

1 Full title

2 Investigating the barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting in the Asia-Pacific region: a
3 mixed-methods study protocol

4 Short title

5 Barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting in the Asia-Pacific region

6

7 Authors

8 Amish Talwar¹; Rebecca Katz²; Martyn D. Kirk¹; Tambri Housen^{1,3}

9

10 Affiliations

11 ¹ National Centre for Epidemiology and Population Health, Australian National University,
12 Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia

13 ² Center for Global Health Science and Security, Georgetown University, Washington, DC,
14 United States

15 ³ School of Medicine and Public Health, University of Newcastle, Newcastle, New South
16 Wales, Australia

17

18 Corresponding author

19 E-mail: amish.talwar@anu.edu.au (AT)

20 **Abstract**

21 **Introduction**

22 The COVID-19 pandemic has raised concerns about the global capacity for timely outbreak
23 reporting. However, gaps remain in our understanding of barriers and enablers to outbreak
24 reporting, particularly at the local level. Field epidemiology training program (FETP) fellows
25 often participate in the outbreak reporting process as part of both their training and the public
26 health roles they assume after graduating; they therefore represent a potentially valuable
27 source of information for better understanding these barriers and enablers. This study will
28 investigate the barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting through a mixed methods approach
29 that will encompass a review of the existing literature as well as surveying and interviewing
30 FETP trainees and graduates from the Asia-Pacific region.

31 **Methods**

32 This study will begin with a scoping review of the literature to identify existing evidence of
33 barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting. Based on our findings from the scoping review,
34 we will administer a survey to FETP trainees and graduates from the World Health
35 Organization Western Pacific and South-East Asian Regions and conduct interviews with a
36 subset of survey respondents to investigate the survey findings in more detail. We will
37 summarise and compare the survey results according to various country-level economic and
38 political indicators, and we will employ thematic analysis to evaluate the interview responses.
39 Based on the findings from the scoping review, survey, and interviews, we will construct a
40 model to comprehensively describe the various barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting.

41 **Discussion**

42 This study will contribute to our understanding of the determinants of outbreak reporting
43 across several geographic, political, and economic contexts by eliciting the viewpoints and
44 experiences of persons involved with outbreak reporting, particularly at the local level. This
45 information will help improve the outbreak reporting process, allowing for more timely
46 reporting and helping prevent future outbreaks from becoming pandemics.

47 **Introduction**

48 The global reaction to the COVID-19 pandemic has raised concerns about the world's
49 collective ability to detect, report, and respond to infectious disease outbreaks. Outbreak
50 reporting is the process by which infectious disease outbreaks, once detected, are reported to
51 public health officials; initial reporting to local public health officials is typically followed by
52 escalation of the report to more senior public health authorities and, where necessary, to the
53 international community to formulate an appropriate outbreak response. Timely outbreak
54 reporting in turn can make the difference between containing an outbreak at its source and an
55 outbreak growing into an epidemic or pandemic. The timeliness of outbreak reporting is
56 contingent on a state's capacity to detect and report an outbreak up to the national level and
57 its willingness to report it to the international community once aware of the outbreak within
58 its borders. Thus, under the 2005 International Health Regulations (IHR), all IHR signatories
59 have an obligation to develop and maintain the capacity to detect infectious disease outbreaks
60 that can become international threats and to report these outbreaks to the international
61 community through the World Health Organization (WHO) [1]. Under the IHR, most
62 countries have agreed to report potential health events of international significance within 24
63 hours of determining the existence of such an event [1].

64 However, delays in outbreak reporting at various levels of the reporting chain have persisted
65 even after the revised IHR came into effect. This was the case for the Ebola outbreak in

66 Western Africa and most recently during COVID-19, where local delays in reporting the
67 existence and extent of the COVID-19 outbreak at its initial stages delayed the global
68 response to the outbreak by several weeks, allowing it to grow into a global pandemic [2-3].
69 To prevent future pandemics, it is crucial to understand why nearly 20 years following the
70 adoption of the most recent version of the IHR countries still experience failures reporting
71 outbreaks in line with their international obligations.

72 Although there is a wide breadth of research on the various barriers and enablers across the
73 outbreak reporting chain, comparatively little research has focused on the barriers and
74 enablers at the local level, where outbreak reports originate. This is particularly true in the
75 Asia-Pacific region, from where several pandemics have emerged in recent decades. Field
76 epidemiology training programs (FETPs) produce skilled epidemiologists who learn to
77 perform public health functions through experiential learning in field settings at the local and
78 subnational level [4]. As part of their training, FETP trainees typically participate in
79 surveillance and outbreak reporting activities [5]. Thus, FETP participants have unique
80 insights into the various determinants of outbreak reporting, particularly at the local level.
81 Therefore, this study seeks to leverage the knowledge of FETP-trained officials in the Asia-
82 Pacific region to fill this knowledge gap by examining their observations and experiences
83 regarding the factors that inhibit or enable outbreak reporting through a survey and key
84 informant interviews.

85 **Evidence gap**

86 Previous studies that have examined the determinants of outbreak reporting have largely
87 focused on countries' ability to detect and report outbreaks. While outbreak preparedness
88 indices such as the Global Health Security Index (GHSI) mainly report on nation-level
89 capacity for outbreak detection and reporting, other studies have focused on determinants

90 commonly found across different countries. In one such study, officials from Brazil, Ethiopia,
91 Liberia, Nigeria, and Uganda identified a series of bottlenecks and enablers to outbreak
92 detection and notification at all levels of their national public health systems [6-7]. These
93 included the availability of core surveillance infrastructure (including laboratory
94 infrastructure), physical infrastructure (including access to appropriate communications and
95 transportation to facilitate outbreak detection and reporting), personnel resources and
96 knowledge, community knowledge, and inter-agency cooperation and coordination [7].
97 Having adequate and appropriately trained personnel to report remains a lynchpin for
98 outbreak reporting. Therefore, additional research has examined the role of health care
99 providers at the local level in reporting, who often are the first to detect potential outbreak
100 cases and have the responsibility to report these cases to public health officials. These studies
101 have identified various barriers to reporting among health care providers, including lack of
102 reporting knowledge as well as lack of time and motivation to report [8-12].

103 Although capacity to report is a prerequisite for timely outbreak reporting, an environment
104 conducive to reporting is also important for effecting an appropriate outbreak response,
105 especially for outbreaks that threaten to grow rapidly and cross borders. A handful of studies
106 have examined this additional condition for reporting among national governments. Two such
107 studies involved surveys and interviews with officials affiliated with National Focal Points
108 (NFPs), which are the country persons or offices responsible for collecting outbreak
109 information and relaying information on potentially significant outbreaks to WHO for further
110 dissemination to the international community to ensure an appropriate global response [13].
111 While the respondents agreed that inadequate surveillance and reporting infrastructure was a
112 major reporting barrier at all levels, they also indicated that fear of damage to tourism and
113 trade as well as “political challenges” were important barriers to outbreak reporting at the
114 national level [13-14]. These findings provided qualitative evidence supporting the results of

115 a previous study, which found that countries that are particularly vulnerable to trade or travel
116 barriers after reporting an outbreak or in which higher domestic political opposition is present
117 were more likely to demonstrate less timely reporting internationally, even after controlling
118 for capacity to detect an outbreak [15].

119 Although these studies have helped define the determinants of outbreak reporting at various
120 levels among a handful of countries, few studies have investigated the experiences of local
121 and subnational public health officials within the Asia-Pacific region. This represents a
122 significant gap given that this region contains over half the world's population, and four of
123 the seven respiratory disease pandemics of the 20th and 21st centuries emerged from this
124 region alone [3,16-20]. The handful of studies from the region that have investigated
125 reporting barriers and enablers at the local and subnational levels have largely corroborated
126 the above findings; however, they have focused on specific countries or disease contexts [21-
127 23]. Furthermore, none of these studies have examined in-depth whether reporting officials,
128 including both public health officials and health care providers, have experienced pressures to
129 not report for either political, security, or economic reasons, despite such pressures likely
130 having played a role during previous outbreaks, including SARS and COVID-19 [24-25].
131 Lastly, these studies have failed to assess the relative importance of the various putative
132 barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting. To address these gaps, this study will survey and
133 interview FETP trainees and graduates across the Asia-Pacific region on their experiences
134 and observations regarding putative barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting. Such a
135 region-wide study can inform regionally relevant approaches to improve outbreak reporting
136 and collaborative response.

137 **Study question and objective**

138 Our research question is the following:

- 139 • What are the barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting in the Asia-Pacific region
140 at the local and subnational levels?

141 The objective of this study will be to elicit the views of FETP trainees and graduates from the
142 Asia-Pacific region on the barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting based on their personal
143 observations and experiences. This information will help identify potential interventions that
144 can improve the outbreak reporting process and help prevent future outbreaks from becoming
145 pandemics.

146 **Methods and Analysis**

147 **Study design**

148 This study will employ a mixed methods approach to assess these barriers and enablers by
149 using both quantitative and qualitative methods for collecting data, which will then be
150 integrated to derive findings and insights not possible with either approach alone [26].
151 Specifically, this study will use an explanatory sequential design (Fig 1) in which a survey
152 will first be administered to FETP trainees and graduates to explore their views on the
153 importance of putative barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting [27]. The survey questions
154 will be informed by a scoping review of the literature and consultations with subject matter
155 experts affiliated with FETPs in the Asia-Pacific region and will be piloted with persons
156 experienced with FETPs and outbreak reporting. Following survey administration, we will
157 conduct semi-structured interviews with a subset of survey respondents to investigate the
158 survey findings in more detail and to evaluate how they differ among varying geographic,
159 political, and socioeconomic contexts [26,28]. Thus, the interviews will focus on both
160 explaining and contextualizing the survey findings based on the unique perspectives and
161 circumstances of these participants. Using data from the scoping review, survey, and
162 interviews, we will construct a candidate conceptual model to describe the various barriers

163 and enablers to outbreak reporting from the local level to the national level and
164 internationally. Participant recruitment began on 16 November 2023 and remains ongoing;
165 we intend to end recruitment on 31 May 2024.

166 **Fig 1. Explanatory sequential study design.**

167 **Study population**

168 Our target population for the survey will be FETP trainees and graduates from FETPs located
169 in the WHO Western Pacific Region (WPRO) and South-East Asian Region (SEARO) [29].

170 The nature and size of the population of persons with outbreak reporting responsibilities at
171 the local and subnational levels in the WHO WPRO and SEARO regions are unclear.

172 Therefore, we will employ maximum variation sampling to capture a wide range of regional
173 backgrounds and responses by approaching all FETPs from the two regions to administer the
174 survey among current trainees and graduates [28]. In addition, we will disseminate the survey
175 through the Training Programs in Epidemiology and Public Health Interventions Network
176 (TEPHINET) global alumni listserv. TEPHINET helps develop and connect the various
177 FETPs globally and can reach FETP alumni registered with TEPHINET [30].

178 For the interview phase, we will approach a subset of survey respondents who indicate
179 willingness to be interviewed. We will again employ maximum variation sampling to select a
180 diverse range of interviewees to reflect viewpoints and experiences across a variety of
181 reporting settings among the regions surveyed. We will preferentially target survey
182 respondents who provide detailed free text responses.

183 **Sampling**

184 **Survey**

185 As of 2023, there are 3,623 graduates from the 21 FETPs in the WPRO and SEARO regions
186 listed with TEPHINET combined [31]. It is unclear how many FETP participants are
187 currently in training; based on our experience with FETPs in these regions, we estimate that
188 each of the 21 WPRO and SEARO FETPs listed with TEPHINET typically has two to five
189 trainees at any one time, for a total of approximately 42-105 trainees from both regions [31].
190 For this study, we will use the mean of this range (74 trainees) as our estimate for the total
191 number of trainees. As part of field epidemiology training, all trainees are expected to be
192 involved in surveillance and outbreak reporting. Although it is unclear how many FETP
193 graduates from these regions continue to perform outbreak- and surveillance-related activities
194 after graduating, a previous study found that 65.7% of graduates from the Eastern
195 Mediterranean region investigate outbreaks, and 69.9%–71.7% work in public health
196 surveillance [5]. Assuming that approximately 70% of graduates in the WPRO and SEARO
197 regions also conduct surveillance and outbreak reporting activities, we anticipate a sample
198 frame for this study of 2,610 persons. Based on a Cochran sample size calculation, we
199 estimate our target sample size to be 335 persons at $\alpha=0.05$ and $p=0.5$ [32]. Previous studies
200 have found the response rate for online surveys to be between 34% and 48% [33]. Because of
201 the added challenges of responding to an online survey in a resource-limited setting and
202 potential language barriers in completing a survey in the English language, we will assume a
203 more conservative response rate of less than half this range, meaning that we assume a
204 minimum 17% response rate; for our target sample size, this would require reaching out to
205 1,971 persons. Thus, to meet our sample size goal, we will reach out to all 21 listed FETPs in
206 the WPRO and SEARO regions to obtain permission to circulate the survey to trainees and
207 graduates. We will also solicit participation from FETPs not listed with TEPHINET to
208 maximize our sample. To determine a more exact target sample size for this population, we
209 will ask each training program to provide information on the total number of trainees and
210 graduates within their programs.

211 **Semi-structured interviews**

212 We will select respondents using a maximum variation sampling approach to reflect the
213 geographical and economic diversity among the WPRO and SEARO countries and to identify
214 shared patterns of experiences that cut across different national settings [28]. Interviews will
215 continue until saturation has been reached (i.e., new data repeats what was expressed in
216 previous data, and elicited themes begin to stabilise) or the list of candidate interviewees has
217 been exhausted [34]. We will aim to interview at least 20 persons, with no more than three
218 persons representing any individual country to ensure representation of varying reporting
219 contexts [35].

220 **Data collection**

221 **Scoping review**

222 We will scope both the peer-reviewed and grey literature according to the PRISMA
223 Extension for Scoping Review guidelines (PRISMA-ScR) to develop a more comprehensive
224 understanding of the existing evidence of barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting among
225 both primary data (e.g., data collected through interviews, focus groups, and surveys) and
226 secondary data analysis (e.g., analysis of country-level data) [36]. We will identify relevant
227 peer-reviewed literature (both quantitative and qualitative studies, including systematic and
228 scoping reviews) and grey literature (non-peer reviewed reports and government documents)
229 published from 15 January 2008 (six months after the 2005 IHR went into effect) to 31
230 December 2023 among three online databases (PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science) and
231 Google Scholar. We will use search terms designed to elicit sources that address 1) outbreak
232 reports and 2) barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting. In addition, we will search the
233 reference lists of sources chosen for data abstraction for additional literature to review, and
234 we will review country outbreak After Action Review reports provided by WHO [37].

235 **Survey**

236 The survey will collect demographic information as well as experiences with FETPs and
237 outbreak reporting. Demographic information will include age, gender, level of education,
238 country of work, public health role, type of FETP training, and country through which the
239 FETP training was completed. The questions investigating knowledge and experiences with
240 putative barriers and enablers to reporting will be generated based on previous research,
241 including the scoping review. These questions will focus on barriers and enablers related to
242 capacity, coordination, and communication; training and socialization around reporting;
243 motivation and incentives to report; and authority to report. In addition, the survey will
244 investigate whether reporting officials have felt pressure to not report or feared economic
245 consequences from reporting to evaluate the impact of organizational, political, and economic
246 factors on reporting. The relative importance of these barriers and enablers to outbreak
247 reporting will be assessed using a Likert scale of 1 to 3, where 1 equals “No impact”, 2 equals
248 “Some impact”, and 3 equals “High impact”. Free text prompts will allow respondents to
249 further contextualize their responses. We will refine the survey based on input provided by
250 subject matter experts affiliated with FETPs in the Asia-Pacific region. We will then pilot the
251 survey with persons experienced with FETPs and outbreak reporting, including FETP trainers
252 and graduates. The survey will be administered through Qualtrics [38].

253 We will analyse the survey findings in the context of various empirical economic and
254 political indicators by which the respondents’ country of work can be classified. Although a
255 previous study did not find a correlation between regime type and outbreak reporting time, a
256 later study did find that domestic commitment to rule of law was significantly associated with
257 outbreak reporting time [15,39]. This latter study also found that development level (i.e.,
258 gross domestic product [GDP] per capita), exports and imports as a share of GDP, and
259 contribution of travel and tourism to GDP were significantly associated with outbreak

260 reporting time [15]. Another study found that increased internet usage and freedom of the
261 press were associated with timelier outbreak reporting, which might reflect the availability of
262 unofficial channels for outbreak reporting, including rumours and media reports [40]. To
263 account for the impacts of these factors on outbreak reporting, we will stratify the
264 respondents' country of work according to the following covariates and compare the survey
265 results across these strata: income level, trade exposure according to GDP, contribution of
266 travel and tourism to GDP, rule of law based on the Worldwide Governance Indicators,
267 number of internet users, and freedom of the press [41-45].

268 **Semi-structured interviews**

269 Interviews will be either held in-person or online on Zoom between the first author and each
270 participant individually. The interviews are anticipated to last for 45 to 60 minutes. The
271 results of the scoping review and survey will inform the creation of semi-structured interview
272 questions for the interviews. These questions will elicit further contextual information and
273 perspectives regarding commonly identified barriers and enablers as well as details about
274 unique barriers and enablers that are outliers with respect to these findings. We will
275 transcribe the interviews verbatim to facilitate data analysis.

276 **Reflexivity**

277 The primary researcher's background as a physician and public health specialist with field
278 epidemiology training and outbreak response experience informed his interest in the research
279 question based on his experience that timely outbreak detection and reporting are crucial to
280 effective outbreak containment. This background also helped the primary researcher identify
281 FETP trainees and graduates as a likely valuable source of information on the outbreak
282 reporting process. However, the primary researcher's training and experience can also affect
283 the interview questions asked, interpretations made, and the researcher-interviewee dynamic

284 itself by providing a pre-defined understanding of outbreak reporting for the researcher and
285 how it can be ideally realised, which might differ from the experiences and understandings of
286 the interviewees. To facilitate reflexivity, the primary researcher will keep a research journal
287 to record post-interview reflections to engage their evolving perception of the data with
288 respect to their own experiences, shape understanding of the researcher-interviewee dynamic,
289 inform future interviews, and refine candidate interview themes [46].

290 **Data analysis**

291 **Scoping review**

292 Data extraction and analysis will proceed per established guidelines for scoping reviews [47].
293 We will extract the following data from the selected literature into a Microsoft Excel
294 spreadsheet: study author, title, journal name, year of publication, and study type; study
295 purpose, methodology, target population, location, and start/end date; and evidence for
296 barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting. Based on the extracted data, we will summarize
297 the reviewed literature based on numbers of sources per country, target population, study
298 type, and methodology; we will present these data in a table along with a descriptive
299 summary. We will also identify common findings across the various literature reviewed and
300 will synthesize these thematically into a coherent narrative description, which will be
301 summarized in a table or flowchart. The results of this review will inform the construction of
302 survey questions about respondents' experiences with barriers and enablers to outbreak
303 reporting.

304 **Survey**

305 We will report counts and percentages for all variables. For Likert variables, we will report
306 median and interquartile range. We will analyse differences in weighted median ordinal
307 responses and GHSI scores for detecting public health events according to the covariates

308 described above (rule of law, trade exposure, contribution of travel and tourism to GDP,
309 country income level, number of internet users, and freedom of press), where weighted
310 medians will be calculated for each stratum [48]. We will compare weighted median ordinal
311 responses and GHSI scores between different income groups using the Kruskal-Wallis test,
312 and we will employ the pair-wise Wilcoxon rank sum test for post-hoc analysis to determine
313 which groups significantly differ ($\alpha=0.05$). For rule of law, trade exposure, travel and
314 tourism, internet use, and freedom of press indicators, we will assess for association with
315 weighted median ordinal responses and GHSI scores using Spearman's rank correlation
316 ($\alpha=0.05$). We will perform all quantitative survey analyses in R [49].

317 We will thematically summarize the findings from the free text box responses using content
318 analysis, where we will inductively code the text into thematic categories and triangulate
319 these findings with the scaled responses [27,50]. We will then use the triangulated findings to
320 inform the interview questions, thereby integrating the study designs [50,51]. Where example
321 quotes are provided verbatim, the quotes will not be attributable by country to protect
322 respondents from unintentional identification.

323 **Semi-structured interviews**

324 We will use thematic analysis incorporating the Framework Method to analyse the interview
325 data [52-53]. First, we will deductively code themes elicited from the findings from the
326 scoping review and survey and group the codes within a working analytical framework [53].
327 Using these codes, two researchers will then conduct a thematic analysis employing a
328 "coding reliability" approach where they will label themes identified in the interviews with
329 these predetermined codes; while one of the coders will be an existing researcher on our
330 team, the other coder will be an outside researcher unaffiliated with the study [52-53]. To
331 begin, the coders will review the interview transcripts and corresponding audio to familiarise
332 themselves with the data. Next, the two coders will code the interview data into a framework

333 matrix [53]. After coding at least the first three transcripts, the two researchers will meet to
334 compare their coded transcripts and to adjust the analytical framework where necessary given
335 the transcript data, including adding new codes or modifying/deleting existing codes [53].
336 The coders will continue to adjust the analytic framework as needed until the final transcript
337 has been coded [53]. On completion of coding, the coders will interpret the matrix data to
338 identify overarching themes, including themes consistent with the previous scoping review
339 and interview data as well as novel ones [53]. In addition, we will calculate the level of
340 agreement between the two coders using Cohen's kappa and recode as necessary if
341 significant differences emerge [52]. Where necessary to discuss participant work location, we
342 will report WHO region and country income level stratum instead of country name to protect
343 interviewee privacy given that both interview findings and country name data might together
344 facilitate interviewee identification. We will code the interview data using NVivo 12 and
345 generate the analytical framework within a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet [54].

346 **Data interpretation**

347 We will depict the integrated findings from the scoping review, survey responses, and
348 interviews using joint displays to visually draw out unique insights that are only accessible
349 through joint interpretation of the quantitative and qualitative data [51,55]. Based on these
350 findings, we will develop a conceptual model incorporating all the known factors that impact
351 outbreak reporting at the local, subnational, and national levels and their interactions across
352 all levels. We will share preliminary interview findings with interviewees to obtain feedback
353 on our results and interpretation.

354 **Patient and public involvement**

355 As stated above, we will consult with subject matter experts to develop the survey instrument
356 and will reach out to TEPHINET and FETPs to disseminate the survey among FETP trainees

357 and graduates. We will directly recruit interviewees among survey respondents who volunteer
358 to be interviewed.

359 **Ethics and Dissemination**

360 **Ethics**

361 The proposed research activities have been approved by the Human Ethics Office at the
362 Australian National University (protocol number 2023-196). We will apply for any protocol
363 amendments with this office.

364 **Consent**

365 Before beginning the survey or interview, participants must read a “Participant Information
366 Sheet” that outlines the study; they must then click “Yes” to the survey question asking for
367 consent to participate in the survey or sign and submit by email or post a written consent
368 form to be interviewed. Participation in the survey and interviews will be voluntary, and
369 participants are free to withdraw from participation at any point while taking the survey or
370 being interviewed.

371 **Confidentiality**

372 We will keep participant identities confidential as far as allowed by law. For the survey we
373 will not require name or contact information unless the respondent would like to be contacted
374 to participate in an interview. We will use this information to create a candidate interviewee
375 list; after abstracting this contact information into this list, we will delete this information
376 from the survey platform. The data interviewees provide will be de-identified, including
377 name as well as any incidentally identifying information provided during the interview.
378 Identifying details (i.e., name and email address) will be stored separately from the rest of the

379 research data in the candidate interviewee list, which will be linked back to each interview
380 within this document. Access to the data will be restricted to the research team. Published
381 results will only be reported in aggregate (except for de-identified quotations where
382 appropriate), and participants will not be identifiable within published outputs. Furthermore,
383 as interview participants could potentially be identified from a publication based on being
384 associated with their country affiliation, these country affiliations will not be referred to in
385 any publication.

386 **Expected output**

387 We will use previous research and results from this study to develop a conceptual model
388 incorporating all the known factors that impact outbreak reporting at the local, subnational,
389 and national levels. This will allow for the coordinated development of key interventions
390 appropriate for each reporting level to improve the outbreak reporting process. More
391 generally, this study will highlight the need to account for the many different determinants of
392 outbreak reporting, including capacity to detect and report outbreaks and political or
393 economic barriers to reporting.

394 **Dissemination**

395 We will share the results of this study at academic conferences and through peer-reviewed
396 reports published in relevant research journals. All survey and interview participants will be
397 provided a URL link to review study outputs. All study data will be retained and securely
398 stored for at least five years following publications arising from this research. After the
399 storage period, de-identified study data will be archived at the Australian Data Archive for
400 use in later research, including potentially by other researchers [56].

401 **Discussion**

402 In the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, the world has begun the process of reforming the
403 body of global health law that informs pandemic preparedness and response, including
404 amending the 2005 IHR and adopting a new pandemic treaty [57-58]. The proposed reforms
405 mainly target country-level barriers to outbreak reporting, particularly the capacity to detect
406 and report outbreaks. However, all outbreak reports start at the local level before moving up
407 through various layers of a country's public health system. As such, it will be crucial to
408 evaluate and address the barriers at all levels of the outbreak reporting system to effect
409 successful reforms to prepare for future outbreaks.

410 With outbreak reporting responsibilities at various levels of the public health system, FETP-
411 trained officials represent a potentially invaluable source of information on the various
412 barriers and enablers to outbreak reporting at all levels of a public health system. By
413 evaluating the experiences of FETP trainees and graduates in the Asia-Pacific region, this
414 study will build on previous studies that have evaluated outbreak reporting within specific
415 country settings or among specific reporting groups to develop a more comprehensive
416 overview of the various outbreak reporting barriers and enablers and to inform relevant
417 approaches to improve reporting and collaborative response.

418 This study is subject to several limitations. Selection bias might affect the survey results,
419 where persons with reliable internet access and fluency in the survey language will be more
420 likely to complete the survey. In addition, this study will elicit the views and experiences of a
421 select population of public health officials, which might constrain the applicability of the
422 study findings beyond settings encountered by FETP-trained officials. This study mitigates
423 these concerns by distributing the survey in a platform that is readily accessible among
424 various mobile phone and computer devices and by recruiting persons with FETP experiences
425 at different levels of government across various countries. Furthermore, potential respondents
426 might choose not to participate in the survey or interviews for fear of being identified and

427 associated with their responses, leading to harmful professional, economic, or legal impacts.
428 To mitigate privacy concerns, the survey and interviews will be fully anonymous, unless a
429 participant asks to be identified.

430 This study is also limited by the study investigators' particular knowledge and experience. As
431 such, the questions to be asked in the survey and interviews might not adequately account for
432 the variety of challenges faced by FETP officials from a variety of different settings. To help
433 address this bias, we will review and pilot this survey with persons who have experience with
434 outbreak reporting in various countries in the Asia-Pacific region. In addition, the interview
435 research journal will help to illuminate any biases with respect to the interviewer's
436 questioning.

437 Despite these limitations, this study will fill a major gap in our understanding of the
438 determinants of outbreak reporting across several geographic, political, and economic
439 contexts by eliciting the viewpoints and experiences of persons with exposure to outbreak
440 reporting across various settings. This information will help improve the outbreak reporting
441 process, allowing for more timely reporting and helping prevent outbreaks from growing into
442 devastating epidemics or pandemics.

443 **Author contributions**

444 AT: conceptualization, methodology, writing – original draft preparation

445 RK, MDK, TH: methodology, supervision, writing – review and editing

446 **Acknowledgments**

447 We thank Amy E. Parry for her invaluable recommendations while developing this project.

448 **References**

- 449 1. World Health Organization. International Health Regulations (2005). 3rd ed. Geneva:
450 World Health Organization; 2016.
- 451 2. Kickbusch I, Liu A. Global health diplomacy-reconstructing power and governance.
452 *Lancet*. 2022 Jun 4;399(10341):2156-2166. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)00583-9.
- 453 3. Singh S, McNab C, Olson RM, Bristol N, Nolan C, Bergström E, et al. How an outbreak
454 became a pandemic: a chronological analysis of crucial junctures and international
455 obligations in the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Lancet*. 2021 Dec
456 4;398(10316):2109-2124. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01897-3.
- 457 4. André AM, Lopez A, Perkins S, Lambert S, Chace L, Noudeke N, et al. Frontline Field
458 Epidemiology Training Programs as a Strategy to Improve Disease Surveillance and
459 Response. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2017 Dec;23(13):S166–73. doi: 10.3201/eid2313.170803.
- 460 5. Al Nsour M, Khader Y, Bashier H, Alsoukhni M. Evaluation of Advanced Field
461 Epidemiology Training Programs in the Eastern Mediterranean Region: A Multi-Country
462 Study. *Front Public Health*. 2021 Jul 22;9:684174. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2021.684174.
- 463 6. Nuclear Threat Initiative. Global Health Security Index: GHS Index Methodology
464 [Internet]. Washington (DC): Nuclear Threat Initiative; 2021 November [cited 2023
465 April 11]. Available from: [https://www.ghsindex.org/wp-](https://www.ghsindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/2021_GHSindex_Methodology_FINAL.pdf)
466 [content/uploads/2021/11/2021_GHSindex_Methodology_FINAL.pdf](https://www.ghsindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/2021_GHSindex_Methodology_FINAL.pdf)
- 467 7. Bochner AF, Makumbi I, Aderinola O, Abayneh A, Jetoh R, Yemanaberhan RL, et al.
468 Implementation of the 7-1-7 target for detection, notification, and response to public
469 health threats in five countries: a retrospective, observational study. *Lancet Glob Health*.
470 2023 Jun;11(6):e871-e879. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00133-X.
- 471 8. Do H, Ho HT, Tran PD, Nguyen DB, Otsu S, de Vázquez CC, et al. Building the hospital
472 event-based surveillance system in Viet Nam: a qualitative study to identify potential

- 473 facilitators and barriers for event reporting. *Western Pac Surveill Response J.* 2020 Sep
474 30;11(3):10-20. doi: 10.5365/wpsar.2019.10.1.009.
- 475 9. Fill MA, Murphree R, Pettit AC. Health Care Provider Knowledge and Attitudes
476 Regarding Reporting Diseases and Events to Public Health Authorities in Tennessee. *J*
477 *Public Health Manag Pract.* 2017 Nov/Dec;23(6):581-588. doi:
478 10.1097/PHH.0000000000000492.
- 479 10. Lafond KE, Dalhatu I, Shinde V, Ekanem EE, Ahmed S, Peebles P, et al. Notifiable
480 disease reporting among public sector physicians in Nigeria: a cross-sectional survey to
481 evaluate possible barriers and identify best sources of information. *BMC Health Serv*
482 *Res.* 2014 Nov 13;14:568. doi: 10.1186/s12913-014-0568-3.
- 483 11. Steele L, Orefuwa E, Dickmann P. Drivers of earlier infectious disease outbreak
484 detection: a systematic literature review. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2016 Dec;53:15-20. doi:
485 10.1016/j.ijid.2016.10.005.
- 486 12. Tan HF, Yeh CY, Chang HW, Chang CK, Tseng HF. Private doctors' practices,
487 knowledge, and attitude to reporting of communicable diseases: a national survey in
488 Taiwan. *BMC Infect Dis.* 2009 Jan 29;9:11. doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-9-11.
- 489 13. Packer C, Halabi SF, Hollmeyer H, Mithani SS, Wilson L, Ruckert A, et al. A survey of
490 International Health Regulations National Focal Points experiences in carrying out their
491 functions. *Global Health.* 2021 Mar 6;17(1):25. doi: 10.1186/s12992-021-00675-7.
- 492 14. Halabi S, Wilson K. The Independence of National Focal Points Under the International
493 Health Regulations (2005). *Harvard Int Law J.* 2022;63(1):135-179.
- 494 15. Worsnop CZ. Concealing Disease: Trade and Travel Barriers and the Timeliness of
495 Outbreak Reporting. *Int Stud Perspect.* 2019;20:344-372. doi: 10.1093/isp/ekz005.

- 496 16. de Groot RJ, Baker SC, Baric RS, Brown CS, Drosten C, Enjuanes L, et al. Middle East
497 respiratory syndrome coronavirus (MERS-CoV): announcement of the Coronavirus
498 Study Group. *J Virol*. 2013 Jul;87(14):7790-2. doi: 10.1128/JVI.01244-13.
- 499 17. Institute of Medicine (US) Forum on Microbial Threats. Learning from SARS: Preparing
500 for the Next Disease Outbreak: Workshop Summary. Knobler S, Mahmoud A, Lemon S,
501 Mack A, Sivitz L, Oberholtzer K, editors. Washington (DC): National Academies Press
502 (US); 2004.
- 503 18. Piret J, Boivin G. Pandemics Throughout History. *Front Microbiol*. 2021 Jan
504 15;11:631736. doi: 10.3389/fmicb.2020.631736. Erratum in: *Front Microbiol*. 2022 Sep
505 27;13:988058.
- 506 19. World Bank Group. Population, total [Internet]. Washington (DC): World Bank Group;
507 2023 [cited 2023 May 29]. Available from:
508 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL>
- 509 20. World Health Assembly, 64. Implementation of the International Health Regulations
510 (2005): Report of the Review Committee on the Functioning of the International Health
511 Regulations (2005) in relation to Pandemic (H1N1) 2009: report by the Director-General
512 (A64/10) [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2011 [cited 2023 May 4].
513 Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/3350/A64_10-en.pdf
- 514 21. Bashir K, Wani KA, Qurieshi MA, Khan SMS, Haq I. Measles surveillance in Kashmir:
515 A mixed methods study. *Indian J Public Health*. 2022 Jul-Sep;66(3):251-256. doi:
516 10.4103/ijph.ijph_1482_21.
- 517 22. Craig AT, Kaldor J, Schierhout G, Rosewell AE. Surveillance strategies for the detection
518 of disease outbreaks in the Pacific islands: meta-analysis of published literature, 2010-
519 2019. *Trop Med Int Health*. 2020 Aug;25(8):906-918. doi: 10.1111/tmi.13448.


- 520 23. Manurung MK, Reo SE, Pardosi JF, Muscatello DJ. Evaluation of the Indonesian Early
521 Warning Alert and Response System (EWARS) in West Papua, Indonesia. *WHO South*
522 *East Asia J Public Health*. 2020 Sep;9(2):111-117. doi: 10.4103/2224-3151.294304.
- 523 24. Li M. Public Health Crises In Comparison: China's Epidemic Response Policies From
524 SARS To COVID-19. *Glob Public Health*. 2021 Aug-Sep;16(8-9):1223-1236. doi:
525 10.1080/17441692.2021.1919735.
- 526 25. Maciel AL, de Carvalho BA, Timmons S, Padoveze MC. Barriers to investigating and
527 reporting nosocomial outbreaks to health authorities in São Paulo, Brazil: a mixed
528 methods approach. *J Hosp Infect*. 2016 Dec;94(4):330-337. doi:
529 10.1016/j.jhin.2016.06.022.
- 530 26. Doyle L, Brady AM, Byrne G. An overview of mixed methods research. *J Res Nurs*.
531 2009;14(2):175-185. doi: 10.1177/1744987108093962.
- 532 27. Creswell JW, Plano Clark VL. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*.
533 London: SAGE Publications Ltd; 2007.
- 534 28. Palinkas LA, Horwitz SM, Green CA, Wisdom JP, Duan N, Hoagwood K. Purposeful
535 Sampling for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation
536 Research. *Adm Policy Ment Health*. 2015 Sep;42(5):533-44. doi: 10.1007/s10488-013-
537 0528-y.
- 538 29. World Health Organization. WHO regional offices [Internet]. Geneva: World Health
539 Organization; 2023 [cited 2023 May 29]. Available from:
540 <https://www.who.int/about/who-we-are/regional-offices>
- 541 30. Training Programs in Epidemiology and Public Health Interventions Network. Vision,
542 Mission and History [Internet]. Atlanta, GA: Training Programs in Epidemiology and

- 543 Public Health Interventions Network; 2023 [cited 2023 September 25]. Available from:
544 <https://www.tephinet.org/who-we-are/vision-mission-and-history>
- 545 31. Training Programs in Epidemiology and Public Health Interventions Network. Training
546 programs [Internet]. Atlanta, GA: Training Programs in Epidemiology and Public Health
547 Interventions Network; 2023 [cited 2023 May 29]. Available from:
548 <https://www.tephinet.org/training-programs>
- 549 32. Bartlett JE, Kotrlik JW, Higgins CC. Organizational research: Determining appropriate
550 sample size in survey research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance*
551 *Journal*. 2001;19(1):43-50.
- 552 33. Wu M-J, Zhao K, Fils-Aime F. Response rates of online surveys in published research: A
553 meta-analysis. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*. 2022;7:100206. doi:
554 10.1016/j.chbr.2022.100206.
- 555 34. Saunders B, Sim J, Kingstone T, Baker S, Waterfield J, Bartlam B, et al. Saturation in
556 qualitative research: exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Qual Quant*.
557 2018;52(4):1893-1907. doi: 10.1007/s11135-017-0574-8.
- 558 35. Braun V. *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. London:
559 SAGE Publications Ltd; 2013.
- 560 36. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA
561 Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern*
562 *Med*. 2018 Oct 2;169(7):467-473. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850.
- 563 37. World Health Organization. After Action Review (AAR) [Internet]. Geneva: World
564 Health Organization; 2024 [cited 2024 January 24]. Available from:
565 <https://extranet.who.int/sph/after-action-review>

- 566 38. Qualtrics. Qualtrics [Computer software]. Provo, UT: Qualtrics; 2020. Available from:
567 <https://www.qualtrics.com>
- 568 39. Kluberg SA, Mekar SR, McIver DJ, Madoff LC, Crawley AW, Smolinski MS, et al.
569 Global Capacity for Emerging Infectious Disease Detection, 1996-2014. *Emerg Infect*
570 *Dis.* 2016 Oct;22(10):E1-6. doi: 10.3201/eid2210.151956.
- 571 40. McAlarnen L, Smith K, Brownstein JS, Jerde C. Internet and free press are associated
572 with reduced lags in global outbreak reporting. *PLoS Curr.* 2014 Oct
573 30;6:ecurrents.outbreaks.cccdec16fa17091eea4c4a725dba9e16. doi:
574 10.1371/currents.outbreaks.cccdec16fa17091eea4c4a725dba9e16.
- 575 41. Reporters Without Borders. World Press Freedom Index [Internet]. Paris: Reporters
576 Without Borders; 2023 [cited 2023 September 25]. Available from:
577 <https://rsf.org/en/index>
- 578 42. World Bank Group. World Bank Country and Lending Groups [Internet]. Washington
579 (DC): World Bank Group; 2023 [cited 2023 September 25]. Available from:
580 [https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)
581 [and-lending-groups](https://datahelpdesk.worldbank.org/knowledgebase/articles/906519-world-bank-country-and-lending-groups)
- 582 43. World Bank Group. TCdata360 [Internet]. Washington (DC): World Bank Group; 2023
583 [cited 2023 May 31]. Available from: <https://tcdata360.worldbank.org>
- 584 44. World Bank Group. Worldwide Governance Indicators [Internet]. Washington (DC):
585 World Bank Group; 2023 [cited 2023 September 25]. Available from:
586 <https://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/#home>
- 587 45. World Bank Group. States and Markets [Internet]. Washington (DC): World Bank
588 Group; 2023 [cited 2023 September 25]. Available from:

- 589 <https://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators/themes/states-and->
590 [markets.html](https://datatopics.worldbank.org/world-development-indicators/themes/states-and-markets.html)
- 591 46. Olmos-Vega FM, Stalmeijer RE, Varpio L, Kahlke R. A practical guide to reflexivity in
592 qualitative research: AMEE Guide No. 149. *Med Teach*. 2022 Apr 7;1-11. doi:
593 10.1080/0142159X.2022.2057287.
- 594 47. Peters MD, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, McInerney P, Parker D, Soares CB. Guidance for
595 conducting systematic scoping reviews. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2015 Sep;13(3):141-6.
596 doi: 10.1097/XEB.0000000000000050.
- 597 48. Bell JA, Nuzzo JB. Global Health Security Index: Advancing Collective Action and
598 Accountability Amid Global Crisis [Internet]. Washington (DC): Nuclear Threat
599 Initiative; 2021 [cited 2023 May 5]. Available from: [https://www.ghsindex.org/wp-](https://www.ghsindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/2021_GHSindexFullReport_Final.pdf)
600 [content/uploads/2021/12/2021_GHSindexFullReport_Final.pdf](https://www.ghsindex.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/2021_GHSindexFullReport_Final.pdf)
- 601 49. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Computer
602 software]. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2022. Available
603 from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 604 50. Ayton D, Tsindos T, Berkovic D. Qualitative Research – a practical guide for health and
605 social care researchers and practitioners. Melbourne, Australia: Monash University;
606 2023.
- 607 51. Fetters MD, Curry LA, Creswell JW. Achieving integration in mixed methods designs-
608 principles and practices. *Health Serv Res*. 2013 Dec;48(6 Pt 2):2134-56. doi:
609 10.1111/1475-6773.12117.
- 610 52. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method for
611 the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Med Res*
612 *Methodol*. 2013 Sep 18;13:117. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-13-117.

- 613 53. Braun V, Clarke V, Hayfield N, Terry G. Thematic Analysis. In Liamputtong P, editor.
614 Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences. Singapore: Springer Nature
615 Singapore Pte Ltd; 2019. p. 843-860.
- 616 54. Lumivero. NVivo (Version 12) [Computer software]. Denver, CO: Lumivero; 2018.
617 Available from: <https://www.lumivero.com>
- 618 55. Guetterman TC, Fetters MD, Creswell JW. Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative
619 Results in Health Science Mixed Methods Research Through Joint Displays. *Ann Fam*
620 *Med*. 2015 Nov;13(6):554-61. doi: 10.1370/afm.1865.
- 621 56. Australian Data Archive. The Australian Data Archive [Internet]. Canberra, Australia:
622 Australian Data Archive; 2024 [cited 2024 January 24]. Available from:
623 <https://ada.edu.au/>
- 624 57. Intergovernmental Negotiating Body to Draft and Negotiate a WHO Convention,
625 Agreement or Other International Instrument on Pandemic Prevention, Preparedness and
626 Response. Zero draft of the WHO CA+ for the consideration of the Intergovernmental
627 Negotiating Body at its fourth meeting [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization;
628 2023 Feb 1 [cited 2023 Feb 17]. Available from:
629 https://apps.who.int/gb/inb/pdf_files/inb4/A_INB4_3-en.pdf
- 630 58. Working Group on Amendments to the International Health Regulations (2005). Article-
631 by-Article Compilation of Proposed Amendments to the International Health Regulations
632 (2005) submitted in accordance with decision WHA75(9) (2022) [Internet]. Geneva:
633 World Health Organization [cited 2023 Jun 11]. Available from:
634 https://apps.who.int/gb/wgihr/pdf_files/wgihr1/WGIHR_Compilation-en.pdf



Figure