

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Community Engagement Interventions for Malaria Prevention, Control and Elimination: A Scoping Review Protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-049812
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Feb-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Awasthi, Kiran Raj; Curtin University Leavy, Justine ; Curtin University, School of Public Health Jancey, Jonine; Curtin University, Western Australian Centre for Health Promotion Research, School of Public Health Clements, Archie ; Curtin University, Faculty of Health Sciences
Keywords:	Public health < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Tropical medicine < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, PUBLIC HEALTH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Title: Community Engagement Interventions for Malaria Prevention, Control and Elimination: A Scoping Review Protocol

Kiran Raj Awasthi ^{1,*}, Jonine Jancey ¹, Archie Clements ¹, Justine E. Leavy ¹

¹ School of Public Health, Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth, WA 6845, Australia

*Correspondence: kiran.awasthi@curtin.edu.au; Tel.: +61-424906590

Abstract: Community engagement strategies need to be adopted by countries for malaria prevention, control, and ultimately elimination. As the decline of malaria has plateaued over the last five years, strengthening community engagement approaches will be necessary to enhance health promotion practice and policy to drive malaria transmission down further. Countries have adopted community engagement interventions (CEI) on malaria that best suit their context, however, there is a paucity of evidence on CEIs, the potential implementation barriers and facilitators and their outcomes.

Objectives The objectives of the review are to map the available evidence on the types of CEI for 1) malaria prevention; 2) malaria control; and 3) malaria elimination; and 4) describe the barriers, facilitators and the outcomes of the CEIs.

Design The scoping review methodology will be based on the Arksey and O'Malles's framework.

Data Source Proquest, PubMed, Web of Knowledge, Google Scholar, and Medline will be searched for publications from January 2000 to current.

Eligibility Criteria Will include primary studies written in the English language using appropriate study designs and methods, including quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods designs; and case, program or project reports. Information on CEIs designed specifically for malaria prevention, control and/or elimination.

Expected results This scoping review aims to identify the available evidence, sources of information and research gaps in the area of CE as one approach for malaria prevention, control and/or elimination.

Key words: community engagement; community participation; community mobilization; social mobilization; community action; malaria; prevention; control; elimination; countries

This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial.

Strengths and limitations of the study

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first scoping review to be undertaken on CEI for malaria prevention, control and elimination.
- The scoping review process will be informed by the University Health Science reference librarian.
- The review will be conducted on peer reviewed published primary sources in English.
- As this will be a scoping review, the study will be limited to providing existing evidence on the topic with an aim to identify and conduct a narrative synthesis only of the various CEIs.

INTRODUCTION

Malaria, a vector borne disease, remains a major public health challenge contributing to an estimated 228 million cases and 400,000 deaths annually worldwide.¹ Globally, between 2010 and 2014, there was a 70 % decrease in malaria incidence, however, in the last five years the progress towards further reduction has been relatively static.² The earlier decrease in cases was attributed to scaling up of routine interventions such as free distribution of long-lasting insecticidal nets (LLINs) or insecticide treated nets (ITNs), periodic indoor residual spraying (IRS), prompt treatment of diagnosed cases, and use of Artemisinin based Combination Therapy (ACT) for the treatment of *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria.^{1,3-5}

Community engagement (CE) is defined as “a process of working collaboratively with groups of people who are affiliated by geographic proximity, special interests, or similar situations, with respect to issues affecting their wellbeing” (p9).⁶ CE has been adopted especially by Lower Middle Income Countries (LMICs) in a quest to reach elimination of malaria by 2030, consistent with the World Health Organization Global Malaria Strategy 2016–2030.^{7,8} CE has been deployed as a prevention and treatment strategy in a variety of countries in a range of national programs, such as: mass drug administration for malaria prevention in Myanmar and Laos;^{9,10} increasing the use of LLINs and promoting early testing and treatment in Cambodia;¹¹ and improving testing facilities in communities in Zambia.¹² A variety of strategies have been implemented as part of CE interventions (CEI), which has included: formation of a community leadership group comprising locals (leaders, elderly and youth); drama campaigns and health education programs delivered in settings such as schools and churches; house-to-house visits by community health volunteers to improve early detection and timely treatment in areas with high levels of migration; and conducting participatory action research led by the community.⁹⁻¹²

Health interventionists use the CE approach to engage and harness communities in health promotion practice, research and policy decision making to address a variety of health and health-related issues to support behavioural and environmental change.¹³ CE can be effective in dealing with health inequalities especially among disadvantaged groups who are challenged by structural, cultural, financial and language barriers.¹⁴ Countries have adopted different community engagement interventions (CEI) that best suit their context and community, however, there is paucity of evidence on the results of these CEIs including the potential barriers and facilitators and outcome. An understanding of the components of CEI used for malaria prevention, control and elimination may assist program planners, managers and policy makers in adapting or selecting suitable activities relevant to their community.

This paper describes the protocol for a scoping review that aims to describe CEIs targeting the prevention, control or elimination of malaria that have been/ or are being implemented by countries and to identify the barriers, facilitators to implementing the interventions and their outcomes.

REVIEW OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the review are to map the available evidence on the types of CEI for 1) malaria prevention; 2) malaria control; and 3) malaria elimination; and 4) describe the barriers, facilitators and the outcomes of the CEIs.

METHODS

Protocols and Registration

During a preliminary search, a 2016 systematic review was found that focused on one element of malaria prevention ([https://doi: 10.1186/s12936-016-1593-y](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-016-1593-y): Malaria Journal).¹⁵ However, no scoping review on community engagement has been conducted to date incorporating all components of malaria prevention, control and elimination across countries.

Eligibility Criteria

The review will only consider interventions studies published from 2000 onwards, a period encompassing two important landmarks, the advent of the Millennium Development Goals (2000-2014) and the Sustainable Development Goals (2015-2030).¹⁶

The evidence will be included if the sources are:

- Primary studies;
- Written in the English language;
- Using appropriate study designs and methods, including quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods designs; and case, program or project reports;
- Providing information on CEIs designed specifically for malaria prevention, control and/or elimination.

The evidence will be excluded if the sources are:

- Secondary studies including systematic reviews;
- Published in languages other than English;
- Providing information on CEIs for diseases or health issues other than malaria;
- Providing anecdotal evidence without a description of the study design and methods.

Information Sources and Search

The search strategy involves searching the databases for peer-reviewed published literature focusing on CEI conducted for malaria prevention, control or elimination. The search followed the updated methodology outlined by the Joanna Briggs Institute guide for scoping reviews in 2017,^{17,18} which itself is based on the framework developed by Arksey and O'Malley¹⁹ and further developed by Levac Colquhoun and O'Brien.²⁰ A scoping review is a valid process of synthesizing evidence on a given topic providing an excerpt of the volume of the literature or studies without seeking to analyse it.²¹ Primarily an exploratory approach, scoping reviews can shed light on the types of evidence available, the way studies have been conducted and help identify and map the evidence that is available in the area of interest.^{21,22}

Five databases including Proquest, PubMed, Web of Knowledge, Google Scholar, and Medline (OVID) will be searched using key words: "community engagement" OR "community participation" OR "community involvement" OR "public engagement" OR "community mobilization" OR "social mobilization" OR "community action" AND "prevention", "control", "elimination" AND "malaria" AND "low income countries" OR "middle income countries" OR "high income countries" OR "developing countries" OR "developed countries". The key words have been defined based on the objectives of the

1
2
3 study. Initially the search will be limited to the article title and abstract for studies published
4 between January 2000 and the current date. The search will be further streamlined by
5 searching for citations from the reference lists of papers selected from the initial search. For
6 papers not available online, the first author (K.R.A.) will contact the lead author of the
7 publication via email requesting a copy of the paper for review.
8
9

10 **Selection of sources of evidence**

11 The title and the abstract obtained from the search results will be examined by two
12 reviewers after the initial search. In the first stage of the study selection, the title and
13 abstract from search results obtained by K.R.A will be examined by two reviewers (J.J., J.E.L.)
14 independent of one another. The selection of the final studies will be agreed upon by three
15 reviewers (K.R.A.; J.J.; J.E.L.). During the final selection process, any differences regarding
16 inclusion and exclusion of papers among the three reviewers will be discussed, and a fourth
17 reviewer (A.C.) will be called upon to reach consensus.
18
19
20

21 **Data Charting process**

22 The data charting process will map the findings according to the attributes: author;
23 date/year of publication; country/ site; aim/ objectives; study population; sample size; study
24 design; barriers; facilitators; outcomes. The charting will be done by K.R.A and will be
25 reviewed by two reviewers (J.J. and J.E.L.). Any disputes or differences will be resolved by
26 the fourth reviewer (A.C.).
27
28
29

30 **Presentation of the Results**

31 The PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA_ScR) will be used to present the review
32 methods and the results from the search.²³ The 22 items checklist for reporting systematic
33 reviews comprising of two optional items (critical appraisal of sources and summary of the
34 evidences) will be followed while presenting the results of the scoping review. The items
35 include eligibility criteria, the search approach, methods of selecting the evidence and the
36 data charting process. The search process and the evidence flow across various stages of the
37 study will be presented visually using an additional diagram. Furthermore, the selected
38 evidence based on the source, study characteristics and the major findings (including the
39 barriers, facilitators and outcomes) will be mapped and presented in tabular form. The
40 results will be synthesized in congruence with the scoping review objectives and a narrative
41 description will be presented. The main findings will be synthesized to highlight the
42 limitations and provide an analysis of CEIs paving way for future research opportunities.
43
44
45
46

47 **Expected Results**

48 This scoping review aims to identify the available evidence, sources of information and
49 research gaps in the area of CE as one approach for malaria prevention, control and/or
50 elimination. The study will also increase the understanding of the existing barriers and
51 facilitators in implementing interventions using a CE approach along with the outcomes. The
52 results from this review will inform future practice and research in this area. This scoping
53 review is a component of formative research underpinning a proposed CEI in Nepal. It is
54 anticipated that the findings will inform and support recommendations made to local
55 authorities (i.e.at the rural municipality level) during the design and implementation phase
56 of a CEI focussed on malaria prevention and control in Nepal.
57
58
59
60

FUNDING

This research has not received any external funding.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the input of Vanessa Varis, Health Sciences reference librarian for her support in the designing the initial search strategy.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

This study only aims to review the secondary sources and does not require human research ethics committee approval. Nonetheless being a component of a mixed methods study, human ethics approval has been obtained from Nepal Health Research Council (ERB 632/2020, Ref. No. 1287) and Curtin University's Human Research Ethics Committee number HRE2020-0701. The results of the scoping review will be disseminated to a community advisory board in a rural municipality in Nepal to help inform their CEI design proposed for 2021. Furthermore, the findings of the scoping review will be submitted to a peer reviewed journal for wider dissemination.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

KRA conceptualized the topic and wrote the original draft. JL, AC and JJ supervised the writing process and were involved in review and editing of the manuscript.

ORCID ID

Kiran Raj Awasthi <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6448-7696>

(Word count: 1588)

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2019. WHO Geneva 2019.
2. Panda S, Swaminathan S, Hyder KA, et al. Drug resistance in malaria, tuberculosis, and HIV in South East Asia: biology, programme, and policy considerations. *BMJ*. 2017;358:j3545.
3. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2018. WHO Geneva 2018.
4. World Health Organization. WHA68 2: Global technical strategy and targets for malaria 2016–2030. World Health Organization 2015.
5. Bhatt S, Weiss D, Cameron E, et al. The effect of malaria control on *Plasmodium falciparum* in Africa between 2000 and 2015. *Nature*. 2015;526(7572):207-11.
6. Control for Disease Control and Prevention. Principles of community engagement. CDC/ATSDR Committee on Community Engagement Atlanta, GA. 1997.
7. Epidemiology and Disease Control Division. Nepal Malaria Strategic Plan 2014-2025. Department of Health Services 2016.
8. World Health Organization. Global technical strategy and targets for malaria 2016–2030. WHO Geneva 2015.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
9. Adhikari B, Pell C, Phommason K, et al. Elements of effective community engagement: lessons from a targeted malaria elimination study in Lao PDR (Laos). *Global health action*. 2017;10(1):1366136.
10. Kajechiwa L, Thwin MM, Nosten S, et al. Community engagement for the rapid elimination of malaria: the case of Kayin State, Myanmar. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2017;2:59.
11. Lim R, Tripura R, Peto TJ, et al. Drama as a community engagement strategy for malaria in rural Cambodia. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2017;2:95.
12. Gordon A, Vander Meulen RJ, et al. The 2019 Isdell: Flowers Cross Border Malaria Initiative Round Table: community engagement in the context of malaria elimination. *Malar J*. 2019;18:432.
13. Wallerstein N, Minkler M, Carter-Edwards L, et al. Improving health through community engagement, community organization, and community building. *Health behavior: theory, research and practice*. 2015;5.
14. Cyril S, Smith BJ, Possamai-Inesedy A, et al. Exploring the role of community engagement in improving the health of disadvantaged populations: a systematic review. *Global health action*. 2015;8(1):29842.
15. Adhikari B, James N, Newby G, et al. Community engagement and population coverage in mass anti-malarial administrations: a systematic literature review. *Malar J*. 2016;15(1):523.
16. Sachs JD. From millennium development goals to sustainable development goals. *The Lancet*. 2012;379(9832):2206-11.
17. Peters M, Godfrey C, Mclnerney P, et al. Methodology for JBI scoping reviews. The Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers manual 2015: The Joanna Briggs Institute; 2015. p. 3-24.
18. Peters MD, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, et al. Guidance for conducting systematic scoping reviews. *International journal of evidence-based healthcare*. 2015;13(3):141-146.
19. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32.
20. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implementation Science*. 2010;5:69.
21. Munn Z, Peters MDJ, Stern C, et al. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2018;18(1):1-7.
22. Pham MT, Rajić A, Greig JD, et al. A scoping review of scoping reviews: advancing the approach and enhancing the consistency. *Res Synth Methods*. 2014;5(4):371-85.
23. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2018;169(7):467-73.

Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	2
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	3
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	3
Information sources*	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	3
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	3-4
Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	4
Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	4
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	4
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	4
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	4



St. Michael's

Inspired Care.
Inspiring Science.

1

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	

JB1 = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

* Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

† A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI guidance (4, 5) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

§ The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

From: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169:467–473. doi: [10.7326/M18-0850](https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850).



St. Michael's

Inspired Care.
Inspiring Science.

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BMJ Open

Community Engagement Approaches for Malaria Prevention, Control and Elimination: A Scoping Review Protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-049812.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	09-Aug-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Awasthi, Kiran Raj; Curtin University Faculty of Health Sciences, Curtin School of Population Health Jancey, Jonine; Curtin University Faculty of Health Sciences, Western Australian Centre for Health Promotion Research Clements, Archie ; Curtin University, Faculty of Health Sciences Leavy, Justine ; Curtin University Faculty of Health Sciences
Primary Subject Heading:	Infectious diseases
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Global health, Infectious diseases, Public health
Keywords:	Public health < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Tropical medicine < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, PUBLIC HEALTH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Epidemiology < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Epidemiology < TROPICAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3
4 1 **Title: Community Engagement Approaches for Malaria Prevention, Control and Elimination:**
5 2 **A Scoping Review Protocol**
6

7
8 3 Kiran Raj Awasthi ^{1,*}, Jonine Jancey ¹, Archie Clements ¹, Justine E. Leavy ¹
9

10 4 ¹ Faculty of Health Sciences, Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth, WA 6845, Australia
11

12 5 *Correspondence: kiran.awasthi@curtin.edu.au; Tel.: +61-424906590
13

14 6 **ORCID ID:** Kiran Raj Awasthi <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6448-7696>
15
16 7

17
18 8 **Key words:** community engagement; community participation; malaria; prevention; control;
19 9 elimination
20
21

22
23 10 (Word count: 2,112)
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 1
5
6 2
7
8 3
9
10
11 4
12
13 5
14
15 6
16
17 7
18
19
20 8
21
22 9
23
24 10
25
26 11
27
28
29 12
30
31 13
32
33 14
34
35 15
36
37 16
38
39 17
40
41 18
42
43 19
44
45 20
46
47 21
48
49 22
50
51 23
52
53 24
54
55 25
56
57 26
58
59 27
60 28
29

**Title: Community Engagement Approaches for Malaria Prevention, Control and Elimination:
A Scoping Review Protocol**

Kiran Raj Awasthi ^{1,*}, Jonine Jancey ¹, Archie Clements ¹, Justine E. Leavy ¹

¹ School of Public Health, Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth, WA 6845, Australia

*Correspondence: kiran.awasthi@curtin.edu.au; Tel.: +61-424906590

Abstract:

Introduction: Community engagement (CE) is important for malaria prevention, control, and ultimately elimination. As the decline of malaria has plateaued over the last five years, strengthening community engagement approaches will be necessary to enhance health promotion practice and policy to drive malaria transmission down further. Countries have adopted a wide range of public health intervention approaches on malaria prevention and control that best suit their context. This review will examine the existing evidence on the various CE approaches adopted by malaria programs and their outcomes.

Methodology and Analysis: The review methodology will follow the updated Joanna Briggs Institute guide for scoping review, 2017, which is based on the framework developed by Arksey and O'Malley and further developed by Levac Colquhoun and O'Brien. Proquest, Web of Knowledge, and Medline will be searched for publications from January 2000 to 31st March 2021 while Google search engine will be used to find any grey literature. The eligibility criteria includes: primary studies written in the English language using appropriate study designs and methods, including quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods designs; and case, program or project reports. CE approaches designed specifically for malaria prevention, control, elimination and their outcomes will be explored. Subheadings and free

1 text terms for “community engagement” and “malaria” will be used for the search. The article
2 screening and data extraction will be examined by two reviewers after the initial search and
3 any disputes will be resolved by a third reviewer through discussion. The PRISMA extension
4 for scoping reviews (PRISMA_ScR) guide will be used to present the review methods and
5 the results.

6 **Ethics and Dissemination:** This study does not require human research ethics committee
7 approval. The findings of the scoping review will be submitted to a peer reviewed journal for
8 wider dissemination.

9
10 This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons
11 Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute,
12 remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on

13 **Strengths and limitations of the study**

- 14 • To our knowledge, this is the first scoping review to be undertaken on CE approaches
15 for malaria prevention, control and elimination.
- 16 • The University Health Science reference librarian will assist in developing a search
17 strategy for the scoping review, is a strength.
- 18 • The review will include peer reviewed published primary sources in English, therefore
19 publications in languages other than English and unpublished articles will be excluded,
20 a limitation of this study.

21 **INTRODUCTION**

22 **INTRODUCTION**

23 Malaria, a vector borne disease, remains a major public health challenge contributing to an
24 estimated 228 million cases and 400,000 deaths annually worldwide.¹ Globally, between 2010
25 and 2014, there was a 70 % decrease in malaria incidence, however, in the last five years the
26 progress towards further reduction has been relatively static.² The earlier decrease in cases was
27 attributed to scaling up of routine interventions such as free distribution of long-lasting
28 insecticidal nets (LLINs) or insecticide treated nets (ITNs), periodic indoor residual spraying
29 (IRS), prompt treatment of diagnosed cases, and use of Artemisinin based Combination Therapy
30 (ACT) for the treatment of *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria.^{1,3-5} Whilst some countries focus their
strategies on malaria prevention by enabling and promoting use of LLINs/ IRS/ larvicides and

1
2
3
4 1 chemoprophylaxis alongside malaria control programs that target a reduction of the disease
5 2 burden to a level where it is no longer a public health concern; countries with fewer malaria
6 3 cases aim for elimination that is to ensure sustained zero local transmission of malaria in the
7 4 population within a set geographic boundary through a strengthened surveillance system.¹
8
9

10
11 5 Community engagement (CE) is defined as “a process of working collaboratively with groups
12 6 of people who are affiliated by geographic proximity, special interests, or similar situations,
13 7 with respect to issues affecting their wellbeing” (p9).⁶ CE has been adopted especially by
14 8 Lower Middle Income Countries (LMICs) in a quest to reach elimination of malaria by 2030,
15 9 consistent with the World Health Organization Global Malaria Strategy 2016–2030.^{7,8} CE has
16 10 been used to co-design public health interventions and approaches for prevention and control
17 11 of malaria in a variety of countries in a range of national programs, such as: mass drug
18 12 administration for malaria prevention in Myanmar and Laos;^{9,10} increasing the use of LLINs
19 13 and promoting early testing and treatment in Cambodia and Kenya;¹¹ and improving access
20 14 to diagnosis and treatment in communities in Zambia.¹² A variety of activities have been
21 15 implemented for malaria prevention, control, and elimination based on CE: formation of a
22 16 community leadership group comprising locals (leaders, elderly and youth); drama campaigns
23 17 and health education programs delivered in settings such as schools and churches; house-to-
24 18 house visits by community health volunteers to improve early detection and timely treatment
25 19 in areas with high levels of migration; and conducting participatory action research led by the
26 20 community.⁹⁻¹²
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 21 Health interventionists’ use CE to harness communities in health promotion practice, research
38 22 and policy related decision making to advance knowledge and support behavioural and
39 23 environmental change to improve health outcomes.¹³ Public health interventions can
40 24 incorporate CE in different forms: providing information; consultation; joint decision-making;
41 25 acting collaboratively; and supporting the community interests independently.¹⁴ CE can be
42 26 effective in dealing with health inequalities especially among disadvantaged groups who are
43 27 challenged by structural, geographical, cultural, financial and language barriers.¹⁵
44 28 Internationally a range of community engagement has been used to best suit the context and
45 29 the target community. For example in Malawi the community based health animators have
46 30 been used by the national malaria program to improve awareness and promote positive
47 31 behavioural change in the community¹⁶, whilst in Nigeria integrated community case
48 32 management has been used to detect and treat malaria cases in remote areas using trained
49 33 community health workers thereby also minimizing the travel time and the cost for the patients
50 34¹⁷. Similarly, in Cameroon and Cambodia local volunteers and village malaria workers have
51 35 been used to conduct proactive and reactive case detection in communities for preventing
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 transmission^{11,18}, whilst the Interactive Malaria Awareness Program (MAP) in South Africa
2 have successfully used home-based care workers to form local level partnerships and also
3 educate communities on malaria prevention and control¹⁹. All these different CE approaches
4 have contributed to improved awareness, early detection of cases and improved access and
5 wider community acceptance for malaria prevention and treatment in the afore mentioned
6 countries.¹⁶⁻¹⁹

7 This paper describes the protocol for a scoping review that aims to describe CE approaches
8 targeting the prevention, control or elimination of malaria that have been/ or are being
9 implemented by countries and to identify the outcomes of these approaches which includes
10 barriers and facilitators.

11 **REVIEW OBJECTIVES**

12 The objectives of the review are to map the available evidence on the types of CE
13 approaches for 1) malaria prevention; 2) malaria control; and 3) malaria elimination; and 4)
14 describe the outcomes of the CE approaches.

16 **METHODS**

17 **Protocols and Registration**

18 During a preliminary search, a 2016 systematic review was found that focused on one
19 element of malaria prevention ([https://doi: 10.1186/s12936-016-1593-y](https://doi:10.1186/s12936-016-1593-y): Malaria Journal).²⁰
20 However, no scoping review on community engagement has been conducted to date
21 incorporating different approaches to all components of malaria prevention, control and
22 elimination across countries.

23 **Eligibility Criteria**

24 The review will only consider interventions studies published from 2000 onwards till the end
25 of March 2021, a period encompassing two important landmarks, the advent of the Millennium
26 Development Goals (2000-2014) and the Sustainable Development Goals (2015-2030).²¹

27 The evidence will be included if the sources are:

- 28 • Primary studies;
- 29 • Written in the English language;
- 30 • Using appropriate study designs and methods, including quantitative, qualitative and
31 mixed methods designs; and case, program or project reports;

- Providing information on CE approaches designed specifically for malaria prevention, control and/or elimination.

The evidence will be excluded if the sources are:

- Secondary studies including systematic reviews;
- Published in languages other than English;
- Providing information on CE approaches for diseases or health issues other than malaria;
- Providing anecdotal evidence without a description of the study design and methods.

Information Sources and Search

The search strategy involves searching the databases for peer-reviewed published literature focusing on CE activities conducted for malaria prevention, control or elimination. The search methodology will follow the updated Joanna Briggs Institute guide for scoping reviews in 2017,^{22, 23} which is based on the framework developed by Arksey and O'Malley²⁴ and further developed by Levac Colquhoun and O'Brien.²⁵ A scoping review is a valid process of synthesizing evidence on a given topic providing an excerpt of the volume of the literature or studies without seeking to analyse it.²⁶ Primarily an exploratory approach, scoping reviews can shed light on the types of evidence available, the way studies have been conducted and help identify and map the evidence that is available in the area of interest.^{26,27}

Databases including Proquest, Web of Science, and Medline (OVID) will be searched using key words: "community engagement" OR "community participation" OR "community involvement" OR "public engagement" OR "community mobilization" OR "social mobilization" OR "community action" OR "community empowerment" OR "community led" OR "community conversation" AND "prevention", "control", "elimination" AND "malaria" . Similarly, advanced Google search will be used to find grey literature including case, program or project reports using the same key words. The key words have been defined based on the objectives of the study. Initially the search will be limited to the article title and abstract for studies published between January 2000 and the current date. The search will be further streamlined by searching for citations from the reference lists of papers selected from the initial search. For papers not available online, the first author (K.R.A.) will contact the lead author of the publication via email requesting a copy of the paper for review.

Selection of Sources of Evidence

1
2
3
4 1 The title and the abstract obtained from the search results will be examined by two reviewers
5 2 after the initial search. In the first stage of the study selection, the title and abstract from
6 3 search results obtained by K.R.A will be examined by two reviewers (J.J., J.E.L.)
7 4 independent of one another. The selection of the final studies will be agreed upon by three
8 5 reviewers (K.R.A.; J.J.; J.E.L.). During the final selection process, any differences regarding
9 6 inclusion and exclusion of papers among the three reviewers will be discussed, and a fourth
10 7 reviewer (A.C.) will be called upon to reach consensus.
11
12
13
14
15

16 9 **Data Charting Process**

17
18 10 The data charting process will map the findings according to the attributes: author; date/year
19 11 of publication; country/ site; aim/ objectives; study population; sample size; study design;
20 12 phases; barriers; facilitators; outcomes. The charting will be done by K.R.A and will be
21 13 reviewed by two reviewers (J.J. and J.E.L.). Any disputes or differences will be resolved by
22 14 the fourth reviewer (A.C.).
23
24
25
26
27

28 16 **Presentation of the Results**

29 17 The PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA_ScR) will be used to present the
30 18 review methods and the results from the search.²⁸ The 22 items checklist for reporting
31 19 systematic reviews comprising of two optional items (critical appraisal of sources and
32 20 summary of the evidences) will be followed while presenting the results of the scoping
33 21 review. The items include eligibility criteria, the search approach, methods of selecting the
34 22 evidence and the data charting process. The search process and the evidence flow across
35 23 various stages of the study will be presented visually using an additional diagram.
36 24 Furthermore, the selected evidence based on the source, study characteristics and the
37 25 major findings (including the barriers, facilitators and outcomes) will be mapped and
38 26 presented in tabular form. The results will be synthesized in congruence with the scoping
39 27 review objectives and a narrative description will be presented. The main findings will be
40 28 synthesized to highlight the limitations and provide an analysis of CE approaches paving
41 29 way for future research opportunities.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 31 **Expected Results**

52
53 32 This scoping review aims to identify the available evidence, sources of information and
54 33 research gaps in the area of CE as one approach for malaria prevention, control and/or
55 34 elimination. The study will also increase the understanding of the existing barriers and
56 35 facilitators in implementing interventions using a CE approach along with the outcomes. The
57 36 results from this review will inform future practice and research in this area.
58
59
60

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

This study only aims to review the secondary sources and does not require human research ethics committee approval. Nonetheless being a component of a mixed methods study, human ethics approval has been obtained from Nepal Health Research Council (ERB 632/2020, Ref. No. 1287) and Curtin University's Human Research Ethics Committee number HRE2020-0701. The findings of the scoping review will be submitted to a peer reviewed journal for wider dissemination.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2019. Who Geneva 2019.
2. Panda S, Swaminathan S, Hyder KA, et al. Drug resistance in malaria, tuberculosis, and HIV in South East Asia: biology, programme, and policy considerations. *BMJ*. 2017;358:j3545.
3. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2018. WHO Geneva 2018.
4. World Health Organization. WHA68 2: Global technical strategy and targets for malaria 2016–2030. World Health Organization 2015.
5. Bhatt S, Weiss D, Cameron E, et al. The effect of malaria control on *Plasmodium falciparum* in Africa between 2000 and 2015. *Nature*. 2015;526(7572):207-11.
6. Control for Disease Control and Prevention. Principles of community engagement. CDC/ATSDR Committee on Community Engagement Atlanta, GA. 1997.
7. Epidemiology and Disease Control Division. Nepal Malaria Strategic Plan 2014-2025. Department of Health Services 2016.
8. World Health Organization. Global technical strategy and targets for malaria 2016–2030. WHO Geneva 2015.
9. Adhikari B, Pell C, Phommasone K, et al. Elements of effective community engagement: lessons from a targeted malaria elimination study in Lao PDR (Laos). *Global health action*. 2017;10(1):1366136.
10. Kajeewiwa L, Thwin MM, Nosten S, et al. Community engagement for the rapid elimination of malaria: the case of Kayin State, Myanmar. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2017;2:59.
11. Lim R, Tripura R, Peto TJ, et al. Drama as a community engagement strategy for malaria in rural Cambodia. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2017;2:95.

- 1
2
3
4 1 12. Gordon A, Vander Meulen RJ, et al. The 2019 Isdell: Flowers Cross Border Malaria
5 2 Initiative Round Table: community engagement in the context of malaria elimination. *Malar J.*
6 3 2019;18:432.
7
8 4 13. Wallerstein N, Minkler M, Carter-Edwards L, et al. Improving health through
9 5 community engagement, community organization, and community building. *Health behavior:*
10 6 *theory, research and practice.* 2015;5.
11
12 7 14. O'Mara-Eves, A., G. Brunton, S. Oliver, J. Kavanagh, F. Jamal and J. Thomas
13 8 (2015). "The effectiveness of community engagement in public health interventions for
14 9 disadvantaged groups: a meta-analysis." *BMC public health* **15**(1): 1-23.
15
16 10 15. Cyril S, Smith BJ, Possamai-Inesedy A, et al. Exploring the role of community
17 11 engagement in improving the health of disadvantaged populations: a systematic review.
18 12 *Global health action.* 2015;8(1):29842.
19
20 13 16. Kaunda-Khangamwa, B. N., H. Van Den Berg, R. S. McCann, A. Kabaghe, W.
21 14 Takken, K. Phiri, M. Van Vugt and L. Manda-Taylor (2019). "The role of health animators in
22 15 malaria control: a qualitative study of the health animator (HA) approach within the Majete
23 16 malaria project (MMP) in Chikwawa District, Malawi." *BMC Health services research* **19**(1):
24 17 1-16.
25
26 18 17. Alegbeleye, A., J. Dada, O. Oresanya, J. Jiya, H. Counihan, P. Gimba, L. Ozor and
27 19 K. Maxwell (2019). "Community engagement and mobilisation of local resources to support
28 20 integrated Community Case Management of childhood illnesses in Niger State, Nigeria."
29 21 *Journal of global health* **9**(1).
30
31 22 18. Bekolo, C. E. and T. D. A. Williams (2019). "Adding proactive and reactive case
32 23 detection into the integrated community case management system to optimise diagnosis and
33 24 treatment of malaria in a high transmission setting of Cameroon: an observational quality
34 25 improvement study." *BMJ open* **9**(6): e026678.
35
36 26 19. Cox, S. N., K. E. Guidera, M. J. Simon, B. A. S. Nonyane, W. Brieger, M. S.
37 27 Bornman and P. S. Kruger (2018). "Interactive malaria education intervention and its effect
38 28 on community participant knowledge: the malaria awareness program in Vhembe district,
39 29 Limpopo, South Africa." *International quarterly of community health education* **38**(2): 147-
40 30 158.
41
42 31 20. Adhikari B, James N, Newby G, et al. Community engagement and population
43 32 coverage in mass anti-malarial administrations: a systematic literature review. *Malar J.*
44 33 2016;15(1):523.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 1 21. Sachs JD. From millennium development goals to sustainable development goals.
5 2 *The Lancet*. 2012;379(9832):2206-11.
6
7 3 22. Peters M, Godfrey C, McInerney P, et al. Methodology for JBI scoping reviews. The
8 4 Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers manual 2017: The Joanna Briggs Institute; 2017. p. 3-24.
9
10 5 23. Peters MD, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, et al. Guidance for conducting systematic scoping
11 6 reviews. *International journal of evidence-based healthcare*. 2015;13(3):141-146.
12
13 7 24. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework.
14 8 *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32.
15
16 9 25. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology.
17 10 *Implementation Science*. 2010;5:69.
18
19 11 26. Munn Z, Peters MDJ, Stern C, et al. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance
20 12 for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Med*
21 13 *Res Methodol*. 2018;18(1):1-7.
22
23 14 27. Pham MT, Rajić A, Greig JD, et al. A scoping review of scoping reviews: advancing
24 15 the approach and enhancing the consistency. *Res Synth Methods*. 2014;5(4):371-85.
25
26 16 28. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-
27 17 ScR): checklist and explanation. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2018;169(7):467-73.
28
29
30
31
32

19 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

20 The authors would like to acknowledge the input of Vanessa Varis, Health Sciences
21 reference librarian for her support in the designing the initial search strategy.
22

23 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

24 KRA conceptualized the topic and wrote the original draft. JL, AC and JJ supervised the
25 writing process and were involved in review and editing of the manuscript.
26

27 FUNDING

28 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial
29 or not for profit sectors.
30

31 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

32 The authors declare no conflict of interest.
33

34 ORCID ID

35 Kiran Raj Awasthi <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6448-7696>
36

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 (Word count: 2,112)

2

3

4

For peer review only

Proposed Search Strategy

MEDLINE

- 1 Community Participation/ or Community-Based Participatory Research/ or Community-institutional relations/ or Community networks/
- 2 (communit* adj3 (engage* or conversation* or action* or consult* or dialog*)).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
- 3 (communit* adj3 (particip* or involve* or empower* or collab* or le?d*)).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
- 4 ((communit* or soci* or public*) adj mobili*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
- 5 1 or 2 or 3 or 4
- 6 exp Malaria/
- 7 (malaria adj3 (prevent* or control* or eliminat* or erad*)).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
- 8 6 or 7
- 9 5 and 8
- 10 limit 9 to (english language and yr="2000 -Current")

WEB OF SCIENCE (topic search)

- 1 (communit* NEAR/3 (engage* or conversation* or action* or consult* or dialog*))
- 2 (communit* NEAR/3 (particip* or involve* or empower* or collab* or led* or lead*))
- 3 ((communit* or soci* or public*) NEAR mobili*)
- 4 1 or 2 or 3
- 5 (malaria NEAR/3 (prevent* or control* or eliminat* or erad*))
- 6 4 and 5
- 7 limit 6 to English language and timespan=2000 -2021

PROQUEST (anywhere except full text NOFT)

- 1 (communit* NEAR/3 (engage* or conversation* or action* or consult* or dialog*))
- 2 (communit* NEAR/3 (particip* or involve* or empower* or collab* or le?d*))
- 3 ((communit* or soci* or public*) NEAR mobili*)
- 4 1 or 2 or 3
- 5 (malaria NEAR/3 (prevent* or control* or eliminat* or erad*))
- 6 4 and 5
- 7 limit 6 to English language and Date=2000 -Current
- 8 limit 7 to Scholarly Journals OR Peer Reviewed

Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	2
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	3
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	3
Information sources*	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	3
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	3-4
Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	4
Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	4
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	4
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	4
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	4



SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	

JB1 = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

* Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

† A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI guidance (4, 5) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

§ The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

From: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;169:467–473. doi: [10.7326/M18-0850](https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850).



St. Michael's
Inspired Care.
Inspiring Science.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Community Engagement Approaches for Malaria Prevention, Control and Elimination: A Scoping Review Protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-049812.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Sep-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Awasthi, Kiran Raj; Curtin University - Perth Bentley Campus, Curtin School of Population Health Jancey, Jonine; Curtin University - Perth Bentley Campus, Curtin School of Population Health Clements, Archie ; Curtin University - Perth Bentley Campus, Curtin School of Population Health Leavy, Justine ; Curtin University - Perth Bentley Campus, Curtin School of Population Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Infectious diseases
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Global health, Infectious diseases, Public health
Keywords:	Public health < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Tropical medicine < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, PUBLIC HEALTH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Epidemiology < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Epidemiology < TROPICAL MEDICINE

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

1
2
3
4 1 **Title: Community Engagement Approaches for Malaria Prevention, Control and Elimination:**
5 2 **A Scoping Review Protocol**
6

7
8 3 Kiran Raj Awasthi ^{1,*}, Jonine Jancey ¹, Archie Clements ¹, Justine E. Leavy ¹
9

10 4 ¹ Faculty of Health Sciences, Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth, WA 6845, Australia
11

12 5 *Correspondence: kiran.awasthi@curtin.edu.au; Tel.: +61-424906590
13

14 6 **ORCID ID:** Kiran Raj Awasthi <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6448-7696>
15
16 7

17
18 8 **Key words:** community engagement; community participation; malaria; prevention; control;
19 9 elimination
20
21

22
23 10 (Word count: 2,200)
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

**Title: Community Engagement Approaches for Malaria Prevention, Control and Elimination:
A Scoping Review Protocol**

Kiran Raj Awasthi ^{1,*}, Jonine Jancey ¹, Archie Clements ¹, Justine E. Leavy ¹

¹ School of Public Health, Curtin University, GPO Box U1987, Perth, WA 6845, Australia

*Correspondence: kiran.awasthi@curtin.edu.au; Tel.: +61-424906590

Abstract: Community engagement (CE) is important for malaria prevention, control, and ultimately elimination. As the decline of malaria has plateaued over the last five years, strengthening CE approaches will be necessary to enhance health promotion practice and policy to drive malaria transmission down further. Countries have adopted a wide range of public health intervention approaches for malaria prevention and control that best suit their context. This review will examine the existing evidence on the various CE approaches adopted by malaria programs across the world and their outcomes.

Methodology and Analysis: The review methodology will follow the updated Joanna Briggs Institute guide for scoping review, 2017, which is based on the framework developed by Arksey and O'Malley and further developed by Levac Colquhoun and O'Brien. Proquest, Web of Knowledge, and Medline will be searched for publications from January 2000 to 31st March 2021 while Google search engine will be used to find any grey literature. The eligibility criteria will be as follows: review will include primary studies written in the English language using appropriate study designs and methods, including quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods designs; and case, program or project reports. Information on CE approaches designed specifically for malaria prevention, control, elimination and their outcomes will be explored. Subheadings and free text terms for "community engagement" and "malaria" will

1 be used for the search. The article screening and data extraction will be examined by two
2 reviewers after the initial search and any disputes will be resolved by a third reviewer
3 through discussion. The PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA_ScR) guide will
4 be used to present the review methods and the results from the search. The scoping review
5 results will identify and map the available evidences, sources of information and research
6 gaps in the area of CE as one approach for malaria prevention, control and/or elimination.

7 **Ethics and Dissemination:** This study only aims to review secondary sources and does not
8 require human research ethics committee approval. The findings of the scoping review will
9 be submitted to a peer reviewed journal for wider dissemination.

10 This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons
11 Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute,
12 remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on

13 **Strengths and limitations of the study**

- 14 • To our knowledge, this is the first scoping review to be undertaken on CE approaches
15 for malaria prevention, control and elimination.
- 16 • The University Health Science reference librarian will assist in developing a search
17 strategy for the scoping review, a strength of the study.
- 18 • The review will include peer reviewed published primary sources in English, therefore
19 publications in languages other than English, unpublished articles, and multi-country
20 studies will be excluded. a limitation of this study.

21 **INTRODUCTION**

22 **INTRODUCTION**

23 Malaria, a vector borne disease, remains a major public health challenge contributing to an
24 estimated 228 million cases and 400,000 deaths annually worldwide.¹ Globally, between 2010
25 and 2014, there was a 70 % decrease in malaria incidence, however, in the last five years the
26 progress towards further reduction has been relatively static.² The earlier decrease in cases
27 was attributed to scaling up of routine interventions such as free distribution of long-lasting
28 insecticidal nets (LLINs) or insecticide treated nets (ITNs), periodic indoor residual spraying
29 (IRS), prompt treatment of diagnosed cases, and use of Artemisinin based Combination
30 Therapy (ACT) for the treatment of *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria.^{1,3-5} Whilst some countries
focus their strategies on malaria prevention by enabling and promoting use of LLINs/ IRS/

1 larvicides and chemoprophylaxis alongside malaria control programs that target a reduction in
2 the disease burden to a level where it is no longer a public health concern; countries with fewer
3 malaria cases aim for elimination to ensure sustained zero local transmission of malaria in the
4 population within a set geographic boundary through a strengthened surveillance system.¹

5 Community engagement (CE) is defined as “a process of working collaboratively with groups
6 of people who are affiliated by geographic proximity, special interests, or similar situations,
7 with respect to issues affecting their wellbeing” (p9).⁶ CE has been adopted especially by
8 Lower and Middle Income Countries (LMICs) in a quest to reach elimination of malaria by
9 2030, consistent with the World Health Organization Global Malaria Strategy 2016–2030.^{7,8}
10 CE has been used to co-design public health interventions and approaches for prevention and
11 control of malaria in a variety of countries in a range of national programs, such as: mass drug
12 administration for malaria prevention in Myanmar and Laos;^{9,10} increasing the use of LLINs
13 and promoting early testing and treatment in Cambodia and Kenya;¹¹ and improving access
14 to diagnosis and treatment in communities in Zambia.¹² A variety of activities have been
15 implemented for malaria prevention, control, and elimination based on CE. These include
16 formation of community leadership groups comprising local decision-makers, elderly and
17 youth; drama campaigns and health education programs conducted in local languages and
18 delivered in schools and churches; house-to-house visits by community health volunteers to
19 improve early detection and timely treatment in rural areas with high levels of migration; and
20 participatory action malaria research led by the community.⁹⁻¹²

21 Health interventionists’ use CE to harness communities in health promotion practice, research
22 and policy related decision making to advance knowledge and support behavioural and
23 environmental change to improve health outcomes.¹³ Public health interventions can
24 incorporate CE in different forms: providing information; consulting; joint decision-making;
25 acting collaboratively; and supporting the community interests independently.¹⁴ CE can be
26 effective in dealing with health inequalities especially among disadvantaged groups who are
27 challenged by structural, geographical, cultural, financial and language barriers.¹⁵
28 Internationally a range of CE approaches that best suit the context and the target community
29 have been used to raise awareness of malaria prevention, and enable year-round round
30 access to free testing and treatment in rural hard-to-reach populations, whilst developing local
31 level ownership. For example in Malawi the community based health animators (volunteers
32 who conduct peer education in Malawi) have been used by the national malaria program as
33 peer influencers to improve awareness and promote positive behaviour change in the
34 community¹⁶. In Nigeria integrated community case management has been used to detect
35 and treat malaria cases in remote areas using trained local community health workers,

1
2
3
4 1 minimizing travel time and the cost for patients¹⁷. Similarly, in Cameroon and Cambodia local
5
6 2 volunteers and village malaria workers have been used to conduct proactive and reactive case
7
8 3 detection in communities to prevent transmission^{11,18}, whilst the Interactive Malaria Awareness
9
10 4 Program (MAP) in South Africa have successfully used home-based care workers to form
11
12 5 local level partnerships and to also educate communities on malaria prevention and control¹⁹.
13
14 6 All these different CE approaches have contributed to improved awareness, early detection of
15
16 7 cases and improved access and wider community acceptance of malaria prevention and
17
18 8 treatment in the afore mentioned countries.¹⁶⁻¹⁹

19
20 9 This paper describes the protocol for a scoping review that aims to describe CE approaches
21
22 10 targeting the prevention, control or elimination of malaria that have been/ or are being
23
24 11 implemented by countries.

25 12 REVIEW OBJECTIVES

26
27 13 The objectives of the review are to map the available evidence on the types of CE
28
29 14 approaches for 1) malaria prevention; 2) malaria control; and 3) malaria elimination; and 4)
30
31 15 describe the outcomes of the CE approaches.

32 16 METHODS

33 17 Protocols and Registration

34
35 18 During a preliminary search, a 2016 systematic review was found that focused on one
36
37 19 element of malaria prevention ([https://doi: 10.1186/s12936-016-1593-y](https://doi:10.1186/s12936-016-1593-y): Malaria Journal).²⁰
38
39 20 However, no scoping review on CE has been conducted to date that incorporates different
40
41 21 approaches to all components of malaria prevention, control and elimination across
42
43 22 countries.

44 23 Patient and Public Involvement

45
46 24 No patient Involved
47
48 25

49 26 Eligibility Criteria

50
51 27 The review will only consider interventions studies published from 2000 onwards till the end
52
53 28 of March 2021, a period encompassing two important landmarks, the advent of the Millennium
54
55 29 Development Goals (2000-2014) and the Sustainable Development Goals (2015-2030).²¹

56
57 30 The evidence will be included if the sources are:

- 58 31 • Primary studies;
- 59
60 32 • Written in the English language;

- 1 • Using appropriate study designs and methods, including quantitative, qualitative and
- 2 mixed methods designs; and case, program or project reports;
- 3 • Providing information on CE approaches designed specifically for malaria prevention,
- 4 control and/or elimination.

5
6 The evidence will be excluded if the sources are:

- 7 • Secondary studies including systematic reviews;
- 8 • Published in languages other than English;
- 9 • Providing information on CE approaches for diseases or health issues other than
- 10 malaria;
- 11 • Multi-country studies will be excluded;
- 12 • Providing anecdotal evidence without a description of the study design and methods.

13 14 **Information Sources and Search**

15
16 The search strategy will involve searching the databases for peer-reviewed published
17 literature focusing on CE approaches conducted for malaria prevention, control or
18 elimination. The search methodology will follow the updated Joanna Briggs Institute guide for
19 scoping reviews in 2017,^{22, 23} which is based on the framework developed by Arksey and
20 O'Malley²⁴ and further developed by Levac Colquhoun and O'Brien.²⁵ A scoping review is a
21 valid process of synthesizing evidence on a given topic, providing an excerpt of the volume
22 of the literature or studies without seeking to analyse it.²⁶ Primarily an exploratory approach,
23 scoping reviews can shed light on the types of evidence available, the way studies have
24 been conducted and help identify and map the evidence that is available in the area of
25 interest.^{26,27}

26 Databases including Proquest, Web of Science, and Medline (OVID) will be searched using
27 key words: "community engagement" OR "community participation" OR "community
28 involvement" OR "public engagement" OR "community mobilization" OR "social
29 mobilization" OR "community action" OR "community empowerment" OR "community led"
30 OR "community conversation" AND "prevention", "control", "elimination" AND "malaria" .
31 Similarly, advanced Google search will be used to identify grey literature including case,
32 program or project reports using the same key words. The key words have been defined
33 based on the objectives of the study. Initially the search will be limited to the article title and
34 abstract for studies published between January 2000 and March 31 2021. The search will be
35 further streamlined by searching for citations from the reference lists of papers selected from

1 the initial search. For papers not available online, the first author (K.R.A.) will contact the
2 lead author of the publication via email requesting a copy of the paper to review.

4 **Selection of Sources of Evidence**

5 The title and the abstract obtained from the search results will be examined by two reviewers
6 after the initial search. In the first stage of the study selection, two reviewers (J.J., J.E.L.)
7 independent of one another will examine the title and abstract from search results obtained
8 by K.R.A. The selection of the final studies will be agreed upon by three reviewers (K.R.A.;
9 J.J.; J.E.L.). During the final selection process, any differences regarding inclusion and
10 exclusion of papers among the three reviewers will be discussed, and a fourth reviewer
11 (A.C.) will be called upon to reach consensus.

13 **Data Charting Process**

14 The data charting process will map the findings according to the attributes: author; date/year
15 of publication; country/ site; aim/ objectives; study population; sample size; study design;
16 phases (prevention, control, elimination); and outcomes. The charting will be undertaken by
17 K.R.A and will be reviewed by two reviewers (J.J. and J.E.L.). Any disputes or differences
18 will be resolved by the fourth reviewer (A.C.).

20 **Presentation of the Results**

21 The PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA_ScR) will be used to present the
22 review methods and the search results.²⁸ The 22 items checklist for reporting systematic
23 reviews comprising two optional items (critical appraisal of sources and summary of the
24 evidences) will be followed. The items include eligibility criteria, the search approach,
25 methods of selecting the evidence and the data charting process. The search process and
26 the evidence flow across various stages of the study will be presented visually using an
27 additional diagram. Furthermore, the selected evidence based on the source, study
28 characteristics and the major findings will be mapped and presented in tabular form. The
29 results will be synthesized in congruence with the scoping review objectives and a narrative
30 description will be presented. The main findings will be synthesized to highlight the
31 limitations and provide an analysis of CE approaches paving the way for future research
32 opportunities.

35 **Expected Results**

1
2
3
4 1 This scoping review aims to identify the available evidence, sources of information and
5 2 research gaps in the area of CE as one approach for malaria prevention, control and/or
6 3 elimination. The results from this review will inform future practice and research in this area.
7
8
9 4

5 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

11 6 This study only aims to review the secondary sources and does not require human research
12 7 ethics committee approval. Nonetheless being a component of a mixed methods study,
13 8 human ethics approval has been obtained from Nepal Health Research Council (ERB
14 9 632/2020, Ref. No. 1287) and Curtin University's Human Research Ethics Committee
15 10 number HRE2020-0701. The findings of the scoping review will be submitted to a peer
16 11 reviewed journal for wider dissemination.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

14 **REFERENCES**

- 25
26
27 16 1. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2019. Who Geneva 2019.
28 17 2. Panda S, Swaminathan S, Hyder KA, et al. Drug resistance in malaria, tuberculosis,
29 18 and HIV in South East Asia: biology, programme, and policy considerations. *BMJ*.
30 19 2017;358:j3545.
31
32 20 3. World Health Organization. World malaria report 2018. WHO Geneva 2018.
33 21 4. World Health Organization. WHA68 2: Global technical strategy and targets for
34 22 malaria 2016–2030. World Health Organization 2015.
35 23 5. Bhatt S, Weiss D, Cameron E, et al. The effect of malaria control on Plasmodium
36 24 falciparum in Africa between 2000 and 2015. *Nature*. 2015;526(7572):207-11.
37 25 6. Control for Disease Control and Prevention. Principles of community engagement.
38 26 CDC/ATSDR Committee on Community Engagement Atlanta, GA. 1997.
39 27 7. Epidemiology and Disease Control Division. Nepal Malaria Strategic Plan 2014-2025.
40 28 Department of Health Services 2016.
41 29 8. World Health Organization. Global technical strategy and targets for malaria 2016–
42 30 2030. WHO Geneva 2015.
43 31 9. Adhikari B, Pell C, Phommasone K, et al. Elements of effective community
44 32 engagement: lessons from a targeted malaria elimination study in Lao PDR (Laos). *Global*
45 33 *health action*. 2017;10(1):1366136.
46 34 10. Kajechiwa L, Thwin MM, Nosten S, et al. Community engagement for the rapid
47 35 elimination of malaria: the case of Kayin State, Myanmar. *Wellcome Open Res*. 2017;2:59.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 1 11. Lim R, Tripura R, Peto TJ, et al. Drama as a community engagement strategy for
5 2 malaria in rural Cambodia. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2017;2:95.
6
7 3 12. Gordon A, Vander Meulen RJ, et al. The 2019 Isdell: Flowers Cross Border Malaria
8 4 Initiative Round Table: community engagement in the context of malaria elimination. *Malar J.*
9 5 2019;18:432.
10
11 6 13. Wallerstein N, Minkler M, Carter-Edwards L, et al. Improving health through
12 7 community engagement, community organization, and community building. *Health behavior:*
13 8 *theory, research and practice.* 2015;5.
14
15 9 14. O'Mara-Eves, A., G. Brunton, S. Oliver, J. Kavanagh, F. Jamal and J. Thomas
16 10 (2015). "The effectiveness of community engagement in public health interventions for
17 11 disadvantaged groups: a meta-analysis." *BMC public health* 15(1): 1-23.
18
19 12 15. Cyril S, Smith BJ, Possamai-Inesedy A, et al. Exploring the role of community
20 13 engagement in improving the health of disadvantaged populations: a systematic review.
21 14 *Global health action.* 2015;8(1):29842.
22
23 15 16. Kaunda-Khangamwa, B. N., H. Van Den Berg, R. S. McCann, A. Kabaghe, W.
24 16 Takken, K. Phiri, M. Van Vugt and L. Manda-Taylor (2019). "The role of health animators in
25 17 malaria control: a qualitative study of the health animator (HA) approach within the Majete
26 18 malaria project (MMP) in Chikwawa District, Malawi." *BMC Health services research* 19(1):
27 19 1-16.
28
29 17. Alegbeleye, A., J. Dada, O. Oresanya, J. Jiya, H. Counihan, P. Gimba, L. Ozor and
30 20 K. Maxwell (2019). "Community engagement and mobilisation of local resources to support
31 21 integrated Community Case Management of childhood illnesses in Niger State, Nigeria."
32 22 *Journal of global health* 9(1).
33
34 23 18. Bekolo, C. E. and T. D. A. Williams (2019). "Adding proactive and reactive case
35 24 detection into the integrated community case management system to optimise diagnosis and
36 25 treatment of malaria in a high transmission setting of Cameroon: an observational quality
37 26 improvement study." *BMJ open* 9(6): e026678.
38
39 27 19. Cox, S. N., K. E. Guidera, M. J. Simon, B. A. S. Nonyane, W. Brieger, M. S.
40 28 Bornman and P. S. Kruger (2018). "Interactive malaria education intervention and its effect
41 29 on community participant knowledge: the malaria awareness program in Vhembe district,
42 30 Limpopo, South Africa." *International quarterly of community health education* 38(2): 147-
43 31 158.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 1 20. Adhikari B, James N, Newby G, et al. Community engagement and population
5 2 coverage in mass anti-malarial administrations: a systematic literature review. *Malar J*.
6 3 2016;15(1):523.
7
8 4 21. Sachs JD. From millennium development goals to sustainable development goals.
9 5 *The Lancet*. 2012;379(9832):2206-11.
10 6 22. Peters M, Godfrey C, Mclnerney P, et al. Methodology for JBI scoping reviews. The
11 7 Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers manual 2017: The Joanna Briggs Institute; 2017. p. 3-24.
12 8 23. Peters MD, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, et al. Guidance for conducting systematic scoping
13 9 reviews. *International journal of evidence-based healthcare*. 2015;13(3):141-146.
14 10 24. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework.
15 11 *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2005;8(1):19-32.
16 12 25. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology.
17 13 *Implementation Science*. 2010;5:69.
18 14 26. Munn Z, Peters MDJ, Stern C, et al. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance
19 15 for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Med*
20 16 *Res Methodol*. 2018;18(1):1-7.
21 17 27. Pham MT, Rajić A, Greig JD, et al. A scoping review of scoping reviews: advancing
22 18 the approach and enhancing the consistency. *Res Synth Methods*. 2014;5(4):371-85.
23 19 28. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-
24 20 ScR): checklist and explanation. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2018;169(7):467-73.

21

22 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

23 The authors would like to acknowledge the input of Vanessa Varis, Health Sciences
24 reference librarian for her support in the designing the initial search strategy.

25

26 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

27 KRA conceptualized the topic and wrote the original draft. JL, AC and JJ supervised the
28 writing process and were involved in review and editing of the manuscript.

29

30 FUNDING

31 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial
32 or not for profit sectors.

33

34 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

35 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

36

1
2
3 1 **ORCID ID**

4 2 Kiran Raj Awasthi <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6448-7696>

6 3

8 4 (Word count: 2,200)

10 5

12 6

14 7

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	2
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	3
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	3
Information sources*	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	3
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	3-4
Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	4
Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	4
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	4
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	4
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	4



SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	

JB1 = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

* Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

† A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI guidance (4, 5) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

§ The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

From: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169:467–473. doi: [10.7326/M18-0850](https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850).



St. Michael's
Inspired Care.
Inspiring Science.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only