis and treatment procedures of patients' conditions.  
60  
61 • Our study recommends that more primary studies be conducted focused on using mHealth interventions to treat and manage many  
62 diseases such as cancer, stroke, chronic respiratory conditions, asthma, and others in this region.  
63

- 64       • The study encourages healthcare professionals to use mHealth applications to screen or diagnose several diseases such as neglected  
65       tropical diseases to enhance early detection.  
66

67

68

69

70

71

## 72   **Introduction**

73   Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries, including Ghana, are confronted with a double burden of communicable and non-communicable diseases  
74   (1, 2). They also have weak healthcare systems, which has been exacerbated by the Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-  
75   CoV-2) pandemic (1, 3-5). In addition, poor access to healthcare due to insufficient healthcare infrastructure, poor road networks, long-distance  
76   travel to health facilities, inadequate health education, lack of financial resources, insufficiently trained health professionals, and many others  
77   also further weakens the healthcare systems (6, 7). The government of Ghana (GoG) has committed to improving the digitization of healthcare  
78   systems, training and posting many skilled health professionals to rural communities, expanding mobile networks to rural Ghana (8).

79   Digitization of healthcare systems such as mobile health (mHealth) technologies and applications have been identified as promising strategies for  
80   improving access to healthcare delivery and patient outcomes (9, 10). Mobile health technology is defined as the use of portable devices for  
81   medical purposes (11). These applications have been shown to provide a cost-effective, convenient, and broadly accessible modality to  
82   implement population-level health interventions (12). In Ghana, mobile phones' availability and utilization as of 2018 was reported to be about  
83   52% and is expected to increase steadily (13). The high rate of mobile phone penetration and its innovativeness could become a promising tool

84 to enhance healthcare provision and bridge the inequalities of healthcare accessibility (14-16). Mobile phone adoption and acceptability are  
85 disproportionately high in resource-limited settings (17). Thus, mHealth applications can address some healthcare disparities among hard-to-  
86 reach populations to help achieve universal health for all (18).

87 Studies in some low-and-middle-income countries (LMICs) have indicated that in this era of SARS-CoV-2, digital health technologies such as  
88 mHealth applications have been utilized for screening, diagnosis, risk assessment, tracking of real-time transmissions, and others in all settings  
89 (19-23). The use of mHealth applications has been shown to reduce the spread of SARS-CoV-2 and other infectious diseases in overcrowded  
90 emergency rooms and improved patient care (24-28). mHealth applications have also been deployed to support disease surveillance, medication,  
91 and treatment adherence, improve communication between clinical staff and their patients, appointment reminders, among others (29-33).

92 Despite these significant challenges and the limited resources in Ghana, mHealth interventions' potential in playing a massive transformative role  
93 in healthcare provision has received considerable attention (11, 34). Considering the prospects of mHealth applications in resource-limited  
94 settings, we conducted a cross-sectional study to determine the availability and use of mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment  
95 support by health workers in the Ashanti Region, Ghana. The research focuses on the availability of mHealth infrastructure, clinical staff  
96 competence, mHealth for diagnostics and treatment, usefulness, ease of use, user satisfaction, and behavioural intention to use mHealth  
97 applications. It is envisaged that the findings of this study will be beneficial to the GoG, donors, Non-Governmental Organizations in health,  
98 development partners, and others on improving quality healthcare provision by integrating mHealth applications into the normal clinical flow. It  
99 is also anticipated that our findings will assist the GoG and other similar settings to implement and sustain digital technologies such as mHealth  
100 to promote universal health coverage.

101


## 102 **Methods**

103 ***Study design and participants***

104 A cross-sectional survey was conducted in primary healthcare facilities in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. The researchers conducted this survey  
105 to examine the availability and use of mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support by health professionals in the Ashanti  
106 Region of Ghana. In this survey, the participants are healthcare professionals who are highly trained clinical staff such as clinicians, nurses,  
107 laboratory scientists, pharmacists, physiotherapists, radiologists, and others who have been mandated to provide healthcare services to the public.  
108 Healthcare professionals across the one hundred health facilities gave written consent to take part in this survey. Few of the participants were  
109 assisted in answering the questionnaire, while the majority answered them independently. All the participants were working in healthcare  
110 facilities in the Ashanti Region of Ghana during our survey

111 ***Study setting***

112 The Ashanti Region is located in the middle part of Ghana (Figure 1). According to the 2010 population census, the Ashanti Region has over  
113 4.70 million inhabitants with a growth rate of 2.7% and is described as Ghana's business hub (35). It is projected to reach 9.5 million inhabitants  
114 in 2040, according to the Ghana Statistical Service 2012 report (36). This region is the most populated part of Ghana and has one of the  
115 enormous numbers of healthcare facilities in the entire country (37). This region is one of the areas with a high prevalence of several  
116 communicable and non-communicable diseases in Ghana. For instance, it has the second-highest prevalence rate of non-communicable diseases  
117 such as hypertension, stroke, diabetes, cancer, and others in Ghana (38-41). However, this region is the second most populated region in Ghana,  
118 yet it has one of the lowest tuberculosis prevalence rates (42). Ashanti Region is one of Ghana's numerous areas with poor healthcare access,  
119 especially for people living in poor-resource settings. There are relatively moderate levels of accessibility to general primary healthcare;  
120 accessibility to healthcare services remains deficient in several rural districts in the Ashanti Region (43, 44). This is primarily due to the uneven  
121 distribution of healthcare facilities since most healthcare facilities are concentrated in the urban and semi-urban areas, with few rural  
122 communities (45).



123

124 **Figure 1:** Map of Ashanti Region of Ghana (46)

125

126



127 ***Sampling method***

128 We obtained a list of 530 primary healthcare facilities from the Ashanti Regional Health Directorate (RHD) of the Ghana Health Service (GHS)  
129 (37). The researchers randomly selected 100 primary healthcare facilities from all the 43 districts in the Ashanti Region. Due to many healthcare  
130 facilities across the entire region, 100 healthcare facilities were chosen to ensure comprehensive study coverage. To guarantee the uniformity of  
131 sampled primary healthcare facilities in all the 43 districts, the following approach was employed: The primary healthcare facilities were first  
132 stratified into 43 strata, and each stratum denoting a district in the region. The 530 primary healthcare facilities were then grouped into four  
133 categories: 167 health centers, 154 clinics, 180 sub-district hospitals, and 29 district hospitals. Probability proportionate to size (PPS) was then  
134 used to determine the proportion of healthcare facilities from each stratum and category with the formula:  $nh = (Nh / N) \times n$  where:  $nh$  represents  
135 the sample size for each stratum  $h$ ;  $Nh$  represents population size for each stratum  $h$ ;  $N$  representing the total population; and  $n$  denotes the total  
136 sample size. A purposive sampling technique was used to select all the district hospitals. Based on this, 29 hospitals were selected from category  
137 one, 30 clinics from category two, 28 clinics sampled from category three, and 13 chosen clinics from category four. We also used a  
138 proportionate stratification to get the total number of primary healthcare facilities selected from all the four groups in each of the 43 strata. After  
139 that, a simple random sampling technique was finally employed to select all the 100 healthcare facilities for this study (Additional file 1).

140 ***Data collection and instruments***

141 The researchers adopted the survey tool from studies conducted by Bauer et al. 2014, Bauer et al. 2017 and Abu-Dalbouch 2013 to match our  
142 study population, settings, and study aim (47-49). The cross-sectional survey tool (Additional file 2) was piloted in eight health centers and  
143 clinics in the Ashanti Region and modified to suit the local context based on the respondents' feedback. This pilot study was conducted to ensure  
144 the validity, reliability, precision of data and remove all forms of ambiguity from the survey tool. We collected data on the category of health  
145 professionals, type of facility, number of healthcare professionals, number of patients seen per week, available healthcare infrastructure,  
146 healthcare workforce competence, ownership of mobile wireless devices, the usefulness of mHealth, ease of use of mHealth applications, user

147 satisfaction, and behavioural intention to use mHealth applications. Data were surveyed and collected by the researcher and three trained  
148 research assistants.

#### 149 *Ethics*

150 This study was given full ethical clearance from the Biomedical Research Ethics Committee from the University of KwaZulu-Natal (approval  
151 reference no. BREC/00000202/2019), Ghana Health Service Ethics Review Committee (approval reference no. GHS-ERC006/11/19), regional  
152 clearance and recruitment site clearance of participants were obtained before the data collection commenced. All the study participants were  
153 given written consent forms explaining the study's objective, and each signed the informed consent forms prior to their participation.

#### 154 *Outcome measures*

155 The study focused on examining the availability of mHealth technologies for disease diagnosis and treatment support by health professionals in  
156 the Ashanti Region of Ghana. The analysis of this study examined two outcome measures.

157 The first outcome was the availability of mobile health applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support which stemmed from the  
158 question: "Are there mHealth interventions available in this facility to support healthcare delivery?" A binary response (yes/no) was captured.

159 The second outcome was the use of mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support, which stemmed from the question: "What  
160 do you use mHealth interventions for" Responses were captured on four options: find health or medical information, disease diagnosis, treat and  
161 manage disease conditions, and treat and monitor patients' health conditions.

#### 162 *Explanatory variables*

- 163 • Demographics assessed whether age, sex, categories of health professionals, type of health facility, the total number of healthcare  
164 professionals, and the number of patients who visit the facility per week influenced the availability and use of mHealth applications.

- 165 • Availability of health infrastructure assessed whether health infrastructure availability had any influence or facilitated the availability of  
166 mobile health applications for diagnostics and treatment support.
- 167 • Healthcare workforce competency assessed whether their level of knowledge influenced or facilitated the availability and use of mHealth  
168 applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support.
- 169 • Owning a mobile phone or having a mobile phone assessed whether mobile phone ownership had any influence or facilitated the use of  
170 mHealth applications for diagnostics and treatment support.
- 171 • The usefulness of mHealth applications assessed whether the benefits of mHealth applications had any influence or facilitated mHealth  
172 for diagnostics and treatment support.
- 173 • Ease of Use of mHealth applications assessed whether the easiness of using mHealth applications had any influence or facilitated  
174 mHealth for diagnostics and treatment support.
- 175 • User satisfaction of mHealth applications assessed whether the user satisfaction had any influence or facilitated mHealth for diagnostics  
176 and treatment support.
- 177 • Behavioural intention to use mHealth applications assessed whether behavioural intention to use mHealth had any influence or facilitated  
178 mHealth for diagnostics and treatment support.

179  
180  
181 ***Data Management and analysis***

182 The completed questionnaires were screened and reviewed by the principal investigator to complete and correct all discrepancies. Data were then  
183 captured into a passworded excel spreadsheet. After data cleaning and verification, the data set were then exported into STATA version 15.  
184 Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations characterize health workers' demographics and clinical

185 features. They were then presented in graphs, tables, and others. Multivariate logistic regression was employed to explore the influence of the  
186 demographic factors on the availability of mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support by healthcare workers. Again, this multivariate  
187 logistic regression was also used to explore the influence of the demographic factors on the use of mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment  
188 support by health workers. In the multivariate logistic regression model, a p-value of 0.05 was set as the statistical significance. Furthermore, the  
189 associations were examined using the odds ratio and 95% CI estimates. A Chi-square test at a significance level of a p-value of 0.05 was used to  
190 assess the relationship between the availability and the use of mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support.

## 191 **Results**

### 192 *Characteristics of the study participants*

193 This study received a 100% response rate from the healthcare professionals in the selected healthcare facilities in the region. Completed  
194 responses were from 285 participants, with 146 males (51.23%) and 139 females (48.77%). The results reveal the highest participants were from  
195 those between the ages of 31-40 years, with 48.07%, followed by those in the category of 20-30 years, with 42.11% of the responses. However,  
196 the lowest participants were from 41-50 years and 51-60 years, with 9.47% and 0.35%. A majority (28.7%) of the respondents in this survey  
197 were general nurses, while only 2.46% were midwives. The average total number of health professionals in each healthcare facility was  
198 estimated at 57.8 (95% CI: 20-98). The average number of patients per week seen by these healthcare professionals was 175.4 (95% CI: 74-372)  
199 (Table S1 supplementary material file).


### 200 *Availability of mobile health for diagnostics and treatment support in the Ashanti region*

201 Results from the frequency table (Table S 2 supplementary file) show that mobile wireless devices are available primarily to healthcare  
202 professionals with a frequency of 276 (96.84%). Mobile health applications are available with an estimated frequency of 179 (62.81%) and a  
203 non-availability frequency of 106 (37.19%). It is also clear that phone calls are the most predominant mHealth interventions utilized by

204 healthcare professionals, with an estimated frequency of 183 (98.92%). Short message service (SMS) is another mHealth intervention used by  
205 healthcare professionals with a second higher frequency of 149 (80.54%). Figure 2 illustrates the availability of the various mHealth  
206 applications. Again, simple mobile phones are readily available to healthcare professionals with an estimated frequency of 185 (100%), followed  
207 by smartphones with 133 (71.89%) and tablets with 107 (57.84%). It is also observed that there is a higher continuous supply of electric power  
208 with an estimated frequency of 149 (80.54%) and relatively high available support systems of 106 (57.30%). Furthermore, most healthcare  
209 professionals have the requisite skills for diagnostics with a high frequency of 132 (71.36%) and the competence for treatment procedures with  
210 an estimated frequency of 164 (88.65%).

211

212



213

214 **Figure 2:** Availability of the various mHealth applications

215

216 *Use of mobile health for diagnostics and treatment support in the Ashanti region*


217 The frequency table (Table S 3 supplementary material file) shows that the higher frequency rates of 182 (98.38%) indicate that many healthcare  
218 professionals are currently using mHealth applications to promote healthcare delivery. In this region, healthcare professionals use mHealth  
219 applications to support treatment procedures of diseases such as HIV (177), 95.86%, TB (171) 92.43%, hypertension 99 (53.51%), malaria 93  
220 (50.54%), and diabetes 79 (42.70%). Figure 3 demonstrates various diseases that are being treated and managed with mHealth applications.  
221 However, only a few healthcare professionals use mHealth applications to support the treatment of other conditions such as diarrhoea 17  
222 (9.19%), cancer 5 (2.70%), chronic respiratory disease 2 (1.08%), and stroke 0 (100%). Also, most healthcare professionals use mHealth  
223 applications to search for medical information 117 (63.24%), disease diagnosis 182 (98.38%), treat and manage disease conditions 162 (87.57%)  
224 and, treat and monitor patients' health conditions 144 (77.84%).

225 Most healthcare professionals agreed that mHealth applications are easy to use when providing healthcare services to their clients. Majority of  
226 them confirmed that mHealth applications are easy to use to support disease diagnosis with an estimated frequency of 262 (87.37%). Some other  
227 healthcare professionals also indicated that it is flexible to interact with mHealth applications with an estimated frequency of 273 (95.79%). The  
228 survey reveals that healthcare professionals are comfortable using mHealth to support healthcare delivery with an estimated 266 (93.33%). Also,  
229 others are very confident in using mHealth applications with an estimated frequency of 254 (89.12%). Again, some healthcare professionals are  
230 delighted with the use of mHealth applications with an estimated frequency of 218 (76.49%). Moreover, most healthcare professionals would use  
231 mHealth to treat and manage patients' disease conditions with a frequency of 254 (89.12%). Furthermore, others intend to use mHealth for  
232 disease diagnosis and treatment support with an estimated frequency of 279 (97.89%).

233

234

235



236

237 **Figure 3:** Types of diseases treated and managed with mHealth applications

238

239 ***Availability of health infrastructure and healthcare workforce competency***

240 From the multivariate logistic regression model (Table 1), the results illustrate that healthcare workers within the age group 20-30 [OR = 17.8  
241 (95% CI: 1.49-21.0)] and 31-40 [OR = 17.6 (95% CI: 1.45-21.1)] had increased odds for toll-free intervention availability when compared to  
242 healthcare workers above 40 years. Also, healthcare workers within the age group 20-30 and 31-40 had increased odds for mobile apps [OR =



243 1.46 (95% CI: 0.34-0.18)] and mHealth availability [OR = 2.93 (95% CI: 0.70-12.2)] compared to those above 40 years. Male healthcare  
244 workers had increased odds for mobile apps' availability [OR = 1.27 (95% CI: 0.53-3.04)], mobile wireless devices [OR = 1.26 (95% CI: 0.11-  
245 5.16)] and toll-free intervention [OR = 1.02 (95% CI: 0.43-2.41)] compared to female healthcare workers (Figure 4).


246 Furthermore, the results show that health professionals such as doctors and pharmacists significantly influenced the requisite skills for  
247 diagnostics and competence to use mHealth for treatment support. Doctors had increased odds for the requisite skills for diagnostics and  
248 competence to use mHealth for treatment support [OR = 1.065 (95% CI: 0.45-2.55)] and [OR = 1.153 (95% CI: 0.27-4.88)] as compared to  
249 laboratory scientists. Pharmacists had increased odds for disease diagnosis requisite skills [OR = 1.243 (95% CI: 0.56-2.71)] compared to  
250 laboratory scientists. The results also illustrate those district hospitals and health centers significantly affect the supply of power and support  
251 systems.

252 Also, district hospitals increased the odds for the supply of power and support systems [OR = 59.87 (95% CI:70.06-5117)] and [OR =159.7  
253 (95% CI: 4.51-5660)] compared to clinics. However, district hospitals had decreased odds [OR = 0.63 (95% CI: 0.11-0.35)] for the competence  
254 to use mHealth for treatment support. Health centers had increased odds for the supply of power and support systems [OR = 53.53 (95% CI:  
255 5.45-525)] and [OR =10.68 (95% CI: 1.05-108)] compared to clinics. The total number of healthcare professionals with access to smartphones  
256 [OR = 1.073 (95% CI: 1.02-1.12)] and competence to use mHealth for treatment support [OR = 1.196 (95% CI: 1.09-1.31)] had increased odds.  
257 However, the total number of healthcare workers with access to supply of power [OR = 0.907 (95% CI: 0.85-0.96)] and support systems [OR =  
258 0.948 (95% CI: 0.91-0.89)] had decreased in odds. Again, an increase in the number of patients per week increased odds for healthcare workers'  
259 competence to use mHealth for treatment support [OR = 1.019 (95% CI: 1.01-1.03)] (Supplementary figure 1).

260

261

262



263

264 **Figure 4:** Odds ratio showing the association on the availability of mobile wireless devices and mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and  
265 treatment support by health workers in Ashanti region, Ghana.

266

267

269 **Table 1:** Multivariate analysis results for the availability of health infrastructure and healthcare workforce competency

Variable		Mobile wireless devices			mHealth availability			SMS			Mobile apps			Toll-free					
		Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value			
Age	20-30 years	0.040	0.01-19.6	0.733	3.33	0.82-14.2	0.104	0.66	0.13-3.31	0.622	1.46**	0.34-6.18	0.010	17.8**	1.49-21.0	0.02			
	31-40 years	0.020	0.03-78.8	0.648	2.93**	0.70-12.2	0.010	1.49	0.29-7.68	0.632	2.21	0.51-9.64	0.287	17.6**	1.45-21.1	0.02			
	Above 40 years	1			1			1			1			1					
Sex	Male	1.260**	0.11-5.16	0.02	0.40	0.18-0.85	0.018	0.81	0.34-1.96	0.653	1.27**	0.53-3.04	0.010	1.02**	0.43-2.41	0.002			
	Female	1			1			1			1			1					
Categories of health professionals	Doctors	-			0.68	0.23-2.03	0.500	1.00	0.34-2.95	0.992	1.16	0.40-3.31	0.781	1.48	0.53-4.15	0.44			
	Nurses	6.980	0.66-73.5	0.106	0.67	0.23-1.91	0.458	1.52	0.48-4.85	0.471	0.84	0.27-2.55	0.764	0.96	0.33-2.83	0.95			
	Pharmacists	1.160	0.27-6.06	0.843	0.68	0.28-1.61	0.385	1.27	0.39-4.15	0.688	0.83	0.31-2.22	0.720	0.84	0.35-2.02	0.71			
	Laboratory Scientists	1			1			1			1			1					
Type of healthcare facility	District hospital	0.010	0.45-1.28	0.993	0.04	0.01-2.26	0.119	2.16	0.04-1.00	0.693	-	-	-	23.8	0	0.98			
	Health center	0.087	0.32-2.01	0.996	0.53	0.17-1.68	0.287	0.59	0.08-4.13	0.600	-	-	-	84.7	0	0.98			
	Clinic	1			1			1		1	1			1					
Total number of healthcare professionals		1.140	0.98-1.35	0.089	1.09**	1.03-1.17	0.004	1.01	0.97-1.07	0.470	1.16***	1.07-1.25	<0.001	1.01	0.95-1.07	0.60			
Total number of patients per week		1.070	1.02-1.13	0.004	1.02***	1.01-1.04	<0.001	0.99	0.99-1.00	0.885	1.00**	1.00-1.01	0.020	0.97***	0.96-0.98	<0.001			
Variable		Smartphones			Tablets			Supply of power			Support systems			Requisite skills			Competence to use mHealth		
		Odds ratio	95 %	p- valu	Odd s	95% CI	p- value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p- valu	Odds ratio	95 %	p- valu	Odds ratio	95 %	p- valu	Odds ratio	95 %	p- valu

			CI	e	ratio				e		CI	e		CI	e		CI	e	
<b>Age</b>	20-30 years	0.729	0.20-2.64	0.631	1.418	0.44-4.54	0.556	0.978	0.24-3.96	0.976	0.654	0.21-2.05	0.468	0.298	0.07-1.21	0.090	0.595	0.63-5.61	0.651
	31-40 years	0.823	0.22-3.05	0.771	1.769	0.54-5.83	0.348	1.491	0.35-6.26	0.585	0.871	0.27-2.78	0.817	0.604	0.14-2.47	0.485	1.805	0.16-20.1	0.631
	Above 40 years	1			1			1			1			1			1		
<b>Sex</b>	Male	0.917	0.44-1.89	0.814	0.985	0.49-1.97	0.968	1.075	0.45-2.55	0.870	1.209	0.63-2.31	0.565	1.208	0.59-2.46	0.601	0.671	0.20-2.24	0.516
	Female	1			1			1			1			1			1		
<b>Categories of health professionals</b>	Doctors	1.132	0.47-2.71	0.779	1.242	0.54-2.87	0.612	0.386	0.12-1.15	0.090	1.143	0.52-2.52	0.740	1.065*	0.45-2.55	0.003	1.153**	0.27-4.88	0.004
	Nurses	1.236	0.49-3.08	0.649	1.690	0.45-2.56	0.881	0.345	0.11-1.06	0.065	0.787	0.35-1.77	0.563	0.723	0.30-1.73	0.467	0.345	0.08-1.39	0.136
	Pharmacists	0.924	0.39-2.17	0.857	1.280	0.56-2.94	0.561	0.487	0.18-1.29	0.149	0.792	0.36-1.72	0.557	1.243*	0.56-2.71	0.010	0.654	0.26-1.61	0.358
	Laboratory Scientists	1			1			1			1			1			1		
<b>Type of healthcare facility</b>	District hospital	0.872	0	0.984	0.119	0.008-2.94	0.193	59.87**	70.06-5117	<0.001	159.7*	4.51-5660	0.005	21.66	0.73-639	0.075	0.623**	0.11-0.35	<0.001
	Health center	0.1333	0	0.987	0.409	0.59-2.81	0.364	53.53**	5.45-525	0.001	10.68*	1.05-108	0.045	2.777	0.43-17.8	0.282	0.630	0.04-9.74	0.741
	Clinic	1			1			1			1			1			1		
<b>Total number of healthcare professionals</b>		1.073*	1.02-1.12	0.002	1.057	1.02-1.10	0.007	0.907**	0.85-0.96	0.001	0.948*	0.81-0.89	0.015	0.969	0.93-1.01	0.160	1.196**	1.09-1.31	<0.001
<b>Total number of patients per week</b>		0.997	0.99-1.00	0.413	1.000	0.99-1.001	0.953	0.997	0.99-1.00	0.418	1.002	0.99-1.00	0.315	0.998	0.99-1.00	0.447	1.019**	1.01-1.03	0.001

270

271

272 *Use of mHealth for diagnostics and treatment support*


273 Results from the multivariate model (Table 2), healthcare workers within the age group 20-30 had increased odds for using mHealth to support  
274 the treatment of hypertension [OR = 2.28 (95% CI: 0.74-7.05)], diabetes [OR = 3.75 (95% CI: 0.96-14.6)], cancer [OR = 6.05 (95% CI: 0.01-  
275 5.85)], and malaria [OR = 1.04 (95% CI: 0.36-3.05)] compared to healthcare workers above 40 years. Also, healthcare workers within the age  
276 group 31-40 had increased odds for using mHealth for managing hypertension [OR = 2.12 (95% CI: 0.67-6.68)], diabetes [OR = 5.75 (95% CI:  
277 1.43-23.1)], cancer [OR = 11.1 (95% CI: 0.01-12.0)] and malaria [OR = 1.24 (95% CI: 0.42-3.67)] as compared to healthcare workers above 40  
278 years (Figure 5). Being a male healthcare professional raised the odds for the use mHealth to manage HIV [OR = 2.47 (95% CI: 0.37-16.4)] and  
279 TB [OR = 1.94 (95% CI: 0.49-7.62)] compared to being a female healthcare professional. Both medical doctors and nurses had increased odds  
280 [OR = 1.66 (95% CI: 0.30-9.16)] and [OR = 1.28 (95% CI: 0.28-5.83)] for the use of mHealth to manage TB when compared to laboratory  
281 scientists (Figure 5).

282 The results further show that healthcare workers within the age group 20-30 had increased odds for the use of mHealth for disease treatment [OR  
283 = 3.05 (95% CI: 0.58-15.9)], using mHealth once a month for diagnostics [OR = 2.16 (95% CI: 0.55-8.55)] and treatment support [OR = 1.06  
284 (95% CI: 0.25-4.43)] compared to those above 40 years. Also, healthcare professionals within the age group 31-40 had a rise in odds for the use  
285 of mHealth for disease treatment [OR = 7.25 (95% CI: 1.32-39.9)], using mHealth once a month for diagnostics [OR = 3.64 (95% CI: 0.68-  
286 19.3)] and treatment support [OR = 2.68 (95% CI: 0.67-10.7)]. Being a male healthcare worker increased the odds for using mHealth to treat  
287 diseases [OR = 1.48 (95% CI: 0.52-4.17)], monitor patients' conditions [OR = 1.22 (95% CI: 0.57-2.59)], using mHealth one to six times a week  
288 for diagnostics [OR = 1.73 (95% CI: 0.85-3.48)] and treatment support [OR = 2.33 (95% CI: 1.03-5.24)] compared to being a female healthcare  
289 worker.

290 Medical doctors had a decreased odds of using mHealth once a month for treatment support compared to laboratory scientists [OR = 0.38 (95%  
291 CI: 0.15-0.19)]. Again, pharmacists had increased odds for using mHealth application one to six times a week to support treatment [OR = 2.07

292 (95% CI: 0.98-4.35)] compared to laboratory scientists. District hospital increased the odds for the use of mHealth for disease treatment [OR =  
293 1.70 (95% CI: 0.02-13.4)] and monitor patients' conditions [OR = 1.60 (95% CI: 0.05-55.6)] compared to clinics. Also, health center had  
294 increased the odds for the use of mHealth for disease treatment [OR = 3.96 (95% CI: 0.23-68.5)] and monitor patients' conditions [OR = 1.41  
295 (95% CI: 0.20-9.98)] when to compared to clinics. As expected, a rise in the number of patients per week increased odds for using mHealth one  
296 to six times for diagnostics [ OR = 1.01 (95% CI: 0.99-1.01)] and treatment support by healthcare workers [OR = 1.01 (95% CI: 1.00-1.01)].  
297 However, an increase in the number of patients decreased the odds for using mHealth to treat diseases [OR = 0.99 (95% CI: 0.98-0.99)]  
298 (Supplementary file 2).

299



300

301

302 **Figure 5:** Odds ratio showing the association on the use of mHealth applications for the management and treatment of HIV and TB conditions  
 303 by health workers in Ashanti region, Ghana

304

305

306

307 **Table 2:** Multivariate analysis results for the use of mHealth for diagnostics and treatment support

Variable		Ever used or currently using mHealth			HIV			TB			Hypertension			Diabetes			Cancer			Malaria		
		Odd s ratio	95% CI	p-value	Od ds ratio	95% CI	p-valu e	Odd s ratio	95% CI	p-valu e	Odd s ratio	95 % CI	p-valu e	Odd s ratio	95 % CI	p-valu e	Odd s ratio	95 % CI	p-valu e	Odd s ratio	95 % CI	p-valu e
Age	20-30 years	0.04	0.05-0.22	0.866	0.19	0.01-37.0	0.535	0.16	0.003-8.91	0.37	2.28*	0.74-7.05	0.011	3.75*	0.96-14.6	0.054	6.05*	0.01-5.85	0.006	1.04*	0.36-3.05	0.010
	31-40 years	0.02	0.08-0.16	0.737	0.15	0.001-34.2	0.496	0.26	0.004-14.5	0.506	2.12*	0.67-6.68	0.020	5.75*	1.43-23.1	0.014	11.1*	0.01-12.0	0.004	1.24*	0.42-3.67	0.002
	Above 40 years	1			1			1			1			1			1			1		
Sex	Male	0.05	0.12-1.05	0.527	2.47**	0.37-16.4	0.003	1.94*	0.49-7.62	0.034	0.84	0.44-1.69	0.60	1.37	0.71-2.63	0.350	0.54	0.07-4.14	0.550	0.96	0.51-1.79	0.893
	Female	1			1			1			1			1			1			1		
Categories of health professionals	Doctors	-	0	0	1.39	0.19-9.98	0.739	1.66*	0.30-9.16	0.054	0.78	0.36-1.69	0.527	0.81	0.37-1.79	0.609	0.85	0.09-7.37	0.884	0.99	0.47-2.12	0.998
	Nurses	-	0	0	2.22	0.27-18.6	0.459	1.28*	0.28-5.83	0.046	0.53	0.23-1.19	0.124	0.57	0.25-1.31	0.187	0.14	0.01-2.15	0.157	0.61	0.27-1.34	0.215
	Pharmacists	0.17	0.005-5.13	0.309	1.01	0.26-3.91	0.981	1.13	0.41-3.15	0.806	1.19	0.56-2.52	0.648	1.26	0.61-2.60	0.528	0.85	0.14-5.04	0.859	1.41	0.69-2.88	0.352
	Laboratory Scientists	1			1			1			1			1			1			1		
Type of healthcare facility	District hospital	0.36	0.13-0.96	0.509	0.01	0.29-30.6	0.259	18.1*	0.05-6.94	0.003	2.47*	0.11-57.0	0.053	0.12	0.04-3.35	0.212	-	0	0	0.36	0.02-7.85	0.514
	Health center	-	0	0	0	0	0	3.89	0.42-36.6	0.233	1.06	1.16-7.01	0.947	0.45	0.64-3.15	0.421	-	0	0	0.33	0.05-2.14	0.244
	Clinic	1			1			1			1			1			1			1		



<b>Total number of healthcare professionals</b>		0.85	0.45-1.56	0.596	1.10**	0.97-1.25	0.010	0.98	0.89-1.07	0.615	1.00	0.96-1.04	0.843	1.04*	0.99-1.09	0.053	0.96	0.83-1.10	0.556	1.00	0.97-1.04	0.842
<b>Total number of patients per week</b>		1.06	0.96-1.16	0.228	1.2*	1.00-1.50	0.019	1.2**	1.00-1.74.0	0.012	0.99	0.99-1.00	0.147	0.99	0.99-1.00	0.351	0.97*	0.94-0.99	0.011	0.99	0.99-1.00	0.710
<b>Variable</b>		<b>Medical information</b>			<b>Disease treatment</b>			<b>Monitor patients' conditions</b>			<b>Once a month for diagnostics</b>			<b>1 to 6 times a week for diagnostics</b>			<b>Once a month for treatment support</b>			<b>1 to 6 times a week for treatment support</b>		
		<b>Odd s ratio</b>	<b>95 % CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Odd s ratio</b>	<b>95 % CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Odd s ratio</b>	<b>95 % CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Odd s ratio</b>	<b>95 % CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Odd s ratio</b>	<b>95 % CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Odd s ratio</b>	<b>95 % CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Odd s ratio</b>	<b>95 % CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Age</b>	20-30 years	0.67	0.21-2.31	0.500	1.06	0.25-4.43	0.939	0.64	0.16-2.45	0.513	3.05*	0.58-15.9	0.018	0.74	0.24-2.31	0.602	2.16*	0.55-8.55	0.002	0.71	0.20-2.49	0.593
	31-40 years	0.79	0.25-2.57	0.706	7.25*	1.32-39.9	0.023	1.04	0.26-4.16	0.959	3.64*	0.68-19.3	0.012	0.92	0.28-2.92	0.888	2.68*	0.67-10.7	0.013	0.91	0.25-3.26	0.886
	Above 40 years	1			1			1			1			1			1			1		
<b>Sex</b>	Male	1.32	0.69-2.53	0.397	1.48*	0.52-4.17	0.041	1.22*	0.57-2.59	0.002	1.17	0.56-2.46	0.662	1.73*	0.85-3.48	0.012	0.66	0.33-1.32	0.245	2.33*	1.03-5.24	0.040
	Female	1			1			1			1			1			1			1		
<b>Categories of health professionals</b>	Doctors	1.19	0.54-2.54	0.669	0.93	0.26-3.28	0.913	1.35	0.54-3.37	0.742	0.56	0.22-1.40	0.214	0.87	0.38-2.01	0.757	0.38*	0.15-0.91	0.030	1.24	0.49-3.13	0.641
	Nurses	1.11	0.48-2.54	0.810	0.45	0.13-1.63	0.226	1.17	0.46-2.92	0.753	1.48	0.61-3.59	0.385	1.00	0.42-2.38	0.996	0.79	0.34-1.84	0.592	1.39	0.52-3.76	0.506
	Pharmacists	2.29	0.90-5.83	0.081	1.32	0.43-4.02	0.623	0.89	0.42-1.86	0.792	0.64	0.26-1.62	0.352	1.69	0.83-3.44	0.143	0.69	0.31-1.56	0.385	2.07*	0.98-4.38	0.054

	Laboratory Scientists	1			1			1			1			1			1			1		
Type of healthcare facility	District hospital	0.35	0.01-0.08	0.552	1.70*	0.02-0.134	0.011	1.60*	0.05-55.6	0.028	6.43	0.18-234	0.310	0.28	0.01-7.88	0.461	0.88	0.03-26.3	0.944	0.76	0.02-27.3	0.885
	Health center	0.42	0.01-0.150	0.457	3.96*	0.23-0.685	0.003	1.41*	0.20-9.98	0.010	1.34	0.19-9.29	0.761	0.54	0.08-3.74	0.532	1.50	0.22-10.2	0.679	0.39	0.05-2.98	0.370
	Clinic	1			1			1		1	1			1			1			1		
Total number of healthcare professionals		0.99	0.03-0.342	0.858	1.00	0.95-1.06	0.905	1.00	0.96-1.05	0.487	0.98	0.93-1.02	0.309	1.01	0.96-1.05	0.659	1.01	0.96-1.05	0.747	0.98	0.94-1.03	0.508
Total number of patients per week		1.00	0.83-0.88	0.941	0.99*	0.98-0.99	0.026	1.00	0.99-1.00	0.839	0.99	0.98-1.00	0.099	1.01*	0.99-1.01	0.054	0.99	0.99-1.00	0.288	1.01*	1.00-1.01	0.020

308 \*\*: p-value < 0.05; \*\*\* p-value < 0.001

Source: Author's computation based on data obtained from the field survey, 2020

### 309 *Usefulness of mHealth interventions*

310 The results from the multivariate model (Table 3) suggest that healthcare professionals within the age group 20-30 had reduced odds for the use  
 311 of mHealth to monitor patients' disease conditions [OR = 0.15 (95% CI: 0.02-1.07)], manage communicable diseases [OR = 0.15 (95% CI: 0.02-  
 312 1.07)] and reminders for medication adherence [OR = 0.32 (95% CI: 0.08-1.24)] compared to those above 40 years. Also, healthcare workers  
 313 within the age group 31-40 had increased odds for the use of mHealth to manage non-communicable diseases [OR = 1.23, (95% CI: 0.54-2.81)]  
 314 and communicable diseases [OR = 1.41(95% CI: 0.54-3.82)] as compared to healthcare professionals above 40 years. However, healthcare  
 315 professionals within the age group 31-40 had reduced odds for the use of mHealth as reminders for treatment adherence procedures [OR =  
 316 0.41(95% CI: 0.17-0.99)] when compared to those above 40 years. Male healthcare professionals who use mHealth to monitor patients' disease  
 317 conditions [OR = 1.76 (95% CI: 0.80-3.85)], manage communicable diseases [OR = 1.19 (95% CI: 0.72-2.00)], manage non-communicable

318 diseases [OR = 1.19 (95% CI: 0.72-2.10)] and as reminders for medication adherence [OR = 1.31 (95% CI: 0.67-2.54)] had increased odds when  
319 compared to female healthcare professionals.

320 Medical doctors had 3-fold increased odds of using mHealth as reminders for medication adherence compared with laboratory scientists [OR =  
321 3.32 (95% CI: 1.38-7.97)]. District hospital reduced the odds for the use of mHealth to monitor patients' disease conditions [OR = 0.41 (95% CI:  
322 0.01-0.78)] and as reminders for clinic appointments [OR = 0.18 (95% CI: 0.01-1.02)] when compared to clinics. Health center increased the  
323 odds for the use of mHealth to manage communicable diseases as compared to clinics [OR = 1.16 (95% CI: 0.46-2.90)]. The total number of  
324 healthcare professionals who use mHealth as reminders for treatment adherence procedures [OR = 1.04 (95% CI: 1.01-1.08)] and clinic  
325 appointments [OR = 1.03 (95% CI: 1.00-1.07)] had risen odds. A rise in number of patients per week increased odds for the use of mHealth to  
326 monitor patients' disease conditions [OR = 1.01 (95% CI: 1.00-1.02)] and manage communicable diseases [OR = 1.00 (95% CI: 0.99-1.00)].

327 District hospitals increased the odds for mHealth to treat and manage disease conditions than clinics [OR = 1.36 (95% CI: 0.11-16.8)]. However,  
328 as a district hospital, the odds for the use of mHealth as reminders to collect drugs reduced [OR = 0.24 (95% CI: 0.001-0.28)]. Also, a health  
329 center increased the odds for the use of mHealth to notify patients of their test results [OR = 2.39 (95% CI: 0.95-6.03)], treat and manage disease  
330 conditions [OR = 3.52 (95% CI: 1.28-9.69)] and increase effectiveness for treatment and management of diseases [OR = 3.88 (95% CI: 1.02-  
331 14.7)] as compared to clinics. The total number of healthcare professionals who use mHealth as reminders for drug collection had increased odds  
332 [OR = 1.05 (95% CI: 1.01-1.10)]. An increase in the number of patients per week had increased the odds for the use of mHealth for follow-ups  
333 [OR = 1.00 (95% CI: 0.99-1.01)] and increase effectiveness to treat and manage diseases [OR = 1.00 (95% CI: 1.00-1.01)].

### 334 *Ease of Use of mHealth interventions*

335 In the multivariate logistic regression model (Table 4), the results demonstrate that healthcare professionals within the age groups 20-30 and 31-  
336 40 had increased the odds for the flexibility to interact with mHealth devices [OR = 1.16 (95% CI: 0.11-11.8)] and easy to use mHealth for  
337 treatment support [OR = 1.33 (95% CI: 0.17-10.3)] compared to those above 40 years. Being a male healthcare worker increased the odds for

338 easy-to-use mHealth for disease diagnosis [OR = 1.71 (95% CI: 0.67-4.29)] and the flexibility to interact with mHealth [OR = 4.00 (95% CI:  
339 0.76-20.9)] compared to being female healthcare professional. Medical doctors had 9-fold increased odds of becoming skillful in using mHealth  
340 for disease diagnosis and treatment support [OR = 9.56 (95% CI: 1.78-51.1)] compared to laboratory scientists. Again, nurses had 2-fold  
341 increased odds for easy-to-use mHealth for disease diagnosis [OR = 2.66 (95% CI: 0.82-8.62)] when compared to laboratory scientists.

342 Also, district hospital had increased the odds for easy-to-use mHealth for disease diagnosis [OR = 14.0 (95% CI: 0.16-11.8)] and treatment  
343 support [OR = 6.69 (95% CI: 0.02-21.4)] compared to clinics. A health center had increased odds for easy learning of how to use mHealth  
344 devices [OR = 1.32 (95% CI: 1.79-8.65)] and becoming skillful in using such applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support [OR =  
345 1.32 (95% CI: 0.60-24.3)]. The total number of healthcare professionals had increased odds for the flexibility of interacting with mHealth  
346 devices for disease diagnosis and treatment support [OR = 1.13 (95% CI: 1.00-1.27)]. A rise in the number of patients per week had increased  
347 odds for using mHealth for disease diagnosis easily [OR = 1.00 (95% CI: 0.99-1.04)].

#### 348 *User satisfaction of mHealth interventions*

349 The results from the multivariate model (Table 4) show that healthcare workers within the age groups 20-30 and 31-40 had reduced odds for  
350 healthcare workers' confidence in using mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support [OR = 0.24 (95% CI: 0.04-1.24)] and mHealth  
351 increasing the quality of healthcare delivery [OR = 0.18 (95% CI: 0.02-2.07)] compared to those above 40 years. Being a male healthcare  
352 professional increased the odds of healthcare workers' comfortability [OR = 1.84 (95% CI: 0.65-5.19)] and confidence [OR = 2.33 (95% CI:  
353 1.00-5.43)] in using mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support compared to being female healthcare professional.

354 Again, medical doctors had increased the odds of becoming comfortable using mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support  
355 [OR = 1.02 (95% CI: 0.28-3.80)] compared to being a laboratory scientist. Again, nurses had increased the odds of feeling comfortable with  
356 mHealth applications [OR = 1.06 (95% CI: 0.29-3.80)] and improving the quality of healthcare delivery with mHealth applications [OR = 2.10  
357 (95% CI: 0.55-7.98)] when compared to being laboratory scientists. Health center had increased odds of healthcare workers' comfortability [OR

358 = 3.84 (95% CI: 0.87-17.8)] and confidence [OR = 3.87 (95% CI: 1.13-13.2)] with the use of mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment  
 359 support compared to clinics. An increase in the number of patients per week had increased the odds of using mHealth to improve healthcare  
 360 delivery quality [OR = 1.01 (95% CI: 0.99-1.02)].

361 **Table 3:** Multivariate analysis results for the usefulness of mHealth interventions

Variable		Monitor patients' disease conditions			Manage non-communicable diseases			Manage communicable diseases			Reminders for treatment adherence procedures			Reminders for medication adherence			Reminders for clinic appointments		
		Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value
Age	20-30 years	0.15**	0.02-1.07	0.052	0.91	0.39-2.11	0.831	0.91**	0.39-2.11	0.034	0.52	0.21-1.29	0.160	0.32**	0.08-1.24	0.011	0.46	0.13-1.58	0.219
	31-40 years	0.24	0.04-1.58	0.140	1.23**	0.54-2.81	0.011	1.41**	0.54-3.82	0.301	0.41**	0.17-0.99	0.049	0.35	0.09-1.37	0.132	0.40	0.12-1.36	0.143
	Above 40 years	1			1			1			1			1			1	0.67-2.41	
Sex	Male	1.76**	0.80-3.85	0.015	1.19**	0.72-2.00	0.004	1.19**	0.72-2.10	0.026	1.05	0.62-1.76	0.840	1.31**	0.67-2.54	0.023	1.27	0.68-2.41	0.446
	Female	1			1			1						1			1		
Categories of health professionals	Doctors	2.42	0.84-6.94	0.099	1.37	0.67-2.78	0.378	1.37	0.67-2.78	0.124	0.84	0.41-1.76	0.638	3.32**	1.38-7.97	0.007	1.22	0.51-2.95	0.644
	Nurses	2.42	0.51-3.53	0.545	1.42	0.70-2.86	0.328	1.42	0.70-2.86	0.388	0.60	0.30-1.22	0.165	2.02	0.89-4.59	0.090	0.55	0.24-1.28	0.168
	Pharmacists	1.34	0.56-3.19	0.507	1.28	0.65-2.50	0.471	1.28	0.65-2.50	0.323	0.77	0.41-1.45	0.421	0.85	0.43-1.68	0.645	0.51	0.24-1.09	0.086
	Laboratory Scientists	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Type of healthcare facility	District hospital	0.41**	0.01-0.78	0.035	2.46	0.26-22.7	0.427	2.46	0.26-22.7	0.777	0.22	0.02-2.28	0.206	0.15	0.01-4.71	0.119	0.18**	0.01-1.02	0.051
	Health center	1.15	0.28-4.63	0.836	1.16	0.46-2.90	0.750	1.16**	0.46-2.90	0.036	1.09	0.43-2.79	0.844	1.16	0.28-4.71	0.829	1.89	0.63-5.66	0.253
	Clinic	1			1			1			1			1			1		

Total number of healthcare professionals		1.07	0.98-1.08	0.134	1.16	0.95-1.02	0.571	0.99	0.95-1.02	0.667	1.04**	1.01-1.08	0.017	1.01	0.97-1.05	0.427	1.03**	1.00-1.07	0.046
Total number of patients per week		1.01**	1.00-1.02	0.003	0.99	0.99-1.00	0.141	1.00**	0.99-1.00	0.020	0.99	0.99-1.00	0.894	1.00	0.99-1.00	0.382	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.443
Variable		Reminders for drugs collection			Follow-ups			Test result notification			Treating and managing disease conditions			Accurate diagnostic decisions			Increase effectiveness for treatment and management of diseases		
		Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value
Age	20-30 years	0.36	0.09-1.42	0.148	0.24*	0.07-0.77	0.017	0.35*	0.13-0.95	0.039	0.73	0.27-1.98	0.545	0.14*	0.01-0.78	0.030	0.36	0.08-1.65	0.191
	31-40 years	1.43**	0.33-6.09	0.024	0.36	0.11-1.18	0.093	0.42	0.16-1.11	0.083	0.62	0.23-1.66	0.345	0.15	0.01-0.90	0.041	0.41	0.09-1.91	0.263
	Above 40 years	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Sex	Male	1.34	0.62-2.90	0.446	1.56*	0.88-2.76	0.012	1.35	0.80-2.28	0.249	1.49*	0.83-2.67	0.016	1.23	0.55-2.74	0.600	1.43	0.67-3.05	0.346
	Female	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Categories of health professionals	Doctors	0.98	0.35-2.73	0.977	0.67	0.31-1.46	0.321	1.19	0.59-2.42	0.611	1.68	0.80-3.53	0.164	2.77*	0.92-8.33	0.004	1.16	0.44-3.02	0.754
	Nurses	0.48	0.18-1.29	0.148	0.84	0.38-1.84	0.672	0.99	0.49-1.98	0.979	2.67*	1.23-5.77	0.012	1.45	0.55-3.83	0.443	2.10**	0.76-5.83	0.015
	Pharmacists	0.69	0.32-1.51	0.363	0.65	0.31-1.38	0.269	0.94	0.50-1.77	0.865	0.74	0.39-1.42	0.380	0.52	0.24-1.16	0.112	1.62	0.58-4.51	0.348
	Laboratory Scientists	1			1			1			1			1					
Type of healthcare facility	District hospital	0.24**	0.001-0.28	0.004	0.57	0.06-5.65	0.636	0.55	0.07-4.30	0.571	1.36*	0.11-16.8	0.010	0.30	0.02-5.51	0.421	0.73	0.03-17.9	0.848
	Health center	1.62	0.38-6.86	0.514	2.39	0.87-6.56	0.089	2.39*	0.95-6.03	0.054	3.52*	1.28-9.69	0.015	0.72	0.11-4.57	0.732	3.88**	1.02-14.7	0.046
	Clinic	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Total number of healthcare professionals		1.05**	1.01-1.10	0.011	1.00	0.96-1.03	0.880	1.01	0.98-1.03	0.482	1.00	0.96-1.03	0.975	1.00	0.95-1.04	0.925	0.99	0.94-1.04	0.873
Total number of patients per week		1.00	0.99-1.01	0.270	1.00*	0.99-1.01	0.053	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.153	1.00	0.99-1.00	0.459	1.00	0.99-1.00	0.521	1.00**	1.00-1.01	0.024

362

\*\* : p-value < 0.05; \*\*\* p-value < 0.001

Source: Author's computation based on data obtained from the field survey, 2020

363

364 ***Behavioural intention to use mHealth interventions***

365 Results from the multivariate model (Table 4) reveal that healthcare professionals within the age groups 20-30 and 31-40 had increased odds for  
366 healthcare professionals intending to use mHealth for the treatment [OR = 0.13 (95% CI: 0.02-0.92)] and management of patients' disease  
367 conditions [OR = 0.35 (95% CI: 0.05-2.38)] compared to those above 40 years. Being a male healthcare professional increased the odds of  
368 healthcare workers' intention to use mHealth for treating and managing patients' disease conditions [OR = 2.79 (95% CI: 1.19-6.54)] and disease  
369 diagnosis and treatment support [OR = 1.97 (95% CI: 1.08-3.60)] compared to being female healthcare professional.

370 Also, pharmacists had increased the odds of healthcare workers' intention to use mHealth to treat and manage patients' disease conditions  
371 compared to laboratory scientists [OR = 1.45 (95% CI: 0.55-3.82)]. The odds increased for a district hospital where healthcare workers intend to  
372 use mHealth [OR = 2.25 (95% CI: 0.15-32.7)] and will always use mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support [OR = 3.20 (95% CI:  
373 0.05-24.0)] compared to clinics. A rise in the number of patients per week had increased the odds for healthcare workers using mHealth to treat  
374 and manage patients' disease conditions [OR = 1.00 (95% CI: 0.99-1.01)] and their intention to use mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment  
375 support [OR = 1.01 (95% CI: 0.99-1.04)].

376

377

378

379 **Table 4:** Multivariate analysis results for the ease of use of mHealth, user satisfaction of mHealth and behavioural intention to use mHealth  
380 interventions

Variable		Easy to use mHealth for disease diagnosis			Easy to use mHealth for treatment			Flexible to interact with mHealth			Frustrating to interact with mHealth			Easy to become skillful in using mHealth			Easy to learn how to use mHealth devices for diagnosis and treatment		
		Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value	Odds ratio	95% CI	p-value
Age	20-30 years	0.15	0.02-1.15	0.069	0.69	0.09-4.96	0.715	1.16**	0.11-11.8	0.010	1.16	0.11-11.8	0.895	0.66	0.11-3.85	0.647	0.23	0.03-1.96	0.182
	31-40 years	0.40	0.05-3.09	0.386	1.33**	0.17-10.3	0.027	0.52	0.04-7.12	0.627	0.52	0.038-7.12	0.627	0.83	0.14-5.13	0.847	0.26	0.03-2.20	0.218
	Above 40 years	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Sex	Male	1.71**	0.67-4.29	0.025	0.91	0.27-3.05	0.883	4.00**	0.76-20.9	0.010	0.40	0.76-20.9	0.100	1.94	0.68-5.51	0.213	1.72	0.59-4.91	0.315
	Female	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Categories of health professionals	Doctors	2.81	0.83-9.48	0.095	2.27	0.36-14.3	0.381	-	0	0	-	0	0	9.56**	1.78-51.1	0.008	2.12	0.57-7.79	0.257
	Nurses	2.66**	0.82-8.62	0.010	0.62	0.13-2.78	0.534	2.25	0.30-16.7	0.427	2.25	0.62-5.51	0.427	3.20	0.91-11.3	0.070	2.41	0.65-8.90	0.186
	Pharmacists	1.71	0.52-5.61	0.370	0.92	0.31-2.63	0.868	1.85	0.62-5.51	0.268	1.85	0.16-2.10	0.268	1.57	0.45-5.47	0.477	0.89	0.35-2.25	0.810
	Laboratory Scientists	1			1			1			1			1			1		
Type of healthcare facility	District hospital	14.0**	0.16-11.8	0.020	6.69**	0.02-21.4	0.051	0.57	0.16-2.10	0.075	0.58	0.02-4.20	0.075	3.78	0.01-45.5	0.586	1.40	0.08-22.3	0.310
	Health center	2.29	0.40-12.9	0.347	1.61	0.16-16.0	0.683	0.31	0.02-4.20	0.376	0.30	1.00-1.27	0.376	3.83**	0.60-24.3	0.015	1.32**	1.79-8.65	0.011
	Clinic	1			1			1		1	1			1			1		
Total number of healthcare professionals		0.95	0.89-1.02	0.185	0.96	0.88-1.05	0.421	1.13**	1.00-1.27	0.041	1.15	1.00-1.29	0.430	0.98	0.91-1.05	0.653	0.95	0.89-1.04	0.361
Total number of patients per week		1.00**	0.99-1.04	0.021	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.740	0.98	0.96-1.00	0.111	0.98	0.96-1.00	0.111	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.573	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.363
<b>Multivariate analysis results for the user satisfaction of mHealth interventions</b>																			
Variable		Comfortable in using mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support			Confident in using mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support			Completely satisfied with using mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support			Using mHealth increases the quality of healthcare delivery								
		Odds	95% CI	p-	Odds	95% CI	p-value	Odds	95% CI	p-value	Odds	95% CI	p-value						



		<b>ratio</b>		<b>value</b>	<b>ratio</b>			<b>ratio</b>			<b>ratio</b>		
<b>Age</b>	20-30 years	0.13	0.01-1.32	0.085	0.24**	0.04-1.24	0.002	0.81	0.31-2.13	0.60	0.24	0.02-2.76	0.253
	31-40 years	0.33	0.03-3.42	0.358	0.60	0.11-3.17	0.552	0.89	0.34-2.29	0.813	0.18**	0.02-2.07	0.012
	Above 40 years	1			1			1			1		
<b>Sex</b>	Male	1.84**	0.65-5.19	0.024	2.33**	1.00-5.43	0.049	1.48	0.84-2.63	0.177	1.33	0.47-3.73	0.584
	Female	1			1			1			1		
<b>Categories of health professionals</b>	Doctors	1.02**	0.28-3.67	0.010	0.44	0.14-1.36	0.155	0.88	0.39-1.96	0.767	1.60	0.42-6.08	0.484
	Nurses	1.06**	0.29-3.80	0.021	0.43	0.14-1.34	0.146	0.80	0.36-1.75	0.584	2.10**	0.55-7.98	0.024
	Pharmacists	0.76	0.29-1.95	0.573	1.02	0.43-2.45	0.959	0.99	0.49-2.00	0.993	1.12	0.35-3.57	0.847
	Laboratory Scientists	1			1			1			1		
<b>Type of healthcare facility</b>	District hospital	0.38	0.82-17.8	0.619	0.36	0.02-7.59	0.514	0.78	0.08-7.46	0.834	0.40	0.01-15.3	0.626
	Health center	3.84**	0.87-17.8	0.006	3.87**	1.13-13.2	0.031	1.68	0.65-4.30	0.277	2.40	0.46-12.3	0.295
	Clinic	1			1			1			1		
<b>Total number of healthcare professionals</b>		1.03	0.97-1.09	0.236	1.02	0.98-1.07	0.262	1.01	0.97-1.04	0.524	1.01	0.94-1.06	0.797
<b>Total number of patients per week</b>		0.99	0.99-1.00	0.818	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.380	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.135	1.01**	0.99-1.02	0.053
<b>Multivariate analysis results for the behavioural intention to use mHealth interventions</b>													
<b>Variable</b>		<b>Use mHealth for the treatment and management of patients' disease conditions</b>				<b>Always using mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support</b>			<b>Intend to use mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support</b>				
		<b>Odds ratio</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Odds ratio</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Odds ratio</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>p-value</b>			
<b>Age</b>	20-30 years	0.13**	0.02-0.92	0.041	0.83	0.31-2.17	0.705	0.16	0.06-13.4	0.349			
	31-40 years	0.35**	0.05-2.38	0.024	1.21	0.46-3.14	0.694	0.39	0.02-58.9	0.718			
	Above 40 years	1			1			1					
<b>Sex</b>	Male	2.79**	1.19-6.54	0.018	1.97**	1.08-3.60	0.026	2.47	0.35-17.2	0.359			
	Female	1			1			1					
<b>Categories of health professionals</b>	Doctors	0.95	0.31-2.87	0.933	1.23	0.54-2.77	0.617	0.70	0.08-5.95	0.751			
	Nurses	0.59	0.21-1.69	0.328	0.97	0.44-2.14	0.947	0.98	0.10-9.26	0.990			
	Pharmacists	1.45**	0.55-3.82	0.044	1.04	0.52-2.12	0.896	1.10	0.35-3.41	0.860			

	Laboratory Scientists	1			1			1		
<b>Type of healthcare facility</b>	District hospital	0.52	0.02-12.9	0.691	2.25**	0.15-32.7	0.052	3.70**	0.05-24.0	0.007
	Health center	1.08	0.22-5.16	0.923	0.81	0.25-2.60	0.728	-	0	0
	Clinic	1			1			1		1
<b>Total number of healthcare professionals</b>		0.99	0.95-1.04	0.968	0.98	0.94-1.02	0.493	0.96	0.85-1.10	0.622
<b>Total number of patients per week</b>		1.00**	0.99-1.01	0.0201	1.00	0.99-1.00	0.892	1.01**	0.99-1.04	0.006

\*\* : p-value < 0.05; \*\*\* p-value < 0.001

Source: Author's computation based on data obtained from the field survey, 2020

381

382

383 **Association between health infrastructure availability or healthcare workforce competency and ownership of mobile wireless devices**

384 A cross-sectional tabulation was done between healthcare infrastructure's availability or healthcare workforce competency and ownership of  
 385 mobile wireless devices using a chi-square test (Table S 4 supplementary material file). The chi-square test results illustrate a significant  
 386 relationship between mobile wireless devices' availability and currently using mHealth interventions to support healthcare provision (p< 0.05).  
 387 Healthcare workers with mobile wireless devices were likely to use mHealth interventions to help healthcare delivery than those without mobile  
 388 wireless devices. In addition to that, there is an association between mobile wireless devices' availability and their use to assist malaria  
 389 conditions' treatment is statistically significant (p< 0.05). Healthcare workers with mobile wireless devices were more likely to use these devices  
 390 to treat malaria conditions than those without mobile wireless devices.

391 Moreover, the chi-square test results also show a significant association between mHealth intervention availability and its use to manage malaria  
 392 conditions (p< 0.05). Healthcare professionals with mHealth interventions were more likely to use such interventions to support malaria  
 393 management than those without mHealth. The results further illustrate a significant relationship between short message services (SMS) and their

394 use to manage hypertension cases ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare workers who stipulated that they have SMS applications were more likely to use such  
395 intervention to manage hypertension conditions than those without SMS services. Also, the chi-square test results suggest a significant  
396 relationship between mobile apps and their use to manage TB ( $p < 0.05$ ), diabetes ( $p < 0.05$ ), and disease diagnosis ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare  
397 professionals who indicated that they have mobile apps were likely to use them for diagnosing or screening diseases and managing TB and  
398 diabetes conditions than others with no mobile apps. The chi-square test results demonstrate a significant association between toll-free lines and  
399 their usage for managing TB ( $p < 0.05$ ) and HIV ( $p < 0.05$ ) conditions. Healthcare workers who suggested that they have toll-free lines were  
400 likely to use this intervention to support the treatment of TB and HIV conditions than others without toll-free lines.

#### 401 **Association between health infrastructure availability or healthcare workforce competency and usefulness of mHealth applications**

402 A cross-sectional tabulation was performed between healthcare infrastructure's availability or healthcare workforce competency and usefulness  
403 of mHealth applications using a chi-square test (Table S 5 supplementary material file). The chi-square test results suggest a significant  
404 relationship between mobile wireless devices' availability and managing non-communicable diseases (NCDs) ( $p < 0.05$ ), communicable diseases  
405 ( $p < 0.05$ ), reminders for treatment adherence procedures ( $p < 0.05$ ), clinic appointments ( $p < 0.05$ ), follow-ups ( $p < 0.05$ ) and treating and  
406 managing diseases ( $p < 0.05$ ) to support healthcare provision. Healthcare workers with mobile wireless devices were likely to use these devices to  
407 manage communicable and non-communicable diseases, reminders for treatment adherence procedures, clinic appointments, and follow-ups  
408 compared with those without mobile wireless devices.

409 The chi-square test results also found a significant association between the availability of mHealth intervention and its use as reminders for  
410 treatment adherence procedures ( $p < 0.05$ ), clinic appointments ( $p < 0.05$ ), follow-ups ( $p < 0.05$ ), and test result notifications ( $p < 0.05$ ) to promote  
411 healthcare delivery. Healthcare professionals who indicated that they mHealth interventions were likely to use these interventions as reminders  
412 for treatment adherence procedures, clinic appointments, follow-ups, and test result notifications than others with no mHealth interventions. The  
413 results further illustrate a significant relationship between short message services (SMS) and their use to manage NCDs ( $p < 0.05$ ) and follow-ups

414 to promote treatment compliance ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare workers with SMS interventions were more likely to use such interventions to manage  
415 NCDs and follow-ups than those without mHealth.

#### 416 **Association between health infrastructure availability or healthcare workforce competency and ease of use of mHealth applications**

417 A cross-sectional tabulation was done between the availability of healthcare infrastructure or healthcare workforce competency and ease of use  
418 of mHealth applications using a chi-square test (Table S 6 supplementary material file). The chi-square test results reveal a significant  
419 relationship between mobile wireless devices' availability and its ease of using mHealth for disease diagnosis ( $p < 0.05$ ), treatment support ( $p <$   
420  $0.05$ ), and its flexibility ( $p < 0.05$ ) to support healthcare services. Healthcare workers who indicated that they have mobile wireless devices were  
421 more likely to find it easier and flexible to use them for disease diagnosis and treatment support than those without mobile wireless devices. In  
422 addition to that, the chi-square test results show a significant association between the availability of mHealth intervention and its ease of using  
423 mHealth for treatment support ( $p < 0.05$ ) and its flexibility ( $p < 0.05$ ) to promote healthcare delivery. Healthcare professionals with mHealth  
424 interventions were likely to find it easier and flexible to use these mHealth interventions to support patients' disease diagnosis and treatment  
425 conditions than others with no mHealth interventions.

426 The results further found a significant relationship between short message services (SMS) and its ease of using mHealth for treatment support  
427 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and its flexibility ( $p < 0.05$ ) to enhance the provision of quality healthcare. Healthcare professionals with SMS interventions were more  
428 likely to find it easier and flexible to use such mHealth interventions for disease diagnosis and treatment support than those without mHealth.  
429 Also, the chi-square test results show a significant relationship between phone calls and its ease of using mHealth for disease diagnosis ( $p <$   
430  $0.05$ ), treatment support ( $p < 0.05$ ), flexibility ( $p < 0.05$ ), becoming skillful in using mHealth ( $p < 0.05$ ) and easy to learn how to use mHealth ( $p <$   
431  $0.05$ ). Healthcare workers who indicated that they use phone call intervention were likely to find it easier and flexible to use such applications  
432 for disease diagnosis and treatment support than other healthcare workers without access to voice calls.

#### 433 **Association between health infrastructure availability or healthcare workforce competency and user satisfaction of mHealth**

434 A cross-sectional tabulation was done between healthcare infrastructure's availability or healthcare workforce competency and user satisfaction  
435 of mHealth applications using a chi-square test (Table S 7 supplementary material file). The chi-square test results show a significant  
436 relationship between mobile wireless devices' availability and confidence ( $p < 0.05$ ) and completely satisfied ( $p < 0.05$ ) using mHealth for disease  
437 diagnosis and treatment support. Healthcare professionals who were confident and completely satisfied with mHealth were more likely to use  
438 these mobile wireless devices for disease diagnosis and treatment support than those with no confidence in mHealth. Also, the chi-square test  
439 results illustrate a significant association between the availability of mHealth intervention and comfortable using mHealth ( $p < 0.05$ ), confidence  
440 in mHealth ( $p < 0.05$ ), and increase quality healthcare ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare professionals with mHealth interventions who were comfortable and  
441 confident in mHealth were likely to use such applications to boost quality healthcare delivery than others with no mHealth interventions.

442 The results further found a significant relationship between short message services (SMS) and completely satisfied with mHealth applications  
443 ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare workers with SMS applications were more likely to be happy with mHealth interventions for disease diagnosis and  
444 treatment support than others with no SMS application access. In addition to that, the chi-square test results indicate a significant association  
445 between phone calls and their comfortability ( $p < 0.05$ ) and increase quality healthcare ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare professionals who suggested that  
446 they use phone call intervention were likely to be comfortable in using mHealth to boost quality healthcare delivery than those without access to  
447 voice calls. Again, the chi-square test results illustrate a significant relationship between mobile apps and completely satisfied in using mHealth  
448 applications ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare workers with mobile apps were more likely to be happy with mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment  
449 support than others with no mobile apps. The chi-square test results reveal a significant association between toll-free intervention and its  
450 comfortability using mHealth ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare professionals who have access to toll-free lines were more likely to be comfortable using  
451 mHealth than those without toll-free lines.

452 **Association between health infrastructure availability or healthcare workforce competency and behavioural intention to use mHealth**

453 A cross-sectional tabulation was performed between the availability of healthcare infrastructure or healthcare workforce competency and  
454 behavioural intention to use mHealth using a chi-square test (Table S 7 supplementary material file). The chi-square test results illustrate a  
455 significant relationship between mobile wireless devices' availability and always use mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support ( $p <$   
456  $0.05$ ). Healthcare professionals with mobile wireless devices were more likely to use mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support than  
457 others with no mobile wireless devices. Additionally, the chi-square test results found a significant association between mHealth intervention  
458 availability and always use mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare workers with mHealth interventions were  
459 likely to use mHealth for disease diagnosis than others with no mHealth interventions.

460 Furthermore, the results also found a significant relationship between SMS and the ability to use mHealth to treat and manage patients'  
461 conditions ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare professionals with SMS interventions were more likely to use mHealth to treat and manage patients' needs than  
462 others with no SMS intervention access. The chi-square test results found a significant association between phone calls and intention to use  
463 mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support ( $p < 0.05$ ). Healthcare workers who indicated that they use phone call intervention intended  
464 to use mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support than those with no access to voice calls. Again, the chi-square test results  
465 demonstrate a significant relationship between mobile apps and always use mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support ( $p < 0.05$ ).  
466 Healthcare professionals with mobile apps were more likely to use mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support than those without  
467 mobile apps.

468

469

470 **Discussion**

471 This study aimed to examine the availability and use of mHealth applications or technologies for disease diagnosis and treatment support by  
472 healthcare workers in Ghana. In this study, 62.81% of healthcare professionals indicated that mHealth applications are available to them, while  
473 37.19% do not have access to mHealth applications. In this study, 98.38% of healthcare professionals are currently using mHealth applications to  
474 support healthcare delivery. In this current study, the findings showed that mobile wireless devices such as simple mobile phones, smartphones,  
475 and tablets are readily available to healthcare professionals in Ghana's Ashanti region. The results also revealed that mHealth applications such  
476 as phone or voice calls, SMS, mobile apps, and toll-free lines are available to healthcare workers in this region and are currently being used to  
477 support healthcare delivery. The study results further illustrated that healthcare professionals extensively use mHealth applications to screen or  
478 diagnose existing many disease conditions in this region.

479 Additionally, this study's results demonstrated that healthcare workers in this part of Ghana currently use mHealth applications to treat HIV, TB,  
480 hypertension, diabetes, malaria, and diarrhoea conditions. Also, the study results revealed that healthcare professionals continuously use  
481 mHealth applications to support the provision of healthcare due to the constant supply of power. Moreover, the study findings suggested that  
482 most healthcare professionals have the requisite skills and competence in using mHealth applications for diagnostics and treatment procedures of  
483 disease conditions. Furthermore, the study results demonstrated a low-level use of mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment  
484 support by healthcare professionals at the rural primary healthcare clinics.

485 A study conducted in the USA largely agrees with this current survey study where healthcare workers use mHealth applications to treat and  
486 manage chronic diseases such as HIV, TB, cancer, hypertension, diabetes, and others (48). This current survey results fully support the findings  
487 from similar surveys conducted in primary care clinics in the USA (50, 51). In their studies, most healthcare workers were comfortable and  
488 confident in using mHealth applications to support their patients' healthcare needs (50, 51). The study findings demonstrate that healthcare  
489 workers use mHealth applications to promote medication adherence, clinic appointments, and follow-ups. This corroborates with the study  
490 findings from a similar study conducted by Belcher et al. in Saudi Arabia, where mHealth applications improved the treatment of diabetes, clinic  
491 appointments, and check-ups (52).

492 This current study's limitations may include respondents' inclusion was based on patient consent, which may have introduced selection bias into  
493 the study sample. Due to the limited funding for the data collection, only 285 participants were enrolled from the numerous primary healthcare  
494 clinics in this region. Our current study results may not be generalized beyond the Ashanti region of Ghana among healthcare professionals using  
495 mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support. Despite all these limitations, our current study is the first comprehensive  
496 research to the best of our knowledge on the availability and use of mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support by  
497 healthcare professionals in the Ashanti region of Ghana. The study helped determine the current availability and use of mHealth applications by  
498 healthcare professionals for diagnostics and treatment procedures of diseases in the Ashanti region. This could guide policymakers in  
499 formulating guidelines on the utilization mHealth technologies to promote quality healthcare delivery.

500 This current study achieved its primary objective and demonstrated a gap in mHealth for disease diagnosis and treatment support at the rural  
501 primary healthcare clinics in Ghana's Ashanti region. This means that policymakers and implementors should adopt various strategies to  
502 facilitate the implementation of mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support in such resource-constrained settings and  
503 enhance their scale-ups. Given this, we recommend a proposed framework for improving the implementation of mHealth for disease diagnosis  
504 and treatment support in low-and middle-income countries (LMICs) (53). The results showed that mHealth applications are generally available  
505 to healthcare professionals and are being utilized for disease diagnosis and treatment support of patients' conditions. This is a good sign that the  
506 continuous use of mHealth should be strengthened to promote quality healthcare delivery as recommended by the World Health Organization  
507 (WHO) 2019 guidelines on digital health (54).

508 The study results demonstrated a low-level use of mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support by healthcare professionals  
509 at the rural primary healthcare clinics. To this end, we encourage policymakers to deliberately implement mHealth at rural primary health clinics  
510 to support disease diagnosis and treatment procedures of patients' conditions. The study findings showed that healthcare professionals employed  
511 mHealth applications to treat some common diseases such as HIV, TB, hypertension, and diabetes. We recommend that more primary studies be  
512 conducted focused on using mHealth interventions to treat and manage other diseases such as cancer, stroke, chronic respiratory conditions,



513 asthma, and others in this region. Moreover, the study findings indicated that most healthcare professionals use mHealth applications to screen or  
514 diagnose several common disease conditions in this region. Hence, we encouraged healthcare professionals to use mHealth interventions to  
515 screen or diagnose several other neglected tropical diseases to enhance early detection to initiate proper treatment processes.

## 516 **Conclusion**

517 The study revealed that mHealth applications are primarily available to healthcare professionals to promote quality healthcare delivery in the  
518 Ashanti region. The findings showed that healthcare professionals use mHealth applications to screen or diagnose, treat, and manage several  
519 common disease conditions at primary healthcare clinics. The results of the study, in addition, demonstrated a low-level use of mHealth  
520 applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support by healthcare professionals at the rural primary healthcare clinics. Future studies are  
521 recommended to examine the availability and use of mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and treatment support by healthcare  
522 professionals at the rural primary healthcare clinics.

## 523 **Abbreviation**

524 GHS - Ghana Health Service

525 GoG - Government of Ghana

526 HIV - Human Immunodeficiency Virus

527 LMICs - Low-and middle-income countries

528 NCDs - Non-communicable diseases

529 RHD - Regional Health Directorate

530 SMS - Short message services

531 SSA - Sub-Saharan African

532 TB - Tuberculosis

533 WHO - World Health Organization

534

### 535 **Acknowledgments**

536

537 We thank the University of KwaZulu-Natal for providing us with essential research resources during this study. The authors are also grateful to  
538 all the staff members at the primary healthcare facilities who participated in this study. The authors would like to thank the Authorities of the  
539 Ashanti Regional Health Directorate, the District Health Management Teams, and all the PHCs managers for permitting us to conduct this study.  
540 Finally, we are grateful to the Department of Public Health Medicine staff for their support in diverse ways.

541

### 542 **Contributors**

543 EO and TPM-T conceptualized the study and developed the analytical strategy. EO collected the data, processed the data, performed the  
544 statistical analysis, interpreted the results, and wrote the first draft of the study. KA and BT contributed to the statistical analysis and  
545 interpretation of the results. TPM-T contributed to the analytical strategy, to the interpretation of the results, and did critical revisions. All  
546 authors contributed to the writing of the manuscript and approved the final version.

### 547 **Funding**

548 This study did not receive any internal or external funding.

### 549 **Competing interests**

550 None declared.

### 551 **Patient and Public Involvement**

552 Patients and/or the public were involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

553 **Patient consent for publication**

554 Not required.

555 **Data Availability**

556

557 Data for this study are the property of the University of KwaZulu-Natal and can be made available publicly. All interested persons can access the  
558 data set from the author Ernest Osei via this email address: [ernestosei56@gmail.com](mailto:ernestosei56@gmail.com) and the University of KwaZulu-Natal Biomedical Research  
559 Ethics Committee (BREC) using the following contacts: The Chairperson Biomedical Research Ethics Administration Research Office,  
560 Westville Campus, Govan Mbeki Building University of KwaZulu-Natal P/Bag X54001, Durban, 4000  
561 KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa Tel.: +27 31260 4769 Fax: +27 31260 4609 Email: [BREC@ukzn.ac.za](mailto:BREC@ukzn.ac.za).

562

563 **References**

- 564 1. Agyemang-Duah W, Mensah CM, Peprah P, Arthur F, Abalo EM. Facilitators of and barriers to the use of healthcare services from a user and  
565 provider perspective in Ejisu-Juaben municipality, Ghana. *Journal of Public Health*. 2019;27(2):133-42.
- 566 2. Llop-Gironés A, Julia M, Chicumbe S, Dula J, ODALLAH AAP, Alvarez F, et al. Inequalities in the access to and quality of healthcare in Mozambique:  
567 evidence from the household budget survey. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2019;31(8):577-82.
- 568 3. Caetano R, Silva AB, Guedes ACCM, Paiva CCNd, Ribeiro GdR, Santos DL, et al. Challenges and opportunities for telehealth during the COVID-19  
569 pandemic: ideas on spaces and initiatives in the Brazilian context. *J Cadernos de Saúde Pública*. 2020;36:e00088920.
- 570 4. Danquah LO, Hasham N, MacFarlane M, Conteh FE, Momoh F, Tedesco AA, et al. Use of a mobile application for Ebola contact tracing and  
571 monitoring in northern Sierra Leone: a proof-of-concept study. *J BMC infectious diseases*. 2019;19(1):1-12.
- 572 5. Bassi A, Arfin S, John O, Jha V. An overview of mobile applications (apps) to support the coronavirus disease 2019 response in India. *J Indian Journal*  
573 *of Medical Research*. 2020;151(5):468.
- 574 6. Kuupiel D, Tlou B, Bawontuo V, Mashamba-Thompson TPJH. Accessibility of pregnancy-related point-of-care diagnostic tests for maternal  
575 healthcare in rural primary healthcare facilities in Northern Ghana: A cross-sectional survey. 2019;5(2):e01236.
- 576 7. Mechael P, Batavia H, Kaonga N, Searle S, Kwan A, Goldberger A, et al. Barriers and gaps affecting mHealth in low and middle income countries:  
577 Policy white paper: Columbia university. Earth institute. Center for global health and economic ...; 2010.
- 578 8. UNDP. GHANA MILLENIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS REPORT. 2015 113.

- 579 9. Lunde P, Nilsson BB, Bergland A, Kværner KJ, Bye A. The effectiveness of smartphone apps for lifestyle improvement in noncommunicable diseases:  
580 systematic review and meta-analyses. *Journal of medical Internet research*. 2018;20(5):e162.
- 581 10. de Jongh T, Gurol-Urganci I, Vodopivec-Jamsek V, Car J, Atun R. Mobile phone messaging for facilitating self-management of long-term illnesses.  
582 *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2012;12:CD007459-CD.
- 583 11. Steinhubl SR, Muse ED, Topol EJ. Can mobile health technologies transform health care? *J Jama*. 2013;310(22):2395-6.
- 584 12. Agyapong VI, Mrklas K, Juhás M, Omeje J, Ohinmaa A, Dursun SM, et al. Cross-sectional survey evaluating Text4Mood: mobile health program to  
585 reduce psychological treatment gap in mental healthcare in Alberta through daily supportive text messages. *J BMC psychiatry*. 2016;16(1):1-12.
- 586 13. *West Africa Mobile Economy*. 2019:36.
- 587 14. Pillay Y, Motsoaledi PA. Digital health in South Africa: innovating to improve health. *BMJ Specialist Journals*; 2018.
- 588 15. Agarwal S, LeFevre AE, Lee J, L'Engle K, Mehl G, Sinha C, et al. Guidelines for reporting of health interventions using mobile phones: mobile health  
589 (mHealth) evidence reporting and assessment (mERA) checklist. *BMJ Open*. 2016;352:i1174.
- 590 16. Mehl G, Labrique A. Prioritizing integrated mHealth strategies for universal health coverage. *J Science*. 2014;345(6202):1284-7.
- 591 17. Smith A. Pew Research Center. *The smartphone difference*. 2016.
- 592 18. Bauer AM, Rue T, Munson SA, Ghomi RH, Keppel GA, Cole AM, et al. Patient-oriented health technologies: patients' perspectives and use. *Journal of*  
593 *mobile technology in medicine*. 2017;6(2):1.
- 594 19. Fagherazzi G, Goetzing C, Rashid MA, Aguayo GA, Huiart L. Digital health strategies to fight COVID-19 worldwide: challenges, recommendations,  
595 and a call for papers. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2020;22(6):e19284.
- 596 20. Reeves JJ, Hollandsworth HM, Torriani FJ, Taplitz R, Abeles S, Tai-Seale M, et al. Rapid response to COVID-19: health informatics support for  
597 outbreak management in an academic health system. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2020;27(6):853-9.
- 598 21. Alwashmi MF. The use of digital health in the detection and management of COVID-19. *International Journal of Environmental Research Public*  
599 *Health*
- 600 2020;17(8):2906.
- 601 22. Caetano R, Silva AB, Guedes ACCM, Paiva CCNd, Ribeiro GdR, Santos DL, et al. Challenges and opportunities for telehealth during the COVID-19  
602 pandemic: ideas on spaces and initiatives in the Brazilian context. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública*. 2020;36:e00088920.
- 603 23. Bassi A, Arfin S, John O, Jha V. An overview of mobile applications (apps) to support the coronavirus disease 2019 response in India. *Indian J Med*  
604 *Res*. 2020;151(5):468-73.
- 605 24. Greenhalgh T, Koh GCH, Car J. Covid-19: a remote assessment in primary care. *BMJ Open*. 2020;368.
- 606 25. Ramsetty A, Adams C. Impact of the digital divide in the age of COVID-19. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*.  
607 2020;27(7):1147-8.
- 608 26. Budd J, Miller BS, Manning EM, Lamos V, Zhuang M, Edelstein M, et al. Digital technologies in the public-health response to COVID-19. *Nature*  
609 *medicine*. 2020:1-10.

- 610 27. Whitelaw S, Mamas MA, Topol E, Van Spall HG. Applications of digital technology in COVID-19 pandemic planning and response. *The Lancet Digital*  
611 *Health*. 2020.
- 612 28. Beratarrechea A, Kanter R, Diez-Canseco F, Fernandez A, Ramirez-Zea M, Miranda J, et al. Challenges of implementing mHealth interventions for  
613 lifestyle modification in prehypertensive subjects in Argentina, Guatemala, and Peru. *Technologies for Development: Springer*; 2015. p. 119-27.
- 614 29. Nhavoto JA, Grönlund Å, Klein GOJ. Mobile health treatment support intervention for HIV and tuberculosis in Mozambique: perspectives of  
615 patients and healthcare workers. 2017;12(4):e0176051.
- 616 30. Mugo PM, Wahome EW, Gichuru EN, Mwashigadi GM, Thiong'o AN, Prins HA, et al. Effect of text message, phone call, and in-person appointment  
617 reminders on uptake of repeat HIV testing among outpatients screened for acute HIV infection in Kenya: a randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One*  
618 2016;11(4):e0153612.
- 619 31. Abaza H, Marschollek M. mHealth application areas and technology combinations: a comparison of literature from high and low/middle income  
620 countries. *Methods of information in medicine*  
621 2017;56(Suppl 1):e105.
- 622 32. Haberer JE, Musiimenta A, Atukunda EC, Musinguzi N, Wyatt MA, Ware NC, et al. Short message service (SMS) reminders and real-time adherence  
623 monitoring improve antiretroviral therapy adherence in rural Uganda. *J AIDS*. 2016;30(8):1295.
- 624 33. Kazi DS, Greenough PG, Madhok R, Heerboth A, Shaikh A, Leaning J, et al. Using mobile technology to optimize disease surveillance and healthcare  
625 delivery at mass gatherings: a case study from India's Kumbh Mela. *Journal of Public Health*  
626 2017;39(3):616-24.
- 627 34. Topol EJ, Steinhubl SR, Torkamani A. Digital medical tools and sensors. *J Jama*. 2015;313(4):353-4.
- 628 35. Service GS. 2010 Population and Housing Census Report: Ghana Statistical Service; 2014.
- 629 36. GSS. 2010 population and housing census: summary report of final results. Ghana Statistical Service Accra; 2012.
- 630 37. Directorate ARH. Annual Report. 2015:125.
- 631 38. Agyemang C, Attah-Adjepong G, Owusu-Dabo E, Aikins ADG, Addo J, Edusei A, et al. Stroke in Ashanti region of Ghana. *J Ghana medical journal*.  
632 2012;46(2):12-7.
- 633 39. Nyiambam W, Sylverken A, Owusu I, Buabeng K, Boateng F, Owusu-Dabo E. Cardiovascular disease risk assessment among patients attending two  
634 cardiac clinics in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. *J Ghana Medical Journal*. 2020;54(3):140-5.
- 635 40. Agyemang-Yeboah F, Eghan BAJ, Annani-Akollor ME, Togbe E, Donkor S, Oppong Afranie B. Evaluation of metabolic syndrome and its associated risk  
636 factors in type 2 diabetes: a descriptive cross-sectional study at the Komfo Anokye Teaching Hospital, Kumasi, Ghana. *J BioMed research international*.  
637 2019;2019.
- 638 41. Donkoh ET, Agyemang-Yeboah F, Asmah RH, Wiredu EK. Prevalence of cervical cancer and pre-cancerous lesions among unscreened Women in  
639 Kumasi, Ghana. *J Medicine*. 2019;98(13).
- 640 42. Abdul IW, Ankamah S, Iddrisu A-K, Danso E. Space-time analysis and mapping of prevalence rate of tuberculosis in Ghana. *J Scientific African*

- 641 2020;7:e00307.
- 642 43. Ashiagbor G, Ofori-Asenso R, Forkuo EK, Agyei-Frimpong S. Measures of geographic accessibility to health care in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. J  
643 Scientific African. 2020;9:e00453.
- 644 44. Ganle JK, Otupiri E, Obeng B, Edusie AK, Ankomah A, Adanu R. Challenges women with disability face in accessing and using maternal healthcare  
645 services in Ghana: a qualitative study. J PloS one. 2016;11(6):e0158361.
- 646 45. Yeleduor V. The community-based health planning and services (CHPS) and access to health care in the Ashanti Region, Ghana 2012.
- 647 46. Dickson KB, Benneh G, Essah R. A new geography of Ghana: Longman London; 1988.
- 648 47. Bauer AM, Rue T, Munson SA, Ghomi RH, Keppel GA, Cole AM, et al. Patient-oriented health technologies: patients' perspectives and use. Journal of  
649 mobile technology in medicine. 2017;6(2):1.
- 650 48. Bauer AM, Rue T, Keppel GA, Cole AM, Baldwin L-M, Katon W. Use of mobile health (mHealth) tools by primary care patients in the WWAMI region  
651 Practice and Research Network (WPRN). J The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine. 2014;27(6):780-8.
- 652 49. Abu-Dalbouh HM. A questionnaire approach based on the technology acceptance model for mobile tracking on patient progress applications. J  
653 Comput Sci. 2013;9(6):763-70.
- 654 50. Bauer AM, Rue T, Munson SA, Ghomi RH, Keppel GA, Cole AM, et al. Patient-oriented health technologies: Patients' perspectives and use. J Journal  
655 of mobile technology in medicine. 2017;6(2):1.
- 656 51. Wang J, Du Y, Coleman D, Peck M, Myneni S, Kang H, et al. Mobile and Connected Health Technology Needs for Older Adults Aging in Place: Cross-  
657 Sectional Survey Study. JMIR aging. 2019;2(1):e13864.
- 658 52. Belcher T, Vess J, Johnson E. Using patient portal messaging to improve glycemic control in adult patients with diabetes in Saudi Arabia. J OJNI.  
659 2019;23(1).
- 660 53. Osei E, Mashamba-Thompson TP. Mobile health applications for disease screening and treatment support in low-and middle-income countries: A  
661 narrative review. J Heliyon. 2021;7(3):e06639.
- 662 54. Organization WH. WHO guideline: recommendations on digital interventions for health system strengthening: web supplement 2: summary of  
663 findings and GRADE tables. World Health Organization; 2019.

## 664 **Additional files**

665 **Table 1:** Multivariate analysis results for the availability of health infrastructure and healthcare workforce competency

666 **Table 2:** Multivariate analysis results for the use of mHealth for diagnostics and treatment support

667 **Table 3:** Multivariate analysis results for the usefulness of mHealth interventions

668 **Table 4:** Multivariate analysis results for the ease of use of mHealth, user satisfaction of mHealth and behavioural intention to use mHealth  
669 interventions

670 **Figure 1:** Map of Ashanti Region of Ghana

671 **Figure 2:** Availability of the various mHealth applications

672 **Figure 3:** Types of diseases treated and managed with mHealth applications

673 **Figure 4:** Odds ratio showing the association on the availability of mobile wireless devices and mHealth applications for disease diagnosis and  
674 treatment support by health workers in Ashanti region, Ghana.

675 **Figure 5:** Odds ratio showing the association on the use of mHealth applications for the management and treatment of HIV and TB conditions  
676 by health workers in Ashanti region, Ghana

677 **Supplementary files**

678 **Additional file 1:** Distribution of primary healthcare facilities sampled in the Ashanti Region  
679

680 **Additional file 2:** Survey tool

681 **Table S 1:** Characteristics of participants from the 100 healthcare facilities surveyed in Ashanti region

682 **Table S 2:** Availability of mobile health for diagnostics and treatment support in the Ashanti region

683 **Table S 3:** Use of mobile health for diagnostics and treatment support in the Ashanti region

684 **Table S 4:** Chi-Square Tests Results of the relationship between the available health infrastructure or healthcare workforce competency and  
685 ownership of mobile wireless devices

686 **Table S 5:** Chi-Square Tests Results of the relationship between the available health infrastructure or healthcare workforce competency and  
687 usefulness of mHealth applications

688 **Table S 6:** Chi-Square Tests Results of the relationship between the available health infrastructure or healthcare workforce competency and ease  
689 of use of mHealth applications

690 **Table S 7:** Chi-Square Tests Results of the relationship between the available health infrastructure or healthcare workforce competency and user  
691 satisfaction and behavioural intention to use mHealth

692 **Supplementary figure 1:** Odds ratio showing the association on the availability of mobile apps, toll-free, supply of power, support systems and  
693 others for disease diagnosis and treatment support by health workers in Ashanti region, Ghana.

694 **Supplementary figure 2:** Odds ratio showing the association on the use of mHealth applications for the management and treatment of  
695 hypertension, diabetes, cancer, malaria, monitor patients' conditions and others by health workers in Ashanti region, Ghana.

696

697

698

699