TITLE

Invisible pursuit: A scoping review of global policy guidance on care of vulnerable infants under 6 months and their mothers

AUTHOR NAMES AND AFFILIATIONS
Marie McGrath, Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN), Oxford, UK
Stephanie V. Wrottesley, Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN), Oxford, UK
Hedwig Deconinck, Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN), Oxford, UK; Institute of Health and Society, School of Public Health, Catholic University of Louvain, Brussels, Belgium.

ABSTRACT

Introduction. Millions of infants worldwide are born vulnerable or become so in the first six months of life. These infants are at risk of poor growth and development, immediate and long-term ill-health, and increased mortality. The wellbeing of infants is intimately connected with the nutrition and health of their mothers, necessitating combined care.

Methods. We conducted a scoping review to investigate the nature and coherence of global policy guidance on the care of vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers, using the MAMI Care Pathway as a framework. Our iterative methodology identified 83 global policy documents, of which 34 (13 guidelines and 21 guidance documents) addressed vulnerable infants under 6 months and their mothers.

Results. We first summarized common characteristics of policy guidance documents. Next, we identified 28 key vulnerability factors (descriptors) and grouped them into small and sick newborns, nutritional status of the infant, infant (breast)feeding difficulties and illness, and maternal lactation difficulties and illness. Finally, we identified 11 care dimensions whose coverage varied across the policies. Congenital illness was the most frequently identified vulnerability marker, followed by low birth weight, preterm birth, breastfeeding problems, maternal physical health, and maternal absence or death. The markers least often identified were the mother's adolescent and anthropometry status and infant mental health. Infant growth was included in only three of 13 priority guidelines. Continuity of care was implied but lacked detail. Policies often focused on specific infant conditions rather than combined individual needs, and few addressed maternal aspects.

Discussion. Vulnerable infants under 6 months come in many forms. Multiple descriptors obscure what exists and what is missing in global policy guidance that impedes care continuity and cross-sector collaboration. Resourceful and innovative amalgamation of global guidance is needed at country level for feasible, efficient, and coherent person-centred delivery of care.

KEY MESSAGES

- **What is already known on this topic.** Extensive global policy guidance exists for managing vulnerable infants under 6 months of age. However, the lack of clear coherence across policies and implementation strategies risk duplicating efforts and missing opportunities. The focus often remains on infants rather than mothers, and on specific conditions rather than personal needs. Diverse descriptors of vulnerability and unpredictable content make it challenging to navigate and apply policy guidance effectively.
- **What this study adds.** This scoping review unearthed consequential gaps. Guidance on vulnerable newborns lacks details on follow-up care beyond the early postnatal period. Infant growth as a marker of vulnerability is missing in key guidance. Maternal health is poorly covered.
- **How this study might affect research, practice, or policy.** Identified common ground in policy guidance present opportunities to align efforts to implement them using a person-centred lens. Policy coherence requires institutional commitment and accountability, connecting disciplines and country leadership to demystify and contextualise existing practices.

MAIN TEXT

INTRODUCTION

Burden. Many infants are born vulnerable or become so in the first 6 months of life, making them susceptible to malnutrition and disease, poor growth and development, immediate and long-term ill-health, and increased mortality.[1] Annually, 8.9 million infants (14.6%) are born with low birth weight (LBW),[2] carrying short- and long-term risks, especially for premature infants.[1] In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), 9.2 million infants (15.5%) under 6 months of age (u6m) are wasted, 10.3 million (17.4%) are underweight, and 11.8 million (19.9%) are stunted.[3] Early poor growth increases the likelihood of later malnutrition, contributing to the global burden of 45 million children under 5 years of age who are wasted and 149 million who are stunted.[4] These conditions limit health, educational, and economic potential for generations.[5,6]

Complexities. Vulnerable infants u6m are described in policy guidance and present in health and nutrition services as 1) newborns with LBW due to preterm or small for gestational age (SGA); 2) infants nutritionally at risk or identified with wasting, stunting, underweight or poor growth; 3) infants with acute or chronic illness, disability or other growth and development concerns; and 4) infants whose mothers have nutrition, physical or mental health or social challenges. Most global policy guidance is fragmented across disciplines and services to support national implementation. Comprehensive, interlinked person-centred care for these infants and their mothers is essential but challenging, requiring services connected across specialities.[7]

A timely window of opportunity. Global guidelines providing evidence-based recommendations expanded the care paradigm. The 2013 World Health Organization (WHO) guideline update on the management of severe acute malnutrition in infants and children[8] included recommendations on outpatient care of wasting in infants u6m. The 2023 WHO guideline on the prevention and management of wasting and nutritional oedema (acute malnutrition) in infants and children under 5 years[9] broadened the concept of vulnerability in this age group to encompass poor growth and development, as well as poor maternal health and nutrition. Consequently, the focus is on the vulnerability of the mother-infant pair throughout the first 6 months of life.

These WHO recommendations, however, focus on infants 1 to 6 months of age, referring to other recommendations on maternal and newborn care[10] and on LBW infant and preterm care[11] for care in the first month. New WHO and UNICEF initiatives are underway to support uptake and implementation of the 2023 WHO guideline on wasting.[9] Such global evidence-based guidance needs to be contextualized for national implementation. Since 2005, the MAMI Global Network has supported policy guidance development and practice for vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers.[12]

This scoping review investigated the nature and coherence of global policy guidance relevant to continuity of care of vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers by investigating four questions:

1. What are the characteristics of policy guidance related to vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers?
2. How is vulnerability in infants u6m and their mothers described?

3. How is continuity of care for vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers conceptualised?
4. What emerging considerations for policy guidance address vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers?

METHODS

We explored global policy guidance from multiple sources relating to the care of vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers. Box 1 describes terms and types of policy guidance classification.[13] Henceforth, 'mother' is synonymous with 'mother or principal caregiver'. We aimed to identify key concepts and research gaps to inform future research, policies, and practice.

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA- ScR) guided reporting.[14]

Box 1. Terms and policy guidance classification used in this scoping review of global policy guidance for vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers[13]

Policy guidance includes normative (WHO) guidelines, implementation or programme guidance, briefs, training guides, manuals, action plans, strategies, and frameworks related to the care of vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers. This includes those generated by the United Nations (UN), professional networks, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and civil society.

Vulnerable mother-infant pairs includes (but is not limited to) infants from birth to 6 months of age (u6m), including newborns born with low birth weight (LBW) or born premature (PT) or small for gestational age (SGA); infants with wasting or nutritional oedema (acute malnutrition), stunting, or underweight; infants with acute or chronic illness and disability or other growth and development concerns; and infants of mothers who are vulnerable because of poor physical or mental health or nutritional or social conditions.

Care, for the purpose of this review, covers health and nutritional care for infants u6m and physical and mental health, nutrition, and social care for their mothers, in community or primary care settings.

Continuity of care is used to indicate one or more of the following attributes of care: 1) provision of services coordinated across levels of care–primary care and referral facilities, across settings and providers; 2) provision of care throughout the life cycle; 3) care that continues uninterrupted until the resolution of an episode of disease or risk; and 4) coherent and interconnected healthcare events over time and consistent with people's health needs and preferences.

Person-centred care consciously adopts the perspectives of individuals, families, and communities as participants in and beneficiaries of trusted health systems. Such perspectives include respect for patients' values, preferences, and expressed needs regarding coordination and integration of care; information, communication, and education; physical comfort, emotional support, and alleviation of fear and anxiety; involvement of family and friends; and transition and continuity.

Guidelines are normative WHO guidelines that describe evidence and best practices and include evidence-based recommendations.

Guidance or manuals describe how to support implementation.

Enabling documents include frameworks, action plans, strategy papers, and training materials that support quality implementation, developing competencies, achieving set goals, improving quality, strengthening political commitment, creating opportunities to accelerate spread, and sustainable scale-up.

We embraced the complexity of this field through iterative, reflective learning.[15] Using the 'learning by doing' approach, we continually refined our thinking to reflect and adapt our findings. We used a published national scoping review protocol to help conceptualise and frame the review.[16] We relied on our collective expertise to consider what was feasible and useful for practice-informed policy interpretation. This pragmatic practitioner lens informed strategic decisions about how to categorise, prioritise, map, and synthesise findings.

Guiding framework, key terms and working definitions. The MAMI Care Pathway is an integrated care pathway approach[17] developed by global peers to support implementation of the 2013 WHO guideline on severe acute malnutrition[8] and is consistent with the 2023 WHO guideline on wasting.[9] We used this Pathway as a framework to appraise how, for whom, and to what extent global policy guidance supports comprehensive, respectful, quality person-centred care for vulnerable mother-infant pairs.[12] For example, we began by considering the dimensions of continuity of care reflected in the MAMI Care Pathway approach for 'small and nutritionally at risk' infants u6m and built on these based on what we learned and what was feasible.

Inclusion criteria. The 'population, concept, and context' (PCC) mnemonic helped us construct clear inclusion criteria.[18]

***Population*:** Selected documents targeted vulnerable newborns and infants u6m and their mothers, particularly in LMICs. They focused on infants who were born or became vulnerable rather than all infants, though we considered other relevant criteria.

***Concept*:** Selected documents covered global policy guidance on infant health and nutrition, child development, maternal physical and mental health, nutrition, and childcare and feeding practices. They included support for breastfeeding, clinical and public health interventions for vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers, active growth monitoring, food or supplementation interventions, and continuity of respectful, quality care across services and over time.

***Context*:** We considered all settings and contexts for the care of vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers in LMICs, including but not limited to secondary and tertiary inpatient healthcare, outpatient care, and community care. We reviewed documents that focused solely on children over 6 months and excluded regional or national policy guidelines. We also judged the relevance of documents by their practical content, so that we included some regional policy guidance that did not meet the initial criteria.

Search strategy. We first searched for global policy guidance related to health, nutrition, child development and care for vulnerable infants u6m in English, without date restrictions. We identified publicly available guidance from relevant institution websites and Google Scholar using various search terms. We hand-searched reference lists of included documents and sourced additional documents through expert advice and contacts, including members of the MAMI Global Network and relevant institutions. Search terms are available in Supplemental Material 1,[19] and the full bibliography of policy guidance documents in Supplemental Material 2.[20] The policy guidance documents database[21] (in Excel) is available upon request.

Guidance screening and selection. We screened and selected global policy guidance on care of infants u6m in five steps:

***Identification*:** Compilation of citations from grey literature searches and key contacts in an Excel spreadsheet and removal of duplicates

Screening: Screening of titles and summaries to exclude irrelevant policy guidance, resolution of inconsistencies and decision-making through team discussions

Eligibility: Screening of full texts, removal of discrepancies or outdated policy guidance and addition of missed documents

Inclusion: Classification of retained global policy guidance into a) normative WHO guidelines (evidence-based recommendations), b) guidance and manuals (implementation how-to) and c) enabling documents (supporting continuity of care continuity, eg, competencies, quality, scale-up, strategies)

***Prioritisation*:** Focus on policy guidance specifically addressing vulnerability in infants u6m and guidance addressing healthy newborns or general, promotive infant or maternal health

Data extraction and synthesis. The review involved three phases of data extraction and appraisal and one synthesis phase. We iteratively organized information according to key themes adjusting frameworks as understanding evolved. The list of variables used in the analysis is available in Supplemental Material 3.[22]

***Key characteristics*:** Information on publication year, URL, source, title, type, aim, topic, target audience, target population, infant description, mother description, sector, level of care, care service, age timeline, infant risks covered, maternal risks covered, interventions, and reviewer notes

Description of vulnerability: An expanded baseline list of vulnerability factors from the MAMI Care Pathway and categorization of data into poor birth outcomes, low infant anthropometry, poor growth and other risk factors related to the infant and mother

Continuity of care guidance: Variables to describe continuity of care built on the MAMI Care Pathway and WHO continuity of care definition. These included care across time, services, levels of care, integrated care pathways, comprehensive person-centred care, early childhood development (ECD), family support, community participation, embedding in routine care, local health system support, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) support, multisectoral support, and organisational capacities, including resilience.

Synthesising data for emerging considerations: Examination of the extracted data and appraisal of priority to identify key considerations for policy guidance development and implementation

Boundaries. This scoping review focused on evidence-informed global policy guidance rather than appraisal of evidence from published research trials or intervention studies. It did not assess the risk of bias or the quality of documents, as these are not required for scoping reviews. While we catalogued ‘enabling documents’, we did not appraise them in detail because of their broad policy context and lack of depth needed for a practice-centric approach. Ethical approval was not required because the review included only publicly available data.

Patient and public involvement. The authors and external reviewers are nutrition and health experts with experience developing global and national policy guidance and conducting scoping reviews. We shared the rationale, objective, and approach of the review with WHO experts involved in developing policy guidance on vulnerable infants u6m and invited their input and collaboration. The review was designed for developers of global policy guidance and implementers or updaters of national guidance. We prioritized the diverse needs and contexts of the intended users. No patients were involved.

RESULTS

We described the selection and organization of policy guidance, followed by the characteristics, vulnerability descriptors, and dimensions of continuity of care.

Selected policy guidance. We examined a broad range of relevant global policy guidance documents in five steps (figure 1). In phase 1, we appraised the characteristics of all 83 policy guidance documents: 20 guidelines, 42 guidance and manuals, and 21 enabling documents. In phase 2, we conducted a more in-depth examination of the nature and coverage of vulnerability in these documents. Out of the 83 policy guidance documents, 51 specifically addressed vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers. Among these, 13 were guidelines, 21 were guidance and manuals (including six manuals), and 17 were enabling documents. In phase 3, we appraised the 34 priority policy guidance documents, which included 13 guidelines and 21 guidance and manuals, and soft copies are available online.[23]

Throughout each phase, we discussed and resolved differences of opinion.



Figure 1: Flow chart depicting the selection of global policy guidance for vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers

Characteristics of policy guidance. We focused on 13 characteristics of 62 policy guidance documents, which included 20 guidelines and 42 guidance and manuals, excluding 21 enabling documents:

Source*:* All guidelines were published by WHO, except one of the regional WHO, Pan American Health Organization. Guidance and manuals were published by a wider range of organisations, including WHO and UNICEF (30 out of 42), as well as other implementing organisations, research partners, and networks.

Publication dates: These ranged from 2011 to 2023 for guidelines and from 2003 to 2022 for guidance and manuals.

Topic*:* Some guidelines targeted a single condition (eg, LBW) or a set of conditions (eg, common childhood conditions), while others covered profiles of vulnerability (eg, at-risk neonates) and aspects of care either in the facility (eg, resuscitation) or at home (eg,

breastfeeding support). Guidance and manuals similarly targeted single conditions (eg, cerebral palsy) or sets of conditions (eg, birth impairments) and profiles of vulnerability (eg, small, sick and preterm infants), as well as quality of care and factors or behaviours that influence vulnerability (eg, feeding difficulties).

Target audience: Across guidelines, the intended target audiences included health policy makers (those involved in the development of policies and procedures), health managers, and healthcare providers. Guidance and manuals were oriented toward healthcare providers, but some included policy makers and managers (15 out of 42).

Target population: Of the 21 guidelines, all but one explicitly targeted infants, and only seven incorporating aspects related to mothers. Of the 42 guidance and manuals, one-half targeted infants only, and one targeted mothers only (perinatal mental health), while 11 targeted both infants and their mothers. The remaining 9 of the 42 guidance and manuals related to other aspects of service provision rather than care for specified conditions (eg, integration of services, monitoring and evaluation, resources and equipment, and quality of care). All policy guidance documents included aspects of care relevant to infants u6m and their mothers, with most guidelines (20 out of 21) and guidance and manuals (30 out of 42) including aspects of care during the early postnatal period in isolation or as part of a broader infant age group.

Infant descriptors of vulnerability*:* Many descriptors were used for infant vulnerability, including healthy newborn, healthy infant, vulnerable newborn, born preterm, LBW, small, small sick, (non)breastfed, developed wasting or acute malnutrition, underweight, stunting, growth faltering, at risk of poor growth and development, feeding problem, excessive crying, physical disability or developmental delay, and with acute or chronic illness.

Maternal descriptors of vulnerability: These included healthy, sick, mental health issue, malnourished, adolescent, prenatal, perinatal, postnatal issues, (not)lactating, absent, multipara, primipara, absent, dead. Most policy guidance addressing maternal vulnerability directly related to the perinatal period.

Sector. We explored content on speciality or discipline (eg, child health, child nutrition, child development, maternal physical health, maternal mental health, maternal nutrition, reproductive health, neonatal health). Most policy guidance was generated by the neonatal health sector.

Level of care: We explored content on tertiary, secondary, primary, or community care. About one-third of the guidelines (7 out of 21) covered all levels of care, and only 1 covered community alone. More than half (24 out of 42) of the guidance and manuals covered care at primary and secondary levels, with or without tertiary level care included, 8 covered community alone, and 6 covered only health systems aspects.

Care service: Documents covered mostly antenatal, maternity, child health, and child nutrition. Two guidance documents dealt with programme management in general.

Infant vulnerability: We used ‘descriptors’ outlined above to explore content such as preterm, LBW, SGA, poor ponderal growth, feeding problem, metabolic problem, excessive crying, disability, and acute or chronic illness. Findings are detailed below.

Maternal vulnerability: We built on ‘descriptors’ outlined above to explore, eg, nutritional risk, impaired breastfeeding conditions, physical health, maternal mental health, multipara, primipara, adolescent, absent, and dead. We share detailed findings below.

Interventions: We explored content on, eg, active case finding or screening, health assessment, breastfeeding or non-breastfeeding assessment, breastfeeding or non-breastfeeding support, clinical care, nurturing care, ECD, crying and sleep counselling, mental health counselling, social support, follow-up visits, home visits, family involvement, and continuity of care.

Descriptors of vulnerability. Forty-six factors categorized vulnerability of infants and mothers into 4 groups: 1) small (8) or sick (6) newborns, 2) low anthropometry (6) and poor ponderal growth (6) of the infant, 3) vulnerability factors of the infant (8), and 4) vulnerability factors of the mother (12). The four factors not covered were mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC) in infants 0 to 5 weeks of age, MUAC in infants 6 weeks to 5 months of age, insufficient weight gain according to the WHO growth velocity standards, and female-headed households. By merging similar factors, we reduced the 46 vulnerability factors to 28, for which we tracked coverage in priority policy guidance (table 1). The 28 vulnerability factors mapped across 34 priority policy guidance are presented in Supplemental Material 4.[24]

Finally, we split leading vulnerability factors in the priority policy guidance documents at the median (equal or above [≥] the 50% threshold) to determine which factors were most frequently covered (table 2). In priority guidelines, factors mentioned most frequently (≥50%) were associated with small or sick newborns (congenital illness, LBW, preterm), breastfeeding difficulties, and illness of infants. Factors less frequently mentioned (40-50%) related to mothers' physical health. In priority guidance and manuals, factors most frequently mentioned (≥50%) were associated with small or sick newborns (poor ponderal growth, breastfeeding difficulties, no breastfeeding, and illness of infants) and mothers (physical health, breastfeeding conditions, mental health, and social or contextual factors).

Table 1: Vulnerability factors mapped across 34 priority policy guidance on care of vulnerable infants under 6 months and their mothers by type (*ordered by frequency in priority guidelines), Scoping review 2024

	Priority guidelines*		**Priority guidance and manuals**		**Priority policy guidance**	
Vulnerability factors (n=28):	(N=13)	%	(N=21)	%	(N=34)	%
Small or sick newborn						
Congenital illness	7	54	15	71	22	65
Low birth weight	7	54	14	67	21	62
Preterm	7	54	13	62	20	59
Disability or congenital abnormality	5	38	12	57	17	50
Birth trauma or complications	5	38	7	33	12	35
Preterm morbidity	4	31	11	52	15	44
Small for gestational age	3	23	5	24	8	24
Nutritional status infant						
Poor ponderal growth (weight loss, stagnant or insufficient weight gain)	3	23	12	57	15	44
Low anthropometry (low WAZ, low WLZ or low MUAC)	3	23	6	29	9	26
Nutritional oedema	3	23	6	29	9	26
Risk factors related to the infant						
Breastfeeding difficulties	7	54	14	67	21	62
Illness	7	54	11	52	18	53
Not breastfed	4	31	13	62	17	50
Neurodevelopment concerns	4	31	11	52	15	44
Hospitalisation history	1	8	5	24	6	18
Mental health	0	0	3	14	3	9
Risk factors related to the mother						
Physical health	6	46	15	71	21	62
Breastfeeding conditions	5	38	12	57	18	53
Mental health	5	38	11	52	17	50

Social or contextual factors affecting care and feeding practices	3	23	11	52	15	44
Birth complication	3	23	6	29	6	18
Adolescent	2	15	7	33	3	9
Absent or died	2	15	5	24	21	62
Multipara	1	8	6	29	18	53
Primipara	1	8	2	10	17	50
Anaemia	0	0	3	14	15	44
Birth spacing	0	0	2	10	6	18
Low MUAC	0	0	2	10	3	9

Table 2. Vulnerability factors present in at least half of 34 priority policy guidance on care of vulnerable infants under 6 months and their mothers, Scoping review 2024

	Priority guidelines:	**Priority guidance and manuals:**
Small or sick newborn:	Congenital illness Low birth weight Preterm	Congenital illness Low birth weight Preterm Disability and/or congenital abnormality Preterm morbidity
Nutritional status infant:	No	Poor ponderal growth
Risk factors related to the infant:	Breastfeeding difficulties Illness	Breastfeeding difficulties Not breastfed Illness Neurodevelopment concerns
Risk factors related to the mother:	No	Physical health Breastfeeding conditions Mental health Social or contextual factors

Overall, there was low coverage of content specific to SGA, low anthropometry, and nutritional oedema. Only 3 of 13 priority guidelines and 12 of 21 priority guidance and manuals included anthropometry as a vulnerability factor. Only 3 of 21 mentioned mother's MUAC, and other maternal nutrition markers were absent. Breastfeeding difficulties (related to the infant) or breastfeeding conditions (related to the mother) were commonly included for identifying infant vulnerability. Not being breastfed was included more often in guidance and manuals than in guidelines. Maternal vulnerability (ie, breastfeeding conditions, mental and physical health, and social or contextual factors affecting care and feeding practices) was mentioned more often in guidance and manuals than in guidelines, with some factors (birth complications, adolescent mother, birth spacing, low anthropometry) rarely mentioned.

Policy guidance content on continuity of care. We identified 11 care dimensions to describe quality person-centred continuity of care for vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers. These included care across time; services and levels of care; integrated care pathway; comprehensive person-centred care; early childhood development; mother, father, family support; community participation; embeddedness; local health system support; monitoring and evaluation of services; wider multisectoral support; and organisational capacities. We excluded the life cycle dimension to avoid oversimplification. A dimension fully or partially addressed was classified as 'applied'. We then described the condition (health problem, disease, disorder, injury, disability, circumstance). Priority guidelines covered four conditions

on newborn care, 6 on illness, 1 on poor growth, 1 on breastfeeding and 1 on ECD. Priority guidance and manuals covered 5 conditions on newborn care, 7 on illness, 2 on preterm and LBW, 2 on poor growth and wasting, 1 on breastfeeding, 2 on feeding difficulties, 1 on perinatal mental health, and 1 on reproductive health. Finally, we explored which care dimensions were covered by the policy guidance. Table 3 shows the condition and dimensions of care for each of the 34 priority policy guidance documents, and table 4 summarizes the coverage of the 11 care dimensions across the documents.

Table 3: Dimensions of care across 34 priority policy guidance on care of vulnerable infants under 6 months and their mothers, Scoping review 2024

Title of document:	Condition	Care across time, services and levels of care	Integrated care pathway	Comprehensive person-centred care	Early childhood development	Mother, father, family support	Community participation	Embeddedness (mainstream)	Local health system support	M&E	Wider multisectoral support	Organisational capacities
Guidelines												
2023 WHO Guideline on the prevention and management of wasting and nutritional oedema in infants and children under 5 years	Poor growth and development	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	-	-	□□	-
2022 WHO Consolidated guidelines on tuberculosis in children and adolescents	Tuberculosis	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	-
2022 WHO Recommendations for care of the preterm or low-birth-weight infant	Preterm, LBW	-	□□	-	-	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□
2021 WHO-PAHO Evidence-based clinical practice guidelines for the follow-up of at-risk neonates	Newborn care	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	-	-	□□	-	-
2021 WHO Guideline: Infant feeding in areas of Zika virus transmission	Zika virus	-	-	-	-	□□	-	□□	-	-	-	-
2021 WHO Consolidated guidelines on HIV prevention, testing, treatment, service delivery and monitoring	HIV	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□
2020 WHO Improving early childhood development	ECD	□□	n/a	n/a	□□	□□	-	-	□□	□□	-	-
2018 WHO Guideline: Counselling of women to improve breastfeeding practices	Breastfeeding	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	-	□□	□□	□□	-	□□
2016 WHO Paediatric emergency triage, assessment and treatment (ETAT)	Critically ill child	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	□□	□□	-	-
2015 WHO Recommendations on interventions to improve preterm birth outcomes	Preterm	-	-	-	-	□□	-	□□	□□	□□	-	-
2015 WHO Guideline: Managing possible serious bacterial infection in young infants when referral is not feasible	Ill child	□□	-	-	-	-	-	□□	□□	□□	-	-
2012 WHO Recommendations for management of common childhood conditions	Ill child	-	-	-	-	-	-	□□	□□	-	-	-

2012 WHO Guidelines on basic newborn resuscitation	Newborn resuscitation	-	-	-	-	-	-	□□	-	□□	-	-
Guidance and manuals												
2022 WHO Guide for integration of perinatal mental health in maternal and child health services	Perinatal mental health	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□
2022 UNICEF, University of Pretoria Feeding preterm and low-birthweight newborns	Preterm, LBW	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	-	-	-
2022 WHO-Europe Pocketbook of primary health care for children and adolescents	Ill child	-	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	□□
2022 SPOON Identifying feeding difficulties in infants – guidelines for healthcare professionals	Feeding difficulties	□□	-	-	-	-	-	□□	-	-	-	-
2022 SPOON Screening children for feeding difficulties – guidelines for healthcare professionals	Feeding difficulties	□□	-	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	-	-
2022 UNICEF Integrating early detection and treatment of child wasting into routine primary health care services	Wasting	□□	n/a	n/a	-	-	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□
2022 WHO Operational handbook on tuberculosis. Module 5: Management of tuberculosis in children and adolescents	Tuberculosis	n/a	□□	□□	-	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-
2021 ENN, LSHTM, MAMI Care Pathway Package, Version 3 (guiding framework)	Small and nutritionally at-risk infant and mother	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□
2020 WHO, UNICEF The Baby Friendly Hospital Initiative for small, sick and preterm newborns	Breastfeeding	-	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-
2020 Partners in Health, UNICEF Early Childhood Development Support for High-Risk Infants	Preterm, LBW	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	-	-	□□	-
2019 WHO Integrated Management of Childhood Illness of the sick young infant age up to 2 months. Chart booklet	Ill child	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	-	□□	-	□□	-	-
2018 IASC Field Manual on Reproductive Health in Humanitarian Settings	Reproductive health	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□
2016 WHO Oxygen therapy for children	Ill child	n/a	□□	-	-	□□	-	□□	□□	□□	-	-
2015 WHO, UNICEF, USAID Caring for newborns and children in the community: planning handbook for programme managers and planners	Newborn care	n/a	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	-
2014 WHO-Europe Hospital care for mothers and newborn babies: quality assessment and improvement tool	Newborn care	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	□□
2014 WHO Integrated management of childhood illness – Chart booklet	Ill child	n/a	□□	□□	-	□□	-	□□	-	-	-	-
2014 Christian Blind Mission (CBM) Recognising impairments at	Newborn care	n/a	□□	□□	□□	-	-	□□	□□	-	-	-

birth												
2013 WHO Pocketbook of hospital care for children	Ill child	n/a	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	-	-
2012 CBM Cerebral Palsy	Cerebral palsy	n/a	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-	-	-
2003 WHO Kangaroo mother care: a practical guide	Newborn care	n/a	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	□□	-
2003 WHO Managing newborn problems	Newborn care	n/a	□□		-	□□	□□	□□	-	□□	-	-

□□= care dimension covered; ECD= early childhood development; LBW= low birth weight; n/a= not applicable; PT=preterm.

Table 4: Dimensions of care across 34 priority policy guidance on care of vulnerable infants under 6 months and their mothers by policy guidance type, Scoping review 2024

Dimensions of care:	Priority guidelines (n=13)	Priority guidance and manuals (n=21)	Team observations
Care across time, services and levels of care	7	10	Gaps in continuity across time, primarily for follow up after discharge from a particular service or when infants 'age out' of the service without adequate referral mechanisms. Also gaps in continuity between services and levels of care, eg, linking facility- and community-based care.
Integrated care pathway	6	18	Strong focus on addressing one or more condition(s), without integration into a broader care pathway that assesses and responds to maternal and infant risks and monitors progress/ links to follow-up care, particularly at other levels of the health system (primary care/outpatient/community levels).
Comprehensive person-centred care	5	17	Guidelines centred on the condition rather than the person (mother, infant), and there was a lack of comprehensive assessment and care for both mother and infant together.
Early childhood development	3	12	Limited contextualisation within a framework that supports early child development, with a focus on identification and management of one or more condition(s) rather than on a holistic approach to ensuring optimal growth and development.
Mother, father, family support	9	18	Primary focus on supporting the mother in feeding and care practices for the infant, including targeted counselling for mothers and other caregivers/ family members in some cases. Lack inclusion of broader aspects of support, particularly for the mother's own health and social circumstances.
Community participation	3	15	Limited aspects of community participation in care/organisation of care, particularly for guidelines.
Integration, embeddedness (mainstream)	10	21	Focus on mainstreaming of guidance into routine care but lacking detail on how to embed services across levels of the health system (particularly primary care/outpatient/community).
Local health system support	9	14	Emphasis on integration into existing health systems and services, particularly for guidelines. More limited reference to the how, including steps such as situational analysis, needs assessment and planning/ budgeting for the necessary infrastructure, resources and capacity development.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) support	10	13	A need for M&E frameworks often mentioned but lacking in detail.
Wider multisectoral support	3	9	Minimally mentioned with only one guideline emphasising the need for linkages to other services and systems (social assistance/protection, food, water and sanitation) and two making brief mentions of policies/services outside of the health system. Greater presence in guidance and manuals but still low overall and lack detail when included.
Organisational capacities	3	6	Largely missing, except for few examples which included best practice statements for, or needs to align with, emergency preparedness plans or humanitarian response strategies.

DISCUSSION

The scoping review was challenging and unpredictable. We navigated the policy guidance jumble to investigate to what extent current policy guidance does and could support continuity of respectful quality care of vulnerable infants and their mothers.[25] We evaluated policy guidance on content, presentation, and comprehensiveness (connected or fragmented). In this discussion, we first examine policy guidance through a complexity lens, then propose future directions with a continuity of care lens and conclude with global-level suggestions on pragmatic practitioner-centric ways forward.

The complexity of policy guidance

The nature and coherence of policy guidance differed, but several considerations emerged.

Unpredictability of policy guidance content. Policy guidance on the care of vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers was often patchy and varied in content, depth, and scope, making comparison and alignment difficult. WHO distinguishes between guidelines (evidence-based recommendations to achieve the best possible health outcomes),[26] practice guidance (implementation and operational support), and manuals (detailed descriptions on what to do, how, and why). However, different authors often use these terms interchangeably or interpret them differently. National guidelines are usually comprehensive manuals that fill gaps in professional education and training. Policy guidance types vary in content, depth, and update timelines. For example, the 2023 WHO guideline on wasting[9] included more implementation details than the 2013 version.[8] Updated guidelines may only partly update specific recommendations. The guideline development process, guided by the 2014 WHO Handbook for Guideline Development,[27] aims for consistency, but is open to interpretation, with shape and form influenced by the expert individuals involved. WHO's living guidelines approach,[28] which aims to keep up with the latest evidence, adds further complexity that requires careful management.

Hidden from view. Guidance often obscured what was included or what was missing. The varied descriptions of vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers made them less visible to users and harder to identify. Vulnerable mother-infant pairs look different on paper but may be the same, such as an LBW baby becoming a wasted or underweight baby next. Guidance for these groups was scattered across multiple documents, hindering a holistic care approach. Consequently, health and nutrition actors must navigate through numerous policy documents to find relevant recommendations for these vulnerable populations.

Missing maternal health and nutrition. Infant care policy guidance rarely addressed mothers' vulnerabilities. While over one-half of the guidelines covered maternal mental health, they lacked practical guidance on managing it, hindering good practice. Maternal nutritional status was poorly covered, with few documents addressing anaemia or using anthropometry to prompt support. Most support focused on managing breastfeeding difficulties. The policy gaps we identified likely reflect wider shortfalls in health and nutrition support for mothers.[29, 30] A holistic, mother-infant-centred care approach is needed to address broader vulnerabilities beyond infant clinical conditions and nutrition, but the guidance we reviewed does not address this critical gap. Identifying an at-risk infant should trigger support for both the mother and infant, ensuring continuity of connected care,[31] and presents an opportune entry point to amplify attention and action to support women's wellbeing in health services.

Vulnerability in newborns is spotlighted, but follow-up care fades. Priority policy guidance often focused on the early postnatal period, addressing small newborns, breastfeeding difficulties and small sick young infants. While the heightened risks during this period justify such a focus, the guidance did not cover subsequent care, such as follow-up support in the community and growth surveillance.[1] Reflecting the reproductive and early life health lens LBW infants were treated as an event (born small) to mitigate immediate risk, but this measure was not interpreted in the context of 'low anthropometry or poor ponderal growth' to prompt subsequent growth surveillance. Infants that are born vulnerable are often hidden in the community and may later show up in healthcare as underweight babies. Clear recommendations are needed on active growth and health surveillance, as even with catch-up growth, these infants are at higher risk of death.[32]

Continuity of care present in principle, missing in practice. It was challenging to determine how well policy guidance supported continuity of care between mothers and infants and infants from birth to 6 months and beyond. As reflected above, the guidance addressed continuity of care from birth inconsistently, often mentioning as a principle or an intention but ignoring how to achieve it. If it were re-framed with continuity of care in mind, valuable content in the policy guidance could be leveraged to achieve this goal in future. As a priority, clearer consistency between different policy documents is needed to effectively secure continuity of care for small vulnerable newborns.[33]

Poor growth reflects more than poor nutrition. Priority policy guidance poorly covered infant growth status and related care practices. Only three documents, one of which was the 2023 WHO guideline on wasting,[9] included low anthropometry or poor growth as vulnerability factors. Guidelines often addressed narrowly defined questions and did not consider ongoing growth monitoring and appraisal. Guidance on clinical health conditions included feeding difficulties but rarely covered growth assessment and management. As reflected above, low anthropometry or poor ponderal growth were rarely included as vulnerability factors in perinatal guidance beyond LBW as a single measure.

In our experience, anthropometry is often considered a nutritional status marker that is primarily or sometimes exclusively addressed to be solved by a nutrition intervention, rather than a broader marker of risk that warrants support including but beyond nutrition. Also, health circles do not yet sufficiently consider growth as a general vulnerability factor because they see it as a general vulnerability factor and the territory of nutrition specialists. The lack of growth guidance may also reflect a focus on specific conditions rather than comprehensive

wellbeing or person-centred care. Given the importance of weight-for-age as a vulnerability indicator in infants u6m,[34] all relevant policy guidance should include consistent anthropometric assessment and responsive growth monitoring.

Looking ahead: The need to support continuity of care

Our exploration of how policy guidance supported continuity of care of vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers raised the following issues*:*

Urgency. Developing coherent policy guidance involving different disciplines and expertise is a long-term goal. Meanwhile, policy guidance will continue to be developed within specialities, with different expert groups and processes. It is crucial to secure connections, collaboration, and transparency without complicating existing processes. Immediate coherent implementation guidance on comprehensive quality care of mother-infant pairs is needed to avoid disconnected implementation, maximise synergies and address critical gaps. Current UN-led initiatives present a time-sensitive opportunity to achieve this.

Person-centred guidance in practice. Global policy guidance often frames principles of care around the infant and/or mother but its content shifts to a disease-focused approach, centring on managing the condition (illness or risk factors). While this is understandable from a guideline perspective, implementation needs to focus on person-centred care, helping one health worker effectively address the perceived needs of the mother and baby. A working example of person-centred policy guidance is the WHO-led development and piloting of the Clinical Care in Crises (CCC) digital mobile reference application.[35] The app aims to provide clinical decision support to frontline health workers in emergencies, increasing access to WHO recommendations and facilitating their application. Its development involved collating various WHO policy guidance to create comprehensive care pathways, with expert consultation to address evidence gaps or make emergency-specific adaptations.

Helping living guidelines work. WHO aims to manage all guidelines as 'living', and to update recommendations when new evidence emerges.[36] Making guidelines available on the MagicApp platform[9] improves their accessibility, but it is unclear how practitioners will be informed of periodic changes and how these changes might affect other recommendations in the same guideline or across different guidelines.

Global-level suggestions

We consider below how to translate complex policy guidance into coherent, practical implementation guidance, tools, and support.

Conceptual living map of global policy guidance. As WHO moves toward living guidelines, embedding a visual, interactive map of policy guidance for vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers in all guidance documents could help address the issues described above. Such a map would increase the visibility, accessibility, and transparency of guidance for users across disciplines. Users could navigate this map by:

- Materials: Location and translations of relevant policy guidance
- Process: Schedules, timelines, and responsibilities (eg, WHO updates and collaborations)
- Updates: Real-time alerts on changes and reasons

This tool could help foster partnerships, collaboration, policy development, and good practices. The poor visibility of global guidance development processes hampers collaboration, which often depends on who knows whom and individual initiative. Inconsistent cross-referencing of guidance documents limits the ability to connect them. WHO, as the global authority on normative guidelines, is well-positioned to lead and manage such a platform, potentially overseen by its Strategic and Technical Advisory Group for Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health and Nutrition (STAGE).[37]

Guideline and guidance distinguished by content. Guidelines are shaped by the experience and expertise of people involved in their development,[38] leading to varying levels of detail and interpretation. This sometimes results in guidelines straying into implementation guidance territory. Normative guidelines typically address specific care questions, while practice guidance requires a practitioner-focused approach. Strong, objective facilitation is essential to ensure that guidelines provide the necessary direction for policy decision-makers and are consistent enough to support cross-policy synergies.

Collaboration as an institutional requirement. Various WHO departments have generated a wealth of inter-related but disconnected policy guidance on the care of vulnerable infants and their mothers. Institutionalizing cross-sector and cross-specialty collaboration is crucial for holistic care. Person-centred continuity of care requires coherent policy aided by aligned global guidance. WHO-led guidance initiatives on infant health and nutrition offer a critical opportunity to develop cohesive interdepartmental guidance and facilitate coherent national policies and practices. Adequate resources (funds and time), reasonable timelines and accountability mechanisms are needed to support this and ensure it happens.

Implications for uptake of national guidance by health managers and practitioners

We have discussed the complexity and coherence of global policy guidance and the need for more coherent development processes. Multiple global and national stakeholders are incorporating this guidance in national policy and practice, involving global implementation guidance development and country-level support. One example is the rollout of the 2023 WHO guideline on wasting,[9] whose expanded remit extends to infants u6m at risk of poor growth and development and includes LBW and premature infants as risk criteria. Similar allied initiatives are underway for newborns, LBW infants, quality of care, and maternal health. National leadership and facilitation are critical to ensure that messy global policy guidance is translated into coherent national policy and person-centred, efficient practice.

Limitations

Whenever possible, we have noted where our experience, assumptions, and perceptions have influenced the results of this work, bringing both potential bias and added value. Others may not share our interpretations. We invite comments and feedback and encourage others to draw and build on this work.

CONCLUSIONS

Joining the dots, filling the gaps. This scoping review of guidance for vulnerable infants and their mothers aims to improve its accessibility and foster collaboration across disciplines. We highlight the need for coherent policy guidance for vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers and the consequences of the lack of such coherence. While there is a wealth of

valuable policy guidance across various sectors and specialities, the guidance needs to connect better to maximise potential and avoid duplicated efforts. There are real gaps, most urgently regarding growth surveillance for infants born vulnerable and the embedded care of their mothers. Implementation guidance on person-centred care rather than condition-centred care is central to securing better care.

REFERENCES

1. Lawn JE, Ohuma EO, Bradley E, et al. Small babies, big risks: global estimates of prevalence and mortality for vulnerable newborns to accelerate change and improve counting. Lancet. 2023;401(10389):1707-1719. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(23)00522-6.

2. Blencowe H, Krasevec J, de Onis M, et al. National, regional, and worldwide estimates of low birthweight in 2015, with trends from 2000: a systematic analysis. Lancet Glob Health. 2019;7(7):e849-e860. doi:10.1016/s2214-109x(18)30565-5.

3. Kerac M, James PT, McGrath MG, Brennan E, Opondo C, Frison S. Infant malnutrition in low- and middle-income countries: assessment and prevalence of small and nutritionally at-risk infants aged under 6 months in 54 Demographic & Health Survey datasets. Medrxiv. 2021;2021-12. doi: 10.1101/2021.12.23.21268306.

4. Global Nutrition Report Stakeholder Group. 2021 Global Nutrition Report: The state of global nutrition. Bristol, UK; 2022.

5. Mertens A, Benjamin-Chung J, Colford JM, et al. Risk factors and impacts of child growth faltering in low- and middle-income countries. medRxiv. 2021:2020.06.09.20127100. doi:10.1101/2020.06.09.20127100.

6. Martorell R, Zongrone A. Intergenerational influences on child growth and undernutrition. Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol. 2012;26 Suppl 1:302-314. doi:10.1111/j.1365-3016.2012.01298.x.

7. Muriuki A, Yahner M, Kiragu M, de Graft-Johnson J, Izulla P. On the road to universal coverage of postnatal care: considerations for a targeted postnatal care approach for at-risk mother–baby dyads in low-income and middle-income countries informed by a consultation with global experts. BMJ Open. 2022;12(6):e058408. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-058408.

8. World Health Organization. Guideline: updates on the management of severe acute malnutrition in infants and children. World Health Organization; 2013.

9. World Health Organization. WHO guideline on the prevention and management of wasting and nutritional oedema (acute malnutrition) in infants and children under 5 years. World Health Organization; 2023. https://app.magicapp.org/#/guideline/7802.

10. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on maternal and newborn care for a positive postnatal experience. World Health Organization; 2022.

11. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations for care of the preterm or low birth weight infant. World Health Organization; 2022.

12. MAMI Global Network, ENN, LSHTM. MAMI Care Pathway Package. v3. Oxford, UK: Emergency Nutrition Network; 2021. https://www.ennonline.net/mamicarepathway.

13. World Health Organization. Health systems strengthening glossary. 2011. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/documents/health-systems-strengthening-glossary.pdf.

14. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2018;169(7):467-473.

15. Greenhalgh T, Papoutsi C. Studying complexity in health services research: desperately seeking an overdue paradigm shift. BMC Med. 2018;16(1):95. doi:10.1186/s12916-018-1089-4.

16. McGrath M, Woldie M, Berhane M, et al. Mapping the range of policies relevant to care of small and nutritionally at-risk infants under 6 months and their mothers in Ethiopia: a scoping review protocol. BMJ Open. 2023;13(9):e069359. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-069359.

17. Grey K, Brennan E, Kerac M, McGrath M. The MAMI Care Pathway Package: A resource to support the management of small and nutritionally at-risk infants under six months of age and their mothers (MAMI). South Sudan Med J. 2021;14(3):94-99. doi:10.4314/ssmj.v14i3.6.

18. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, et al. Chapter 11: Scoping Reviews (2020 version). In: Aromataris E, Munn Z, eds. JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis. JBI; 2020. https://synthesismanual.jbi.global. doi:10.46658/JBIMES-20-12.

19. Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN). Supplemental Material 1 Search Terms.

20. Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN). Supplemental Material 2 Bibliography.

21. Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN). Policy Guidance Documents on Care of Vulnerable Infants Under Six Months and their Mothers. Oxford, UK: ENN; 2024. Available upon request from: mami@ennonline.net.

22. Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN). Supplemental Material 3 Variables used in the analysis.

23. Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN). Priority Policy Guidance on Care of Vulnerable Infants Under Six Months and their Mothers. Oxford, UK: ENN; 2024. Available from: https://public.tableau.com/app/profile/mami.global.network/viz/MAMIScopingReview2024/Dashboard1.

24. Emergency Nutrition Network (ENN). Supplemental Material 4 Vulnerability factors across 34 priority policy guidance on care of vulnerable infants u6m and their mothers.

25. Greenhalgh T, Thorne S, Malterud K. Time to challenge the spurious hierarchy of systematic over narrative reviews? Eur J Clin Invest. 2018;48(6):e12931. doi:10.1111/eci.12931.

26. Saluja K, Reddy KS, Wang Q, et al. Improving WHO's understanding of WHO guideline uptake and use in Member States: a scoping review. Health Res Policy Syst. 2022;20(1):98. doi:10.1186/s12961-022-00899-y.

27. World Health Organization. WHO handbook for guideline development. 2nd ed. World Health Organization; 2014.

28. Vogel JP, Dowswell T, Lewin S, et al. Developing and applying a 'living guidelines' approach to WHO recommendations on maternal and perinatal health. BMJ Glob Health. 2019;4(4):e001683. doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2019-001683.

29. Lelijveld N, Wrottesley SV, Akwanyi B, James PT. Nutrition of women and adolescent girls in humanitarian contexts: Current state of play. 2022. https://www.ennonline.net/humanitariannutritionforwomen. Accessed August 11, 2022.

30. James PT, Wrottesley SV, Lelijveld N, et al. Women's nutrition: A summary of evidence, policy and practice including adolescent and maternal life stages. 2022. https://www.ennonline.net/womensnutritionasummarytechnicalbriefingpaper. Accessed January 20, 2022.

31. Kitila SB, Feyissa GT, Olika AK, Wordofa MA. Maternal Healthcare in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Scoping Review. Health Serv Insights. 2022;15:11786329221100310. doi:10.1177/11786329221100310.

32. Mwangome M, et al. Growth monitoring and mortality risk in low birthweight infants: a birth cohort study in Burkina Faso [version 1; peer review: approved with reservations]. Gates Open Res. 2021;5:82.

33. Ashorn P, Ashorn U, Muthiani Y, et al. Small vulnerable newborns—big potential for impact. Lancet. 2023;401(10389):1692-1706. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(23)00354-9.

34. Hoehn C, Lelijveld N, Mwangome M, et al. Anthropometric Criteria for Identifying Infants Under 6 Months of Age at Risk of Morbidity and Mortality: A Systematic Review. Clin Med Insights Pediatr. 2021;15:11795565211049904. doi:10.1177/11795565211049904.

35. World Health Organization. Clinical Care in Crises. L4 Mobile Reference App. 2024. https://www.who.int/tools/CCC/l4-mobile-reference-app.

36. Akl EA, Meerpohl JJ, Elliott J, et al. Living systematic reviews: 4. Living guideline recommendations. J Clin Epidemiol. 2017;91:47-53. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.08.009.

37. World Health Organization. Strategic and Technical Advisory Group for Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health and Nutrition (STAGE). 2024. https://www.who.int/groups/strategic-and-technical-advisory-group-of-experts-for-maternal-newborn-child-and-adolescent-health-and-nutrition-STAGE/about.

38. Montgomery P, Movsisyan A, Grant SP, et al. Considerations of complexity in rating certainty of evidence in systematic reviews: a primer on using the GRADE approach in global health. 2019;4:e000848.