

# 1 Improving the quality of in-patient neonatal routine data as a pre-requisite 2 for monitoring and improving quality of care at scale: A multi-site 3 retrospective cohort study in Kenyan hospitals

4 Timothy Tuti<sup>1\*</sup>, Jalemba Aluvaala<sup>1,2</sup>, Daisy Chelangat<sup>1</sup>, George Mbevi<sup>1</sup>, John Wainaina<sup>1</sup>, Livingstone  
5 Mumelo<sup>1</sup>, Kefa Wairoto<sup>1</sup>, Dolphine Mochache<sup>1</sup>, Grace Irimu<sup>1,2</sup>, Michuki Maina<sup>1</sup>, Mike English<sup>1,3</sup> on  
6 behalf of The Clinical Information Network Group<sup>^</sup>

7  
8 <sup>1</sup>KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme, Nairobi, Kenya

9 <sup>2</sup>Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya

10 <sup>3</sup>Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

11

12 \* Corresponding Author: P.O. Box 43640, Nairobi, Kenya; Email: [TTuti@kemri-wellcome.org](mailto:TTuti@kemri-wellcome.org)

13 <sup>^</sup>Membership of the Clinical Information Network is provided in the Acknowledgments.

14

## 15 Abstract

16 **Objectives:** The objectives of this study were to (1) determine if membership of a clinical information  
17 network (CIN) was associated with an improvement in the quality of documentation of in-patient  
18 neonatal care provided over time, and (2) characterise accuracy of prescribing for basic treatments  
19 provided to neonatal in-patients if data are adequate.

20 **Design and Settings:** This was a retrospective cohort study involving all children aged  $\leq 28$  days  
21 admitted to New-Born Units (NBUs) between January 2018 and December 2021 in 20 government  
22 hospitals with an interquartile range of annual NBU inpatient admissions between 550 and 1640 in  
23 Kenya. These hospitals participated in routine audit and feedback processes on quality of  
24 documentation and care over the study period.

**NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Outcomes:** The study's outcomes were the number of patients as a proportion of all eligible patients  
26 with (1) complete domain-specific documentation scores, and (2) accurate domain-specific treatment  
27 prescription scores at admission.

28 **Findings:** 80060 NBU admissions were eligible for inclusion. Upon joining the CIN, documentation  
29 scores in the *monitoring (vital signs), other physical examination and bedside testing, discharge*  
30 *information, and maternal history* domains demonstrated a statistically significant month-to-month  
31 relative improvement in number of patients with complete documentation of 7.6%, 2.9%, 2.4%, and  
32 2.0% respectively. There was also statistically significant month-to-month improvement in prescribing  
33 accuracy after joining the CIN of 2.8% and 1.4% for feeds and fluids but not for Antibiotic prescriptions.  
34 Findings suggest that much of the variation observed is due to hospital-level factors.

35 **Conclusions:** It is possible to introduce tools that capture important clinical data at least 80% of the  
36 time in routine African hospital settings but analyses of such data will need to account for missingness  
37 using appropriate statistical techniques. These data allow trends in performance to be explored and  
38 could support better impact evaluation, performance benchmarking, exploration of links between  
39 health system inputs and outcomes and scrutiny of variation in quality and outcomes of hospital care.

40 **Keywords:** Data Quality, Inappropriate Prescribing, Quality Improvement, Newborn, Inpatients, Africa

41 Word Count: 5014

42

## 43 Introduction

44 Neonatal (new-born children aged  $\leq 28$  days) deaths account for 47% of all under-five deaths with  
45 37% of these deaths occurring in Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries [1]. These deaths are largely  
46 attributable to preterm birth, sepsis and intrapartum complications[2] and hospital admissions with  
47 these conditions are still associated with high morbidity in Low- and Middle-Income Countries (LMICs)  
48 like Kenya [3]. Essential interventions such as newborn resuscitation, Kangaroo Mother Care (KMC),  
49 early recognition and treatment of neonatal infections, and Continuous Positive Airway Pressure  
50 (CPAP) therapy have been identified as major interventions to reduce neonatal deaths in hospitals [4,  
51 5]. However, available evidence suggests that adherence to recommended care giving practices in  
52 LMICs is poor [6-8] while poorly functioning information systems mean limited data of questionable  
53 quality on the delivery of such interventions in routine hospital settings in LMIC is available [9, 10].

54 Availability of high-quality timely, accessible, and easy to use data from routine clinical settings could  
55 improve monitoring of intervention adoption and quality of hospital care at scale, and ultimately might  
56 help improve clinical outcomes [9-12]. An integrated approach providing a mechanism to promote  
57 continued improvement of clinical information, implementation of effective practices and  
58 technologies, and locally relevant research can comprise a 'learning health system', which are posited  
59 to be influential in producing the positive change required [13-16].

60 The objectives of this study were to determine: (1) if good quality data can be generated from  
61 hospitals' newborn units invited to participate in a low-cost learning health system and whether the  
62 quality of documentation that is the source of routine data improves over time, (2) if basic  
63 recommended treatments or interventions are being correctly provided to neonatal in-patients (if the  
64 quality of clinical data permits this) and (3) the potential of data to support tracking of intervention  
65 adoption and ultimately their effects in LMIC.

## 66 **Methods**

### 67 **Ethics and Reporting**

68 The reporting of this observational study follows the Strengthening of reporting of observational  
69 studies in epidemiology (STROBE) statement [17]. The Scientific and Ethics Review Unit of the Kenya  
70 Medical Research Institute (KEMRI) approved the collection of the de-identified data that provides the  
71 basis for this study as part of the Clinical Information Network (CIN) for newborns (CIN-N). Individual  
72 consent for access to de-identified patient data was not required.

### 73 **Study design and setting**

74 This study is situated within the CIN-N. The CIN-N is a collaborative learning health system network  
75 between KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme, the Ministry of Health, Kenya Paediatric  
76 Association, and 21 partner hospitals [9, 18]. The hospitals in CIN-N are first referral-level,  
77 geographically dispersed hospitals with an interquartile range of annual NBU inpatient admissions  
78 between 550 and 1640. A paediatric network was established in 2013/2014 to improve care given to  
79 inpatient children [13]. After co-development work with a single large NBU, multiple hospitals'  
80 neonatal units joined to extend the original paediatric network and create the CIN-N in 2017/2018. In  
81 these hospitals most admission care and prescribing is done by medical officer interns who rotate  
82 departments regularly resulting in almost complete changes in those responsible for NBU admissions  
83 every three months [19]. In-depth description of the development of CIN-N is detailed elsewhere [3,  
84 9, 18]. For the purposes of this study, the hospital which was instrumental in the design of the data  
85 collection tools for better capture of NBU data is omitted from subsequent analyses because it was  
86 developing and using information tools for four years before any additional hospitals joined the CIN-  
87 N; thus, only data from 20 hospitals is analysed.

88 This was a retrospective cohort study involving NBUs in the CIN-N hospitals. The CIN-N hospitals  
89 receive three-monthly clinical audit and feedback reports on the quality of care including for example,  
90 summaries of key issues for documentation and treatment prescription errors once they join [18].  
91 Shorter feedback reports on data quality, and morbidity and mortality reports are disseminated  
92 monthly via email to clinicians, nurses in-charge and other hospital administration staff. Neonatal

93 team leaders (neonatologists, paediatricians, and nurses) met face to face once or twice annually until  
94 2020 (before the COVID-19 pandemic) to discuss these reports and how to improve clinical care.  
95 Finally, those that received no feedback were neither included in written reports nor discussed in  
96 meetings. During the COVID-19 pandemic only short, online network meetings were conducted that  
97 focused mostly on disseminating information of relevance to the pandemic and efforts to improve  
98 local neonatal audit and nursing practices.

### 99 **Study size and participants**

100 All hospitals have a specific newborn unit (NBU) and all aged  $\leq 28$  days admitted (1) between January  
101 2018 and December 2021 to the NBU of 20 CIN-N hospitals were eligible for inclusion. We excluded  
102 neonates whose admission or discharge dates were missing or improbable (e.g. discharge date is  
103 earlier than admission date), and those whose admissions fell within prolonged health worker strikes  
104 that resulted in major disruption to health care delivery (i.e. December 2020 – January 2021) [20].

### 105 **Data sources and management**

106 Methods of collection and cleaning of data in the CIN-N are reported in detail elsewhere [21]. Clinical  
107 data for neonatal admissions to the hospitals within the CIN-N are captured through Neonatal  
108 Admission Record (NAR) forms and other forms and charts that are part of the hospital's medical  
109 record. The NAR and associated patient charts prompt the clinician with a checklist of fields covering  
110 nine documentation domains that include demographics, admission information, discharge  
111 information, maternal history, presenting complaints, cardinal signs on examination, other physical  
112 examinations, nursing monitoring and supportive care [18]. Other charts that are also used are a  
113 comprehensive newborn monitoring chart (collects data on vital signs, feeds and fluids prescribed)  
114 which were developed and introduced between March and June 2019 [22], transfer forms (containing  
115 key data when a baby is transferred internally from maternity unit to NBU), treatment sheets,  
116 discharge summaries and death notification reports in case death occurs.

117 The clinical signs included in the NAR are based on recommendations in guidelines from the national  
118 Ministry of Health and the World Health Organisation (WHO) [23]. NAR forms were originally

119 developed as part of the Emergency Treatment and Triage plus admission (ETAT+) approach which  
120 includes skill training in essential inpatient newborn care [24]. In earlier work they were associated  
121 with improved documentation of key patient characteristics during admission [18]. NAR are not  
122 provided to hospitals in CIN-N and so their adoption is at the discretion of hospital teams and  
123 supported by hospitals' own resources, although CIN-N hospitals are encouraged to use them.

124 Each hospital has a clerk who extracts data from the NAR forms into a Research Electronic Data  
125 Capture (REDCap) database [25]. Two sets of data are captured: minimum and full datasets. The  
126 minimal dataset – which is unsuitable for this study's analyses - is collected for (1) admissions during  
127 major holidays when the data clerk is on leave, and (2) on a random selection of records in hospitals  
128 where the workload is very high. The minimal dataset includes biodata and patient outcomes at  
129 discharge and is collected on all neonatal admissions in all CIN-N hospitals for reporting to the national  
130 Health Information System. The full dataset contains comprehensive data on admission details,  
131 patient history, clinical investigations, treatment and discharge information including diagnoses and  
132 outcome [9]. The data collected is subjected to routine quality assurance checks explained in detail  
133 elsewhere [9].

## 134 **Quantitative variables**

### 135 *Creation of documentation scores*

136 The outcome for objective 1 of this study was based on use of individual patient documentation scores  
137 compiled from the signs, symptoms, treatments, and outcomes data (Table 1). These scores were  
138 developed for each of the eight NAR indicator documentation domains then used to determine trends  
139 in the completeness of documentation in the hospitals involved. Domains had different numbers of  
140 component data items (Table 1) considered key for characterising NBU populations and assessing core  
141 aspects of technical quality of care neonates receive [26]. Domain-specific composite scores for each  
142 patient were developed by arithmetic aggregation of all items with valid (non-missing) data in that  
143 domain (score = 1 if valid data, = 0 for missing data).

144 *Creation of treatment correctness scores and intervention tracking*

145 We created an additional three indicator domains to reflect the accuracy of basic treatment  
 146 prescriptions (antibiotics, fluids, and feeds) for relevant sub-populations of neonates receiving these  
 147 treatments and based on the dosage or volume recommendations in the national guidelines [27]  
 148 (Table 2). Each eligible patient in each of the treatment domains in the analysis could either have  
 149 correct or incorrect prescription: If the treatment was correctly prescribed, then it contributed a score  
 150 of one to the domain-specific score; if treatment information was missing or treatment was incorrectly  
 151 prescribed, then it contributed a score of zero to the domain-specific score. Finally, we descriptively  
 152 assessed how well the data could support tracking of intervention adoption over time by evaluating  
 153 whether neonates eligible for weight monitoring, CPAP, and KMC received these essential services.  
 154 The adoption of weight monitoring, CPAP and KMC were summarised by coverage scores calculated  
 155 as the percentage of neonates potentially eligible who were recorded as receiving these  
 156 interventions/monitoring.

**Table 1: Variables used in the documentation and coverage scores**

<b>Documentation score</b>			
<b>Domain of care</b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>Maximum score</b>
<b>Demographics</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sex</li> <li>2. Age in days</li> <li>3. Birth weight</li> <li>4. Gestational age</li> </ol>	All admissions	4
<b>Admission information</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use of the Neonatal Admissions Record (NAR)</li> <li>2. Date of birth</li> <li>3. Date of admission</li> <li>4. Admission weight</li> <li>5. Mode of delivery</li> <li>6. APGAR<sup>1</sup> score at 5 minutes</li> <li>7. Admission diagnosis</li> </ol>	All admissions	7
<b>Discharge information</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Date of discharge/death</li> <li>2. Outcome (dead/alive)</li> <li>3. Discharge diagnosis</li> <li>4. Discharge weight</li> </ol>	All admissions/ those who died	4
<b>Maternal history</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Age</li> <li>2. Parity</li> </ol>	All admissions	4

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. HIV status</li> <li>4. VDRL status<sup>2</sup></li> </ol>		
<b>Presenting complaints (Newborn)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fever</li> <li>2. Convulsions</li> <li>3. Difficulty breathing</li> <li>4. Difficulty feeding</li> <li>5. Apnoea</li> </ol>	All admissions	5
<b>Cardinal signs on examination</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grunting</li> <li>2. Central Cyanosis</li> <li>3. Bulging fontanelle</li> <li>4. Floppy (inability to suck reduced movements / activity)</li> </ol>	All admissions	4
<b>Other physical examination and bedside testing</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pallor/Anaemia</li> <li>2. Bilateral air entry on chest examination</li> <li>3. Chest indrawing</li> <li>4. Capillary refill time</li> <li>5. Signs of umbilical infection</li> <li>6. Irritability</li> <li>7. Jaundice</li> <li>8. Glucose test</li> </ol>	All admissions	8
<b>Monitoring (Vital signs)<sup>3</sup></b>	Nursing chart: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Temperature</li> <li>2. Pulse rate</li> <li>3. Respiratory rate</li> <li>4. Pulse oximetry or central cyanosis</li> </ol>	All admissions	4
<b>Coverage score<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>Variables</b>	<b>Denominator (eligible neonates)</b>	<b>Maximum score</b>
	1. Repeated weight monitoring	Birth weight less <2.5 kg and length of stay >6 days	N/A
	2. CPAP <sup>5</sup>	A clinical diagnosis of respiratory distress syndrome at admission or discharge	N/A
	3. KMC <sup>6</sup>	Birth weight <2kg discharged alive	N/A
<b>Note:</b>			
<sup>1</sup> APGAR: Appearance (skin colour); Pulse (heart rate); Grimace response (reflexes); Activity (muscle tone); Respiration (breathing rate and effort)			



<sup>2</sup>VRDL: **V**enereal **D**isease **R**esearch **L**aboratory

<sup>3</sup>Monitoring (Vital signs) documentation domain represents **ONLY** the first admission set of vital signs

<sup>4</sup>Percentage of eligible neonates who received the intervention.

<sup>5</sup>CPAP: **C**ontinuous **P**ositive **A**irway **P**ressure

<sup>6</sup>KMC: **K**angaroo **M**other **C**are

157

**Table 2: Threshold for prescribing antibiotics, fluids, and feeds**

Domain (Dose determination) <sup>1</sup>		Correct treatment	Underdose	Overdose	Documentation Variables	Denominator	Maximum score
<b>Antibiotic treatment</b> (Dose prescribed/birth weight in kilograms)	Penicillin	1. 40000 ui/kg to 60000ui/kg for 12-hourly for age <7 days or, 2. 40000 ui/kg to 60000ui/kg for 8-hourly for age 7-28 days	<40000 ui/kg <sup>2</sup>	>60000 ui/kg <sup>3</sup>	1. Dose 2. Frequency 3. Route 4. Age 5. Birth weight	Patients prescribed with penicillin	5
	Gentamicin	1. ≥2.4 mg/kg to ≤3.6 mg/kg for birth weight <2 kg and age <7 days, or 2. ≥4 mg/kg to ≤6 mg/kg for birth weight ≥ 2kg and age <7 days, or 3. ≥6 mg/kg to ≤9 mg/kg for age 7-28 days	1. <2.4 mg/kg for birth weight < 2kg and age <7 days, or 2. <4.0 mg/kg for birth weight ≥ 2kg and age <7 days 3. <6 mg/kg for age 7-28 days	1. >3.6 mg/kg for birth weight <2 kg and age <7 days or, 2. >6 mg/kg for birth weight ≥2 kg and age <7 days 3. >9 mg/kg for age 7-28 days	1. Dose 2. Frequency 3. Route 4. Age 5. Birth weight	Patients prescribed with gentamicin	5
<b>Fluids<sup>4</sup></b> (Intravenous fluids prescribed / birth weight in kilograms)		1. ≥64 ml/kg/day to ≤96 ml/kg/day for birth weight <1.5kg or, 2. ≥48 ml/kg/day to ≤72 ml/kg/day for birth weight ≥1.5 kg	1. <64 ml/kg/day for birth weight <1.5 kg or, 2. <48 ml/kg/day for birth weight ≥1.5 kg	1. >96 ml/kg/day for birth weight <1.5 kg or, 2. >72 ml/kg/day for birth weight ≥1.5 kg	1. Volume 2. Duration 3. Age 4. Birthweight	Patients with fluid prescription	4
<b>Feeds<sup>4</sup></b> ((volume of feeds prescribed in milligrams / birth weight in kilograms) number of times administered)		1. ≥64 ml/kg/day to ≤96 ml/kg/day for birth weight <1.5kg or, 2. ≥48 ml/kg/day to ≤72 ml/kg/day for birth weight ≥1.5 kg	1. <64 ml/kg/day for birth weight <1.5kg or, 2. <48 ml/kg/day for birth weight ≥1.5 kg	1. >96 ml/kg/day for birth weight <1.5 kg or, 2. >72 ml/kg/day for birth weight ≥1.5 kg.	1. Type 2. Volume 3. Frequency 4. Age 5. Birthweight 6. Route	Patients with enteral feeds prescribed	6

**Note:**

ml – milliliters; mg – milligrams; ui – international units; kg – kilograms

<sup>1</sup>Allows for ±20% error margin in prescription dose

<sup>2</sup> Includes dose given fewer times than 12-hourly for age < 7 days or 8-hourly for age 7-28 days respectively.

<sup>3</sup> Includes dose given more times than 12-hourly for age < 7 days or 8-hourly for age 7-28 days respectively.

<sup>4</sup> For prescriptions given to neonates in day one of life. Feeds prescribed covers only enteral feeds and does not include any trophic feeds given. Intravenous fluids prescribed covers only 10% Dextrose (D10) prescriptions.

158

159

160 **Statistical methods**

161 Documentation performance of each hospital over time was summarised monthly using trend plots  
162 as a percentage representing (1) the average score of individual patient domain-specific score as a  
163 proportion of the maximum domain score possible (i.e., Documentation score), and (2) the number of  
164 patients with maximum possible documentation score for each domain out of all patients with full  
165 data collection admitted to the NBU. Similarly, domain-specific treatment accuracy and treatment  
166 coverage was summarised monthly for each hospital using trend plots as a percentage representing  
167 the proportion of neonates eligible for essential treatments who received an accurate prescription or  
168 required intervention respectively.

169 These pooled scores are presented using scatter plots for each hospital each month over the period  
170 2018 to 2021 (i.e., from the month of joining CIN-N). We used Locally Weighted Scatterplot Smoothing  
171 (LOWESS) line plots to visually represent the trend over time for each documentation, treatment  
172 accuracy, and treatment coverage domain.

173 To characterise clinical documentation completeness and adherence to recommended treatment  
174 prescribing guidelines over time while quantifying heterogeneity between CIN-N hospitals, we fitted  
175 generalised linear mixed models for each documentation and treatment accuracy domain. These  
176 mixed models (using log link) were fitted on two types of hospital-level count outcome variables  
177 computed monthly:

- 178 (a) Documentation domain completeness score per hospital (as the number of all patients with all  
179 domain-specific variables documented out of all patients admitted to CIN-N hospitals).
- 180 (b) Treatment domain accuracy score per hospital (as the number of all patients with accurate  
181 treatment prescription out of all those with the treatment prescribed).

182 Our approach to the mixed models fitting is within the multilevel modelling framework, with patients  
183 nested in hospitals nested in time points. Time elapsed was captured as months since the hospitals  
184 joined the CIN-N and was treated as a continuous fixed effect. From previous studies within the CIN,  
185 the effect of time on adherence to recommended clinical practice was found to vary across hospitals

186 [28]. We used a likelihood ratio test (LRT) to determine the most suitable random effects model  
187 (hospital random intercepts vs hospital random intercepts with random slopes for time). The outcome  
188 variables for documentation and treatment domains were assumed to follow a Poisson distribution.  
189 An offset term (i.e., the number of patients eligible per month per hospital) was included in each  
190 model to model the count outcome as a rate over time (e.g., change in the number of patients with  
191 accurate treatment prescribed), and the model effects reported as incidence rate ratios (IRR). We  
192 provide Intra-cluster correlation coefficients (ICC) to indicate variation between hospitals in  
193 recommended documentation practices and adherence to treatment guidelines.

#### 194 **Missing data**

195 Missing data was considered 'informative' as the analysis is based on documentation or no  
196 documentation. For the documentation score, missing variables were recorded as zero and therefore  
197 contributed a score of zero to the domain score per patient. For treatments, the absence of clear  
198 prescription information was logically considered to represent an inadequate prescription; for  
199 coverage, no record of use of the intervention was assumed to indicate no use.

#### 200 **Sensitivity analyses**


201 Overdispersion of the outcome variables (which is when the conditional variance exceeds the  
202 conditional mean), a key negative binomial model assumption, was evaluated by a likelihood ratio test  
203 comparing the model(s) to their Poisson model equivalent, which holds the conditional mean and  
204 variance to be equal (i.e., Equidispersion). Also, a likelihood ratio test (LRT) was used to examine the  
205 most suitable random effect model (random intercepts at the hospital level versus random intercepts  
206 for the hospitals with random slopes for time) [29]. To ensure that we adequately reflect the  
207 correlations between the repeated outcome measurements of each hospital which decrease with time  
208 lag (i.e. autocorrelation), we used LRT to examine if there would be evidence to support including a  
209 term for an autocorrelation structure of order one [30], over using a mixed model without such a term.

210 Finally, we explored whether there was evidence supporting the assumption that the conditional  
211 outcome of the models' approximated a normal distribution using quantile residual quantile-quantile  
212 (QQ) plot for each fitted model, although this assumption is debatable for count data models [31].

## 213 Results

### 214 Descriptive findings

215 Figure 1 depicts the study population inclusion process. Out of the 84,960 NBU admissions to CIN-N  
216 hospitals, 80,060 (94.23%) were eligible for analysis. Most exclusions were because an admission was  
217 randomly sampled for minimum data collection (2934/84960) or fell in industrial action period  
218 (1966/84960). Among the patients admitted to CIN-N during the study period and selected for this  
219 study, 43953/80060 (54.9%) were male. Overall, the mortality rate across the 20 hospitals was  
220 11314/80060 (14.13%). The median birth weight of CIN-N NBU admissions was 3 kgs (inter-quartile  
221 range (IQR): 2.0-3.395) and median length of stay was 4 days (1QR: 2-8). NBU admissions had a median  
222 of one admission diagnosis (IQR: 1-2). The leading NBU discharge diagnoses over time was low birth  
223 weight followed by birth asphyxia, respiratory distress syndrome, and then neonatal sepsis. Out of the  
224 42998/80060 (53.71%) NBU admissions with Gentamicin prescription and 43889/80060 (54.82%) with  
225 Penicillin prescription, 1022/42998 (2.38%) and 1964/43889 (4.47%) were classified as incorrect  
226 because of incomplete prescribing data (e.g., any of missing age, birth weight, dosage, route, and  
227 frequency of administration variables) respectively. Out of the 35295/80060 (44.09%) NBU admissions  
228 with fluids prescription and 13643/80060 (17.04%) with feeds prescription, 2778/35295 (7.87%) and  
229 3721/13643 (27.27%) were classified as incorrect because of incomplete prescribing data respectively.  
230 The proportion of records in which key items are not recorded is illustrated in Table 3.



231

232

233 *Figure 1: Flow-chart of the inclusion criteria. The overall population (n = 80060) is used for documentation score analysis.*  
234 *Supplementary Table 1 provides details of when CIN-N hospitals joined the network and patient records per hospital so far.*

235

**Table 3: Proportion of records in which key items are not recorded**

Indicator domain	Variable	Patients with variable not recorded (%)
<b>Demographics</b>	Sex	823/80060 (1.03%)
	Age in days	282/80060 (0.35%)
	Birth weight	1597/80060 (1.99%)
	Gestational age	11552/80060 (14.43%)
<b>Admission Information</b>	NAR used	4895/80060 (6.11%)
	Date of birth	0/80060 (0%)
	Date of admission	0/80060 (0%)
	Admission weight	8008/80060 (10%)
	Date of delivery	1105/80060 (1.38%)
	APGAR Score (5 minutes)	7728/80060 (9.65%)
	Admission diagnosis	548/80060 (0.68%)
<b>Discharge Information</b>	Date of discharge/death	0/80060 (0%)
	Outcome	112/80060 (0.14%)
	Discharge diagnosis	2220/80060 (2.77%)
	Discharge weight	20054/80060 (25.05%)
<b>Maternal History</b>	Age	9770/80060 (12.2%)
	Parity	12742/80060 (15.92%)
	Gravidity	69365/80060 (86.64%)
	HIV status	7806/80060 (9.75%)
	VDRL status	10896/80060 (13.61%)
<b>Presenting Complaints (Newborn)</b>	Fever	7637/80060 (9.54%)
	Convulsions	8456/80060 (10.56%)
	Difficulty breathing	7015/80060 (8.76%)
	Difficulty feeding	9078/80060 (11.34%)
	Apnoea	8813/80060 (11.01%)
<b>Cardinal signs on examination</b>	Grunting	7541/80060 (9.42%)
	Central cyanosis	4818/80060 (6.02%)
	Bulging fontanelle	7042/80060 (8.8%)
	Floppy	7541/80060 (9.42%)
<b>Other physical examination and</b>	Pallor/Anaemia	5454/80060 (6.81%)
	Bilateral air entry	10599/80060 (13.24%)



<b>bedside testing</b>	Indrawing	7374/80060 (9.21%)
	Capillary refill	18020/80060 (22.51%)
	Umbilical infection	8682/80060 (10.84%)
	Jaundice	5691/80060 (7.11%)
	Glucose ordered	6786/80060 (8.48%)
	Irritability	12238/80060 (15.29%)
<b>Monitoring (Vital signs)<sup>1</sup></b>	Temperature	27190/80060 (33.96%)
	Pulse rate	28417/80060 (35.49%)
	Respiratory rate	30613/80060 (38.24%)
	Pulse Oximetry / Central Cyanosis	38196/80060 (47.71%)
<b>Coverage score indicators</b>	Kangaroo Mother Care (KMC) <sup>2</sup>	10208/18102 (56.39%)
	Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (CPAP) <sup>3</sup>	1818/22431 (8.1%)
	Weight monitoring <sup>4</sup>	1118/13832 (8.08%)
<b>Note:</b>		
<sup>1</sup> Monitoring (Vital signs) documentation domain represents ONLY the first admission set of vital signs		
<sup>2</sup> Denominator is neonates with birth weight <2kg discharged alive		
<sup>3</sup> Denominator is neonates with a clinical diagnosis of respiratory distress syndrome at admission or discharge		
<sup>4</sup> Denominator is neonates with birth weight less <2.5 kg and length of stay >6 days		

236


237 **Objective 1 Findings: Quality of documentation of in-patient neonatal care provided over**  
 238 **time**

239 Examining trends with data from across hospitals it can be seen that at the time all (new) hospitals  
 240 joined the CIN-N, documentation completeness for 5/8 documentation domains was already around  
 241 80% or better (Figures 2, Table 4). This is likely attributable to most of these sites already using the  
 242 NAR linked to being already part of CIN-Paediatrics [9, 14, 16]. Specifically, for *admission information*,  
 243 *discharge information* and *demographics* documentation domains, performance was consistently  
 244 >95%, with a median of >80% of patients having full documentation at admission (Table 4, Figure 2).  
 245 For this reason, we do not further examine hospital specific trends for these domains.

246

<b>Table 4: Domain documentation summary statistics pooled across all time periods</b>		
<b>(n= 80060 patients)</b>		
<b>Domain of care</b>	<b>Median percentage (Inter-quartile range)</b>	
	<b>Level of completeness of domain documentation across time</b>	<b>Patients with complete domain documentation across time</b>
Demographics	96.1% (93.34%-97.61%)	85.1% (75.47%-90.67%)
Admission information	97.7% (95.42%-98.59%)	85.4% (72.71%-91.11%)
Discharge information	94.8% (90.22%-97.64%)	81.6% (63.79%-91.39%)
Cardinal Signs	94.4% (88.07%-98.05%)	87.5% (76.16%-95.43%)
Maternal history	91.4% (81.23%-95.12%)	78% (58.56%-87.01%)
Presenting complaints (Newborn)	96.4% (90.7%-99.08%)	93.8% (85.23%-98.5%)
Other physical examination and bedside testing	92.7% (84.83%-97.28%)	74.9% (46.8%-90.14%)
Monitoring (Vital signs)	70.5% (27.13%-94.46%)	44.3% (0%-91.47%)

247



Each uniquely shaped point represents an individual hospital

248


249 *Figure 2: Domain-specific documentation trends over time. Domain completeness score summarised as an average of all*  
 250 *individual patient domain-specific scores in each month. Trend line generated using LOWESS technique.*

251 For other domains, performance started lower with a suggestion from all hospitals' data of  
 252 improvement over time, but also considerable between-hospital variability e.g., *maternal history,*  
 253 *other bedside examination, and monitoring (vital signs)* (Figure 2). We explore and demonstrate this  
 254 considerable between hospital variability (e.g., *Other examination* domain) in Figure 3 (and  
 255 Supplementary Figure 1). Plots display some examples of broad improvement (H13 and H20), some  
 256 with static performance over time (e.g., H12) and some with rather erratic performance including

257 occasional substantial declines (e.g., H2). Domains that often have lower baselines were those where  
258 documentation practices were less standardised prior to joining CIN-N. New information tools such as  
259 Transfer Forms (for sick newborns transferred from labour wards or theatres to NBU) or feedback on  
260 documentation of vital signs on NBU admission may have improved performance for *Maternal history*  
261 and *Monitoring (Vital signs)* domains across hospitals over time (Figures 2 and 3). However, the  
262 challenges with adoption or improvement are illustrated by both patterns where facilities starting very  
263 low showed gradual improvement and those starting high which either stagnated or got worse.

264 All documentation domains demonstrated month-to-month improvements in the number of patients  
265 with complete domain documentation– even if modest in size – which are statistically significant  
266 (Table 5); In descending order, *monitoring (vital signs)*, *other physical examination and bedside testing*  
267 (i.e. Other Signs), *discharge information*, and *maternal history* domains demonstrated a statistically  
268 significant month-to-month relative improvement in number of patients with complete  
269 documentation of 7.6%, 2.9%, 2.4%, and 2.0% respectively (Table 5).

270



271

272 *Figure 3: Illustration of hospital-specific documentation trends using a random selection of half the CIN-N hospitals. Hospital-*  
 273 *specific trends for the remaining subset of hospitals can be found in Supplementary Figure 1. Trend line generated using*  
 274 *LOWESS technique. Fewer observations in some hospitals due to different CIN-N joining dates.*

275

<b>Table 5: Incidence rates of complete domain documentation at admission over time</b>					
Count models with random intercept for hospitals and autocorrelation term for time respectively <sup>1</sup>					
<b>Domain</b>	<b>Term<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>IRR</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>P-Value</b>	<b>ICC (Correlation)<sup>3</sup></b>
Admission Information	(Intercept)	0.695	0.637 - 0.758	<0.001	0.6682 (0.988)
	Time	1.006	1.004 - 1.007	<0.001	
Cardinal signs on examination	(Intercept)	0.665	0.573 - 0.772	<0.001	0.66 (0.943)
	Time	1.007	1.002 - 1.012	0.009	
Demographics	(Intercept)	0.755	0.716 - 0.796	<0.001	0.6848 (0.976)
	Time	1.004	1.002 - 1.005	<0.001	
Discharge Information <sup>4</sup>	(Intercept)	0.344	0.258 - 0.458	<0.001	0.0239 (0.954)
	Time	1.024	1.014 - 1.034	<0.001	
Maternal History	(Intercept)	0.373	0.254 - 0.547	0.004	0.5341 (0.984)
	Time	1.020	1.01 - 1.03	0.022	
Monitoring (Vital signs) <sup>4</sup>	(Intercept)	0.028	0.01 - 0.078	<0.001	0.5121 (0.982)
	Time	1.076	1.046 - 1.107	0.006	
Other physical examination and bedside testing <sup>4</sup>	(Intercept)	0.206	0.11 - 0.388	<0.001	0.5064 (0.991)
	Time	1.029	1.016 - 1.043	<0.001	
Presenting Complaints	(Intercept)	0.711	0.618 - 0.819	<0.001	0.6752 (0.905)
	Time	1.008	1.002 - 1.013	0.006	
<sup>1</sup> Time treated as continuous covariate representing consecutive months in CIN					
<sup>2</sup> Intercept term provides baseline rate at month 1 of joining the CIN.					
<sup>3</sup> Intra-Cluster Correlation (ICC), with autocorrelation parameter provided in the brackets. The choice to account for heterogeneity between hospitals while allowing for varying effects of time (i.e., a random slope) within each hospital was more suitable than just a hospitals random intercepts model; However, a hospitals random intercept model with an autocorrelation term for time outperformed a random slopes model equivalent (Supplementary Table 2).					
<sup>4</sup> Used negative binomial models in place of Poisson models given the equidispersion assumption violation (Supplementary Table 2)					

276


277 At the time of joining CIN-N, less than 50% of the patients admitted to the hospitals had complete  
 278 documentation of *Discharge information, Monitoring (Vital signs), Other physical examination and*  
 279 *bedside testing, and Maternal history* domains, with a substantive amount of variance in the outcome  
 280 explained by hospital factors as illustrated by the high ICCs (Table 5, Figure 3). Hospitals with higher

281 baseline performance tended to demonstrate slower rates of improvement than hospitals with lower  
282 baseline performance as illustrated in Figure 3 (Table 5, H13 versus H17 in Figure 3).

283 **Objective 2 Findings: Accuracy of essential neonatal intervention prescriptions over time**

284 Given the good quality of prescribing data from CIN-N and the reasonable assumptions about the  
285 meaning of missing prescribing data, treatment prescribing accuracy was evaluated for the common  
286 antibiotics, feeds, and fluids in NBUs. Domain specific treatment accuracy scores revealed an  
287 increasing proportion of patients with accurate fluids and feeds prescriptions from approximately 40%  
288 to 60%, and 15% to 40% respectively, although feeds prescribing accuracy then regresses to 25%  
289 (Figure 4).

290



291

292 *Figure 4: Overall trend in treatment accuracy and coverage. KMC: Kangaroo Mother Care; CPAP: Continuous Positive Airway*  
 293 *Pressure; RDS: Respiratory Distress Syndrome. Trend line generated using LOWESS technique.*


294 Antibiotic prescription shows a modest improvement in accuracy from around 65% to 80% within the  
 295 first 12 months, after which it then fluctuated around 80% over time across all CIN-N admissions.

296 Treatment coverage levels for KMC demonstrated an increase over time from 20% to 40% in neonates  
 297 with birth weight <2kg (Figure 4). There was a small increase in CPAP coverage levels over time in  
 298 neonates with a clinical diagnosis of respiratory distress syndrome (RDS) from 4% to 10%. Repeated



299 weight monitoring for sick neonates improved from 80% to approximately 95% over time (Figure 4).  
300 There is evidence of moderate to high hospital variability in both treatment accuracy and coverage  
301 scores in CIN-N hospitals (Figure 4).

302 While antibiotic treatment accuracy seems to have a ceiling effect of 80% in pooled hospital data,  
303 hospital specific plots (Figure 5, Supplementary Figure 2) indicate that hospitals can consistently attain  
304 accuracy levels > 80% (H8, H11, H19), suggesting improvements in other sites would be possible.  
305 Hospital-specific trends suggest fluids prescribing accuracy improves from a lower baseline for some  
306 hospitals (e.g., H5, H12, H20) but there is still a long way to go, with considerable between hospital  
307 variability evident over time (Figure 5, Supplementary Figure 2). Similarly, feeds prescribing accuracy  
308 shows some improvement in some hospitals from a lower baseline (e.g., H5, H8) but in others  
309 performance is erratic (H2, H12), with most performing consistently poorly over time (e.g., H13, H19)  
310 (Figure 5, Supplementary Figure 2).



311

312 *Figure 5: Hospital-specific treatment accuracy trends for half of randomly selected CIN-N hospitals. Hospital-specific trends*  
 313 *for the remaining subset of hospitals can be found in Supplementary Figure 2. Trend line generated using LOWESS technique.*  
 314 *Fewer observations in some hospitals due to different CIN-N joining dates.*

315

Count model with random intercept for hospitals and autocorrelation term for time respectively <sup>1</sup>					
Treatment Domain	Term	IRR	95% CI	P-value	ICC (Correlation) <sup>2</sup>
Antibiotics	(Intercept)	0.735	0.688 - 0.786	<0.001	0.6771 (0.989)

	Time	1.002	1 - 1.003	0.053	
Feeds	(Intercept)	0.108	0.066 - 0.177	<0.001	0.0403 (0.984)
	Time	1.028	1.013 - 1.043	<0.001	
Fluids	(Intercept)	0.228	0.11 - 0.473	<0.001	0.4072 (0.995)
	Time	1.014	1.002 - 1.027	0.028	

<sup>1</sup>Time treated as a continuous covariate representing consecutive months since joining the CIN; Months with no patients reporting assumed to have a MNAR mechanism and dropped from regression analysis.

<sup>2</sup>Intra-Cluster Correlation, with autocorrelation parameter provided in the brackets. The choice to account for heterogeneity between hospitals while allowing for varying effects of time (i.e., a random slope) within each hospital was more suitable than just a hospital's random intercepts model; However, a hospital's random intercept model with an autocorrelation term for time outperformed a random slopes model equivalent (Supplementary Table 2).

316

317 On average, 73.5%, 10.8% and 22.8% of the patients in the CIN-N received the correct antibiotic, feeds,  
 318 and fluids treatment at the time when hospitals joined the CIN-N (Table 6). There was a modest  
 319 statistically significant month-to-month relative increase in correct inpatient treatment after joining  
 320 the CIN of 2.8% and 1.4% for feeds and fluids prescribing accuracy. Antibiotic prescriptions showed no  
 321 statistically significant month-to-month improvement after joining CIN-N (Table 6). The high ICC from  
 322 the antibiotics and fluids mixed models suggests that much of the variation in the prescribing practices  
 323 accuracy is associated with hospital-level factors.

### 324 Sensitivity analyses findings

325 It was reasonable to use Poisson models (which assumes equidispersion) in all but four documentation  
 326 domains (*Discharge information, Monitoring (Vital Signs), Other physical examinations and bedside*  
 327 *testing (i.e., Other Signs)* documentation domains) and the *Feeds* treatment accuracy domain which  
 328 showed evidence suggestive of overdispersion (Supplementary Table 2). Where the equidispersion  
 329 assumption was violated, negative binomial models were used and informed any inference drawn.

## 330 Discussion

### 331 Summary of findings

332 This study aimed at determining if quality routine clinical data might be generated from CIN-N  
333 hospitals and if the quality of data improved over time. As the data quality was reasonable, they were  
334 then used to determine whether essential treatments or interventions are being correctly prescribed  
335 to newborns and to track intervention adoption. From the time hospitals joined the CIN-N, around  
336 80% of newborns had complete documentation in 5/8 documentation domains (Table 4). This  
337 relatively good performance at baseline may be a consequence of participation in the paediatric CIN  
338 by most of these hospitals prior to formal extension of CIN to NBUs (i.e., CIN-N) with many paediatric  
339 practitioners previously exposed to use of the NAR, ETAT+ training and national neonatal guidelines  
340 [13]. All documentation domains demonstrated month-to-month statistically significant albeit modest  
341 improvements (between 0.6% and 7.6% per month) in the number of patients with complete domain  
342 documentation (Figure 4, Table 5). On average, 73.5%, 10.8% and 22.8% of the newborns with  
343 treatment orders in the CIN-N for first-line antibiotics, feeds, and fluids had correct prescriptions at  
344 the time when hospitals joined the CIN-N (Table 6). There is a modest statistically significant 2.8% and  
345 1.4% month-to-month relative increase in accurate feeds and fluids prescription after joining the CIN-  
346 N resulting in an end line performance of around 40% and 60% respectively. Antibiotic prescribing  
347 showed no statistically significant month-to-month change.

348 Although sometimes modest the improvements observed were often sustained during the COVID-19  
349 pandemic (perhaps with the exception of feed prescribing) that restricted network engagement  
350 activities to brief online meetings between April 2020 and December 2021. Improvements also  
351 occurred over a period of 4 years during which junior medical staff on NBUs changed every 3 months  
352 with frequent changes also in senior staff [19]. Across the entire period CIN-N sustained distribution  
353 of feedback reports and the magnitude of improvements observed are in keeping with findings from  
354 many audit and feedback interventions [32].

355 Coverage levels for KMC in neonates with birth weight <2kg and CPAP in neonates with clinically  
356 diagnosed respiratory distress syndrome (RDS) demonstrated an increase over time from 20% to 40%  
357 and 4%-10%; repeated weight monitoring for sick neonates with birth weight <2.5 kg and length of  
358 stay >6 days improved from 80% to approximately 95% over time (Figure 4). There was evidence of  
359 moderate to high hospital variability in documentation, treatment accuracy, and coverage scores in  
360 CIN-N hospitals; as shown previously hospitals with higher baseline performance evidence slower  
361 rates of improvement than hospitals with lower baseline performance in some cases perhaps linked  
362 to ceiling effects [33].

### 363 **Comparison to other findings**

364 Previous studies in Kenya depict a health system that is struggling to collect quality data that is usable  
365 for decision making especially for neonatal care [18, 34]. The poor quality of neonatal clinical data has  
366 been widely reported in other African countries [35, 36], this undermines efforts to track the scale up  
367 of quality care [37, 38]. Implementation of a learning health system across hospitals utilising a  
368 common data platform to facilitate routine audit and feedback cycles have been shown to improve  
369 the documentation of patient data and its subsequent use in care improvement [9, 37, 39]. Employing  
370 findings, tools and practices from previous studies and progressively engaging more hospitals we  
371 demonstrate that data can be collected using a common data platform as part of a learning health  
372 system approach from a network of hospitals' NBUs; we further show that these data can be useful  
373 for identifying potential gaps in care (e.g., treatment accuracy) with an aim of improving the quality  
374 of care provided in facilities and tracking outcomes at scale [13-16, 18, 40]. To our knowledge this is  
375 the largest reported long-term neonatal learning health system platform in SSA, serving as an  
376 exemplar actionable health information system in line with WHO standards [13, 15, 16, 41].

377 Findings from scoping reviews suggest that having better data can help improve quality of care if  
378 coupled with development of local leadership, training, and use of local improvement strategies such  
379 as mortality audits or quality improvement cycles; This can help reduce inpatient neonatal mortality  
380 in low-income country hospitals [42-45]. However, the complex intervention strategies required to

381 tackle multiple quality and safety concerns in hospitals may make it challenging to demonstrate  
382 mortality reductions over the short term [46]. High-quality data platforms may therefore be especially  
383 helpful to track whether hospital quality of care and mortality rates are improving over the long-term.  
384 Hospital neonatal outcomes may also be influenced by the successful scaling up of key interventions  
385 such as CPAP and KMC. It is therefore essential to be able to track their adoption at scale. However,  
386 outside specific research studies these data are rarely reported and the effects of programmes  
387 supporting such scaling up therefore remain largely unknown. The CIN-N data platform we describe,  
388 by spanning aspects of care rarely included in other LMIC quality assessment approaches, offers one  
389 means to track adoption over the long-term and provides a hypothesis generating platform for  
390 implementation research linked to observed variations in quality of care and intervention rollout [42,  
391 47, 48].

### 392 **Implications of findings**

393 For key clinical data domains (i.e., demographic, admission, and discharge information) there was  
394 good data documentation at the time hospitals joined the CIN-N. This is likely attributable to most of  
395 these sites being already part of CIN-Paediatrics, where organisationally, the learning health system  
396 culture was already being cultivated, allowing these hospitals to take advantage of the roll-out and  
397 dissemination of tools like the NAR coupled with ETAT+ training. This also does suggest that it is  
398 possible to introduce tools that capture essential clinical data with missingness rates of 20% or less in  
399 routine SSA hospital settings. Analyses of such data do then need to account for missingness using  
400 appropriate statistical techniques to reduce potential biases [49, 50]. The slow but steady month-to-  
401 month improvement illustrates how long it takes to change clinical behaviours for some forms of  
402 patient documentation.

403 For several documentation domains (e.g., *Other physical examination, Maternal History, Monitoring*  
404 *Vital Signs*) and all treatment accuracy and coverage domains except antibiotic prescribing accuracy,  
405 considerable variability in performance between hospitals remains a persistent challenge. In some  
406 cases, this may reflect a “ceiling” effect (e.g., *Fluids* prescribing accuracy). It is evident, however, that

407 some hospitals can attain higher accuracy levels consistently (Figures 3 and 5), suggesting  
408 improvements in other sites would be possible. Similarly, trends in accuracy in the prescription of  
409 feeds and fluids are quite erratic and vary within and between hospitals (Figure 6). These erratic  
410 patterns might have been exacerbated by the limited interaction of hospitals through CIN meetings  
411 during the COVID-19 pandemic and other challenges to sustaining quality care such as human resource  
412 shortages and labour strikes [19, 20]. Learning from ‘positive deviants’ may be informative. Prior  
413 research suggests good performers have adequate and supportive staffing, participate actively in local  
414 clinical audits and feedback process, and have good supervision by unit leads [14-16, 51].

415 Better theory-driven ways of conducting audit and feedback might be required within CIN-N to  
416 improve quality of care and treatment accuracy. [32] For example, more active feedback might be  
417 needed for more complex tasks such as to promote accurate prescribing. Further elaborations might  
418 explicitly address (1) capacity limitations of CIN-N hospitals and clinical teams to produce the  
419 improvements required, (2) lessons learned about the identity and culture of each individual CIN-N  
420 hospital and site specific barriers to change (3) specific use of behavioural thinking that directly  
421 supports positive clinical behaviours by ensuring feedback is actionable, controllable and timely [39,  
422 52].

#### 423 **Strengths and limitations**

424 This study is among the few in SSA focusing on documentation of new-born data, an implementation  
425 of strategic objective 2 and 5 of the Every Newborn Action Plan [6, 53, 54]. The CIN-N generates data  
426 from more than 20 NBUs across Kenya by improving routine data sources in a strategy that is relatively  
427 low-cost and scalable as the central data management and data quality assurance processes involved  
428 can benefit from economies of scale [9, 55]. However, the data generated are limited only to  
429 ‘documentation’, limiting the range of measures of quality e.g., whether prescriptions were correct.  
430 Key limitations therefore remain such as confirmation of whether treatment was dispensed as  
431 prescribed (i.e., treatment adherence), and, for interventions such as CPAP, it can be hard to  
432 determine the best denominator population which would ideally be newborns that might have

433 benefited from its use. This problem in identifying suitable denominators that enable evaluation of  
434 the appropriate use of interventions mean tracking adoption may frequently be based on a cruder  
435 measure of frequency of (documented) use. Furthermore, for some indicators applicable to only  
436 relatively small numbers of patients performance may appear erratic because there are few data  
437 points per month. Thus, less frequent monitoring over longer time periods may be required to sensibly  
438 track trends.

## 439 Conclusions

440 It is possible to introduce tools that capture essential clinical data often in 80% or more of newborns  
441 admitted to routine SSA hospital settings engaged in a centrally supported peer-to-peer network, but  
442 analyses of such data need to account for missingness using appropriate statistical techniques.  
443 Improvements in quality indicators are on average modest but valuable on a month-to-month basis  
444 and occur over a prolonged period that included the COVID pandemic. Average effects mask  
445 considerable temporal and between hospital variability with some hospitals demonstrating high levels  
446 of performance for indicators likely to be important to patient safety and outcomes such as feeding  
447 or antibiotic treatment prescribing accuracy. Learning from high-performing hospitals and  
448 continuously deploying better theory-driven feedback approaches may help realise better  
449 improvements more widely. However, considerable system challenges such as rapid staff turnover,  
450 general staff shortages and ongoing material resource challenges likely contribute to persistent  
451 problems delivering quality care. Such quality clinical data (and associated platforms) can support  
452 better impact evaluation, performance benchmarking, exploration of links between health system  
453 inputs and outcomes and critical scrutiny of geographic variation in quality and outcomes of hospital  
454 care [56]. Efforts to improve the quality of clinical data from SSA are needed to support these  
455 objectives remain much needed.



## 456 **Declarations**

### 457 **Abbreviations**

458 A&F, Audit and Feedback; CIN, Clinical Information Network; CPAP, Continuous Positive Airway  
459 Pressure; ETAT+, Emergency Treatment and Triage plus admission; KEMRI, Kenya Medical Research  
460 Institute; KMC, Kangaroo Mother Care; KPA, Kenya Paediatric Association; LMICs, Low and middle-  
461 income countries; MoH, Ministry of Health; NAR, Neonatal Admission Record; NBU, Newborn Unit;  
462 SERU, KEMRI's Scientific and Ethics Review Unit; SSA, Sub-Saharan Africa; WHO, World Health  
463 Organization.

### 464 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

465 Ethical approval was provided by the KEMRI Scientific and Ethical Review Committee (SERU 3459).  
466 Individual patient consent for the de-identified clinical data was judged to not be required, but consent  
467 from participating hospitals was sought.

### 468 **Consent for publication**

469 This protocol is published with the permission of the Director of Kenya Medical Research Institute  
470 (KEMRI). At this stage with no protocol containing no data from any individual person, individual  
471 consent is not applicable.

### 472 **Availability of Data and Materials**

473 The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available due to the  
474 primary data being owned by the hospitals and their counties with the Ministry of Health; The research  
475 staff do have permission to share the data without further written approval from both the KEMRI-  
476 Wellcome Trust Data Governance Committee and the Facility, County or Ministry of Health as  
477 appropriate to the data request.

478 Requests for access to primary data from qualitative research by people other than the investigators  
479 will be submitted to the KEMRI-Wellcome Trust Research Programme data governance committee as  
480 a first step through [dgc@kemri-wellcome.org](mailto:dgc@kemri-wellcome.org), who will advise on the need for additional ethical  
481 review by the KEMRI Research Ethics Committee.

### 482 **Competing interests**

483 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

## 484 **Funding**

485 This work was primarily supported by a Wellcome Trust Senior Fellowship (#097170) awarded to ME.

486 Additional support was provided by a Wellcome Trust core grant awarded to the KEMRI-Wellcome

487 Trust Research Programme (#092654). The funders had no role in the preparation of this report or the

488 decision to submit for publication.

## 489 **Author contributions**

490 **Conceptualization:** TT, ME

491 **Data Curation:** GM, LM, KW, JW, DM

492 **Formal Analysis:** TT, JA, DC, MM, ME

493 **Methodology:** TT, JA, ME

494 **Investigation:** TT, JW, DC, JA, ME

495 **Software:** TT, JW, KW, LM, GM

496 **Supervision:** ME

497 **Writing – Original Draft Preparation:** TT

498 **Writing – Review & Editing:** TT, DC, JA, JW, GM, KW, LM, DM, GI, MM, ME

499 All authors revised the manuscript, approved the final version and agreed to be accountable for the

500 findings.

## 501 **Acknowledgements**

502 The **Clinical Information Network (CIN) Group:** The CIN group hospital teams who are tagged to

503 collaborate in the network's development, data collection, data management, implementation of

504 audit and feedback interventions and who will participate in this study include the following focal

505 persons:

506 a. **Paediatricians:** Juma Vitalis, Nyumbile Bonface, Roselyne Malangachi, Christine Manyasi,

507 Catherine Mutinda, David Kibiwott Kimutai, Rukia Aden, Caren Emadau, Elizabeth Atieno Jowi,

508 Cecilia Muithya, Charles Nzioki, Supa Tunje, Dr. Penina Musyoka, Wagura Mwangi, Agnes

509 Mithamo, Magdalene Kuria, Esther Njiru, Mwangi Ngina, Penina Mwangi, Rachel Inginia, Melab

510 Musabi, Emma Namulala, Grace Ochieng, Lydia Thurania, Felicitas Makokha, Josephine Ojigo,

511 Beth Maina, Catherine Mutinda, Mary Waiyego, Bernadette Lusweti, Angeline Ithondeka, Julie  
512 Barasa, Meshack Liru, Elizabeth Kibaru, Alice Nkirote Nyaribari, Joyce Akuka, Joyce Wangari;  
513 b. **Nurses:** Amilia Ngoda, Aggrey Nzavaye Emenwa, Patricia Nafula Wesakania, George Lipesa, Jane  
514 Mbungu, Marystella Mutenyo, Joyce Mbogho, Joan Baswetty, Ann Jambi, Josephine Aritho,  
515 Beatrice Njambi, Felisters Muccheke, Zainab Kioni, Jeniffer, Lucy Kinyua, Margaret Kethi, Alice  
516 Oguda, Salome Nashimiyu Situma, Nancy Gachaja, Loise N. Mwangi, Ruth Mwai, irginia Wangari  
517 Muruga, Nancy Mburu, Celestine Muteshi, Abigael Bwire, Salome Okisa Muyale, Naomi Situma,  
518 Faith Mueni, Hellen Mwaura, Rosemary Mututa, Caroline Lavu, Joyce Oketch, Jane Hore Olum,  
519 Orina Nyakina, Faith Njeru, Rebecca Chelimo, Margaret Wanjiku Mwaura, Ann Wambugu, Epharus  
520 Njeri Mburu, Linda Awino Tindi, Jane Akumu, Ruth Otieno, Slessor Osok;  
521 c. **Health Record Information Officers (HRIOs):** Seline Kulubi, Susan Wanjala, Pauline Njeru,  
522 Rebbecca Mukami Mbogo, John Ollongo, Samuel Soita, Judith Mirenja, Mary Nguri, Margaret  
523 Waweru, Mary Akoth Oruko, Jeska Kuya, Caroline Muthuri, Esther Muthiani, Esther Mwangi,  
524 Joseph Nganga, Benjamin Tanui, Alfred Wanjau, Judith Onsongo, Peter Muigai, Arnest Namayi,  
525 Elizabeth Kosiom, Dorcas Cherop, Faith Marete, Johanness Simiyu, Collince Danga, Arthur Otieno  
526 Oyugi, Fredrick Keya Okoth.

527 The **Clinical Information Network (CIN) Group's** monitored email address is [CIN@kemri-wellcome.org](mailto:CIN@kemri-wellcome.org)  
528 and the list can change when new paediatrician(s), nurse(s) or HRIO leave or come into the hospital.

### 529 **Open access**

530 This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0  
531 Unported (CC BY 4.0) license, which permits others to copy, redistribute, remix, transform and build  
532 upon this work for any purpose, provided the original work is properly cited, a link to the licence is  
533 given, and indication of whether changes were made.

534

### 535 **References**

536 1. Tunçalp, Ö., et al., *Quality of care for pregnant women and newborns—the WHO vision.*  
537 *BJOG: an international journal of obstetrics & gynaecology*, 2015. **122**(8): p. 1045-1049.

- 538 2. Liu, L., et al., *Global, regional, and national causes of under-5 mortality in 2000–15: an*  
539 *updated systematic analysis with implications for the Sustainable Development Goals*. The  
540 Lancet, 2016. **388**(10063): p. 3027-3035.
- 541 3. Irimu, G., et al., *Neonatal mortality in Kenyan hospitals: a multisite, retrospective, cohort*  
542 *study*. BMJ Global Health, 2021. **6**(5): p. e004475.
- 543 4. Brotherton, H., et al., *Impact of early kangaroo mother care versus standard care on survival*  
544 *of mild-moderately unstable neonates < 2000 grams: A randomised controlled trial*.  
545 EClinicalMedicine, 2021. **39**: p. 101050.
- 546 5. World Health Organization, *WHO recommendations on interventions to improve preterm*  
547 *birth outcomes*. 2015.
- 548 6. Bee, M., A. Shiroor, and Z. Hill, *Neonatal care practices in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic*  
549 *review of quantitative and qualitative data*. Journal of Health, Population and Nutrition,  
550 2018. **37**(1): p. 1-12.
- 551 7. de Graft-Johnson, J., et al., *Cross-sectional observational assessment of quality of newborn*  
552 *care immediately after birth in health facilities across six sub-Saharan African countries*. BMJ  
553 open, 2017. **7**(3): p. e014680.
- 554 8. Wilunda, C., et al., *Assessing coverage, equity and quality gaps in maternal and neonatal*  
555 *care in sub-saharan Africa: an integrated approach*. PloS one, 2015. **10**(5): p. e0127827.
- 556 9. Tuti, T., et al., *Improving documentation of clinical care within a clinical information network:*  
557 *an essential initial step in efforts to understand and improve care in Kenyan hospitals*. BMJ  
558 Global Health, 2016. **1**(1): p. e000028.
- 559 10. Murphy, G.A., et al., *Estimating the need for inpatient neonatal services: an iterative*  
560 *approach employing evidence and expert consensus to guide local policy in Kenya*. BMJ  
561 global health, 2017. **2**(4): p. e000472.
- 562 11. Maina, M., et al., *Using treatment guidelines to improve antibiotic use: insights from an*  
563 *antibiotic point prevalence survey in Kenya*. BMJ Global Health, 2021. **6**(1): p. e003836.
- 564 12. World Health Organization, *Standards for improving the quality of care for small and sick*  
565 *newborns in health facilities*. 2020.
- 566 13. Irimu, G., et al., *Approaching quality improvement at scale: a learning health system*  
567 *approach in Kenya*. Archives of Disease in Childhood, 2018. **103**(11): p. 1013-1019.
- 568 14. English, M., et al., *What do we think we are doing? How might a clinical information network*  
569 *be promoting implementation of recommended paediatric care practices in Kenyan*  
570 *hospitals?* Health research policy and systems, 2017. **15**(1): p. 1-12.
- 571 15. English, M., et al., *Building learning health systems to accelerate research and improve*  
572 *outcomes of clinical care in low-and middle-income countries*. PLoS medicine, 2016. **13**(4): p.  
573 e1001991.
- 574 16. English, M., et al., *Employing learning health system principles to advance research on severe*  
575 *neonatal and paediatric illness in Kenya*. BMJ Global Health, 2021. **6**(3): p. e005300.
- 576 17. Von Elm, E., et al., *The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology*  
577 *(STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies*. Annals of internal  
578 medicine, 2007. **147**(8): p. 573-577.
- 579 18. Maina, M., et al., *Using a common data platform to facilitate audit and feedback on the*  
580 *quality of hospital care provided to sick newborns in Kenya*. BMJ Global Health, 2018. **3**(5): p.  
581 e001027.
- 582 19. Ogero, M., et al., *Examining which clinicians provide admission hospital care in a high*  
583 *mortality setting and their adherence to guidelines: an observational study in 13 hospitals*.  
584 Archives of disease in childhood, 2020. **105**(7): p. 648-654.
- 585 20. Irimu, G., et al., *Tackling health professionals' strikes: an essential part of health system*  
586 *strengthening in Kenya*. BMJ global health, 2018. **3**(6).
- 587 21. Tuti, T., et al., *Innovating to enhance clinical data management using non-commercial and*  
588 *open source solutions across a multi-center network supporting inpatient pediatric care and*

- 589            *research in Kenya*. Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 2016. **23**(1): p.  
590            184-192.
- 591    22.    Muinga, N., et al., *Using a human-centred design approach to develop a comprehensive*  
592            *newborn monitoring chart for inpatient care in Kenya*. BMC health services research, 2021.  
593            **21**(1): p. 1-14.
- 594    23.    World Health Organization, *Pocket book of hospital care for children: guidelines for the*  
595            *management of common childhood illnesses*. 2013: World Health Organization.
- 596    24.    Irimu, G., et al., *Developing and introducing evidence based clinical practice guidelines for*  
597            *serious illness in Kenya*. Archives of disease in childhood, 2008. **93**(9): p. 799-804.
- 598    25.    Harris, P.A., et al., *Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—a metadata-driven*  
599            *methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support*.  
600            Journal of biomedical informatics, 2009. **42**(2): p. 377-381.
- 601    26.    English, M., et al., *Implementing locally appropriate guidelines and training to improve care*  
602            *of serious illness in Kenyan hospitals: a story of scaling-up (and down and left and right)*.  
603            Archives of disease in childhood, 2011. **96**(3): p. 285-290.
- 604    27.    Amolo, L., G. Irimu, and D. Njai, *Knowledge of postnatal mothers on essential newborn care*  
605            *practices at the Kenyatta National Hospital: a cross sectional study*. Pan African Medical  
606            Journal, 2017. **28**(1): p. 159-159.
- 607    28.    Tuti, T., et al., *Pulse oximetry adoption and oxygen orders at paediatric admission over 7*  
608            *years in Kenya: a multihospital retrospective cohort study*. BMJ open, 2021. **11**(9): p.  
609            e050995.
- 610    29.    Verbeke, G., G. Molenberghs, and D. Rizopoulos, *Random effects models for longitudinal*  
611            *data*, in *Longitudinal research with latent variables*. 2010, Springer. p. 37-96.
- 612    30.    Linden, A., *Conducting interrupted time-series analysis for single-and multiple-group*  
613            *comparisons*. The Stata Journal, 2015. **15**(2): p. 480-500.
- 614    31.    Roback, P. and J. Legler, *Beyond multiple linear regression: applied generalized linear models*  
615            *and multilevel models in R*. 2021, Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- 616    32.    Ivers, N., et al., *Audit and feedback: effects on professional practice and healthcare*  
617            *outcomes*. Cochrane database of systematic reviews, 2012(6).
- 618    33.    Gachau, S., et al., *Does audit and feedback improve the adoption of recommended practices?*  
619            *Evidence from a longitudinal observational study of an emerging clinical network in Kenya*.  
620            BMJ global health, 2017. **2**(4): p. e000468.
- 621    34.    Aluvaala, J., et al., *Assessment of neonatal care in clinical training facilities in Kenya*. Archives  
622            of disease in childhood, 2015. **100**(1): p. 42-47.
- 623    35.    Bhattacharya, A.A., et al., *Quality of routine facility data for monitoring priority maternal and*  
624            *newborn indicators in DHIS2: a case study from Gombe state, Nigeria*. PloS one, 2019. **14**(1):  
625            p. e0211265.
- 626    36.    Dadzie, D., et al., *Evaluation of neonatal mortality data completeness and accuracy in*  
627            *Ghana*. Plos one, 2021. **16**(3): p. e0239049.
- 628    37.    Canavan, M.E., et al., *Maternal and neonatal services in Ethiopia: measuring and improving*  
629            *quality*. Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 2017. **95**(6): p. 473.
- 630    38.    Dickson, K.E., et al., *Scaling up quality care for mothers and newborns around the time of*  
631            *birth: an overview of methods and analyses of intervention-specific bottlenecks and*  
632            *solutions*. BMC pregnancy and childbirth, 2015. **15**(2): p. 1-19.
- 633    39.    Brown, B., et al., *Clinical performance feedback intervention theory (CP-FIT): a new theory for*  
634            *designing, implementing, and evaluating feedback in health care based on a systematic*  
635            *review and meta-synthesis of qualitative research*. Implementation Science, 2019. **14**(1): p.  
636            1-25.
- 637    40.    *A Model Pediatric form for the Newborn*. Hospital Topics, 1965. **43**(1): p. 98-99.

- 638 41. WHO. *Standards for improving the quality of care for small and sick newborns in health*  
639 *facilities* Standards 2, statement 2.2 2020 [cited 2022 26th May]; Available from:  
640 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240010765>.  
641 42. Ogola, M., et al., *Audit identified modifiable factors in Hospital Care of Newborns in low-*  
642 *middle income countries: a scoping review*. BMC pediatrics, 2022. **22**(1): p. 1-17.  
643 43. Willcox, M.L., et al., *Death audits and reviews for reducing maternal, perinatal and child*  
644 *mortality*. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2020(3).  
645 44. Singh, K., et al., *Can a quality improvement project impact maternal and child health*  
646 *outcomes at scale in northern Ghana?* Health research policy and systems, 2016. **14**(1): p. 1-  
647 13.  
648 45. Ayieko, P., et al., *A multifaceted intervention to implement guidelines and improve admission*  
649 *paediatric care in Kenyan district hospitals: a cluster randomised trial*. PLoS medicine, 2011.  
650 **8**(4): p. e1001018.  
651 46. Hategeka, C., et al., *Impact of a multifaceted intervention to improve emergency care on*  
652 *newborn and child health outcomes in Rwanda*. Health Policy and Planning, 2022. **37**(1): p.  
653 12-21.  
654 47. English, M., et al., *Programme theory and linked intervention strategy for large-scale change*  
655 *to improve hospital care in a low and middle-income country-A Study Pre-Protocol*. Wellcome  
656 open research, 2020. **5**.  
657 48. Mekbib, T. and S. Leatherman, *Quality improvement in maternal, neonatal and child health*  
658 *services in sub-Saharan Africa: a look at five resource-poor countries*. Ethiopian Journal of  
659 Health Development, 2020. **34**(1).  
660 49. Sterne, J.A., et al., *Multiple imputation for missing data in epidemiological and clinical*  
661 *research: potential and pitfalls*. Bmj, 2009. **338**.  
662 50. White, I.R., P. Royston, and A.M. Wood, *Multiple imputation using chained equations: issues*  
663 *and guidance for practice*. Statistics in medicine, 2011. **30**(4): p. 377-399.  
664 51. Lawton, R., et al., *Positive deviance: a different approach to achieving patient safety*. BMJ  
665 quality & safety, 2014. **23**(11): p. 880-883.  
666 52. Tuti, T., et al., *Evaluation of an audit and feedback intervention to reduce gentamicin*  
667 *prescription errors in newborn treatment (ReGENT) in neonatal inpatient care in Kenya: a*  
668 *controlled interrupted time series study protocol*. Implementation Science, 2022. **17**(1): p. 1-  
669 17.  
670 53. World Health Organization, *Opportunities for Africa's newborns*. 2006.  
671 54. World Health Organization, *Every newborn: an action plan to end preventable deaths*. 2014.  
672 55. Hemkens, L.G., D.G. Contopoulos-Ioannidis, and J.P. Ioannidis, *Routinely collected data and*  
673 *comparative effectiveness evidence: promises and limitations*. Cmaj, 2016. **188**(8): p. E158-  
674 E164.  
675 56. Grimshaw, J., et al., *Reinvigorating stagnant science: implementation laboratories and a*  
676 *meta-laboratory to efficiently advance the science of audit and feedback*. BMJ quality &  
677 safety, 2019. **28**(5): p. 416-423.

678

## 679 Appendix

680

Supplementary Table 1: Hospitals' CIN-N membership and patient volumes				
Hospital	CIN-N Join Date <sup>1</sup>	Total Patients <sup>2</sup>	Months <sup>3</sup>	Median monthly patient count (Inter-quartile range)
H1	November 2018	3815	36	106 (96-117)

H2	February 2018	2628	45	58 (50-64)
H3	March 2018	5245	44	116 (100-144)
H4	June 2019	683	28	23 (22-29)
H5	November 2018	3142	36	90 (73-107)
H6	April 2018	5544	43	130 (121-137)
H7	March 2018	4408	43	98 (92-106)
H8	October 2018	7690	37	217 (201-232)
H9	March 2018	1785	43	45 (29-52)
H10	April 2018	3787	35	85 (61-100)
H11	March 2018	8836	44	198 (178-209)
H12	June 2017	8606	46	185 (158-208)
H13	March 2018	3486	44	76 (60-94)
H14	November 2019	2160	24	92 (78-99)
H15	September 2019	3550	18	139 (129-147)
H16	September 2019	5334	26	188 (175-201)
H17	April 2018	4264	43	95 (72-106)
H18	October 2018	7311	37	200 (169-242)
H19	March 2018	1533	44	34 (28-43)
H20	July 2017	1153	40	23 (18-29)

Note:

<sup>1</sup>Hospitals joined at different calendar times.

<sup>2</sup>Monthly patient counts includes all data before any exclusion.

<sup>3</sup>Data collected between January 2017 and December 2017, and December 2020 and January 2021 omitted due to a national health workers' strike (i.e., industrial action)

681

682

683

<b>Supplementary Table 2: Sensitivity analysis evaluating if there is any evidence that negative binomial model assumptions might have been violated?</b>								
<b>Domain<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Over-dispersion value<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Equi-dispersion LRT p-value<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Nested model LRT p-value<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Auto-correlation LRT p-value<sup>4</sup></b>	<b>AIC</b>	<b>BIC</b>	<b>Log likelihood</b>	<b>Deviance</b>
Admission Information	0	1	<0.001	<0.001	4988.35	5015.89	-2488.18	4976.35

Cardinal Signs	0.05	0.581	<0.001	<0.001	6071.43	6099.19	-3029.71	6059.43
Demographics	0	0.915	<0.001	<0.001	5187.99	5215.76	-2588	5175.99
Discharge Information	0.3	0.03	<0.001	<0.001	6363.95	6391.72	-3175.97	6351.95
Maternal History	0.117	0.303	<0.001	<0.001	6012.4	6040.17	-3000.2	6000.4
Monitoring (Vital Signs)	2.254	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	5124.04	5151.66	-2556.02	5112.04
Other Examinations	2.442	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	6176.34	6204.11	-3082.17	6164.34
Presenting Complaints	0	0.902	<0.001	<0.001	6291.42	6319.18	-3139.71	6279.42
Antibiotics	0	0.945	0.097	<0.001	4477.24	4504.85	-2232.62	4465.24
Feeds <sup>4</sup>	0.571	0.001	<0.001	<0.001	2263.05	2289.49	-1125.52	2251.05
Fluids	0	1	<0.001	<0.001	4171.96	4199.22	-2079.98	4159.96

**Note:**

<sup>1</sup>Evidence from all the final documentation completeness and treatment appropriateness negative binomial and Poisson models fitted (Tables 5 and 6) is suggestive that the model errors are normally distributed (i.e., the conditional outcomes were normally distributed) and log-linear (Supplementary Figures 3-5) thus suitable for these analyses.

<sup>2</sup>Model comparison test between negative binomial- and Poisson model structure for evidence in supporting presence of overdispersion.

<sup>3</sup>Comparison test between random slope-intercept model and random intercept only models for evidence in support of allowing time to vary within hospitals


<sup>4</sup>Comparison between random slope-intercept model (for time and hospital respectively) and random intercept model with auto-correlation term for time for exploring how best to allow time to vary within hospitals during model specification.

684

685

686






687

688 *Supplementary Figure 1: Hospital-specific documentation trends for last half of randomly selected CIN-N hospitals. Trend line*  
 689 *generated using LOWESS technique. Fewer observations in some hospitals due to different CIN-N joining dates.*

690




691

692 *Supplementary Figure 2: Hospital-specific treatment accuracy trends for half of randomly selected CIN-N hospitals. Trend line*  
693 *generated using LOWESS technique. Fewer observations in some hospitals due to different CIN-N joining dates.*


694

695



696

697 *Supplementary Figure 3: Normality assumption check for Poisson and negative binomial generalised linear mixed models*  
698 *for documentation completeness domains*




699

700

701


Supplementary Figure 4: Linearity assumption check for Poisson and negative binomial generalised linear mixed models the documentation completeness domains

### Normality and linearity assumption check



702


703 *Supplementary Figure 5: Linearity and normality assumption check for the treatment appropriateness Poisson and negative*  
704 *binomial generalised linear mixed models*



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.05.31.22275848>; this version posted June 2, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure


# Documentation Completeness Score



Each uniquely shaped point represents an individual hospital



Figure

# Documentation Completeness Score




Figure





Figure

# Treatment Appropriateness Score



Figure