Appendix S1. Continuum of Care Card

Continuum of Care Card Health facility & ANC No.:							
CoC SERVICES Name:							
ANC1 by 16 weeks (by 4 m onths) Date at 16 weeks	ANC2 24-28 weeks (6-7 months) Date at 28 weeks	ANC3 at32 weeks (at8 m onths) Date at32 weeks	ANC4 at 36 weeks (at 9 m onths) Date at 36 weeks	Skilled de livery Facility de livery	PNC1 by 48hours (by 2 days) Date at2 days	PNC2 at7 days Date at7 days	PNC3 at6 weeks
Date ofactualvisit	Date of actual visit	Date of actual visit	Date of actual visit	date Date ofactual visit	Date of actual visit	Date of actual visit	Date of actual visit
Mother	M other	M other	M other	D e livery	M other	M other	M other
ESSENTIAL	SERVICES		B bod test2	1			
	(Hb1) Malara Drug T PT1) nus Toxo E h on 4	Malaria Drug 2 (PT2) oxo id	(Hb 2) Malaria Drug 3 (PT3)	1	D	ĺ	e
Blood group Rhesus factor	DUCATION						
Item s for	Transportation	C aregiver	Call care provider after de livery		Early initiate, Exclusive Breastfeeding	Fam ily planning	
DANGER S	IGNS If Yes	s, see the det	ail record		i' '\	i' '\	
ANC1	ANC2	ANC3	ANC4	D e livery	PNC1	PNC2	PNC3
Mother YES NO	Mother YES NO	Mother YES NO	Mother YES NO	M other YES NO	M other YES NO	Mother YES NO	Mother YES NO
Year Halib- Our Consern	JICA	ONBRACE	M O. C. D. C.	Baby YES NO Contact nur	Baby YES NO mber of Health	Baby YES NO care provider	Baby YES NO
CUT HERE BY HE	ATH CARE PROVID	ER AT 6 WEEK AFT	ER DELIVERY				
ANC1	ANC2	ANC3	ANC4	D e livery	PNC1	PNC2	PNC3
☆	*	☆	☆	☆	☆	*	☆
Health faciltiy &	ANC numberr	☆ Name	☆	☆	☆ ☆ ☆	☆ ☆ ☆	☆ ☆
					A	A	A

Appendix S2. RE-AIM Framework Criteria and Assessment

after final treatment contact

26.

Measure of primary outcome at >=6 months

Appen	Appendix S2. RE-AIM Framework Criteria and Assessment					
	Criterion	Assessment				
Reach 1.	Exclusion criteria (% excluded or characteristics)	Women were excluded if they refused to participate, declined to be				
2.	Percentage of individuals who participated, based on valid denominator	interviewed, or had moved out of the target sites. Percentage of women who received the intervention components in the intervention and control areas were: CoC card: 72.8% vs. 21.6%. Percentage of women who had stayed at a facility for at least 24 hours postpartum (44.5% vs. 53.7%), and the percentage of women who had received home-visit PNC within 48 hours (2.9% vs. 14.0%), increased between the pre- and post-intervention periods.				
3.	Characteristics of participants compared with nonparticipants	Most of the sociodemographic characteristics of participants did not differ significantly between the intervention and control groups. However, the wealth quintiles and travel time to health facilities were differed.				
4.	Use of qualitative methods to understand recruitment	Summarized in the intervention procedure report.				
Effective						
5.	Measure of primary outcome	Continuum of care completion rate: increased from 7.5% to 52.9% in the intervention area and from 9.2% to 39.7% in the control area. Relative risk of neonatal complication immediately after birth and at 6 weeks after birth were 0.82 (0.68-0.99) and 085 (0.72-0.99), respectively.				
6.	Measure of primary outcome relative to public health goal	No national data was available regarding the rate of continuum of care completion and neonatal complication. Coverage rates of antenatal care 4 times or above and delivery by skilled birth attendants were 76.9% and 82.0% respectively after intervention. Antenatal care rate was lower than the national survey, 87.3% in 2014 [1]. The skilled birth attendance rate was higher than the national survey, 55.3% in 2013 [2].				
7.	Measure of broader outcomes or use of multiple criteria (e.g. quality of life or potential negative outcome)	Multiple outcomes assessed, but quality of life. No evidence of negative outcomes.				
8.	Measure of robustness across subgroups (e.g. moderation analysis)	Difference in outcomes between intervention sites.				
9. 10.	Measure of short-term attrition (%) and differential rates by treatment group Use of qualitative methods to understand outcomes	Rate differential between intervention sites. Summarized in effectiveness evaluation report.				
Adoption	n					
Adoj	otion: setting level					
11. 12.	Setting exclusion (% or reasons or both) Percentage of settings approached that participated	6% of facility did not participated to intervention due to lack of health personnel. No refusals of 66 approached.				
13.	(valid denominator) Characteristics of settings participating (both	Summarized in study setting and appendix 1 including population,				
14.	comparison and intervention compared with either nonparticipants or some relevant resource data) Use of qualitative methods to understand setting level adoption	maternal demographic information, and regional characteristics. Summarized in adoption evaluation report.				
	•					
Adoj 15. 16.	otion: staff level Staff exclusions (% or reasons or both) Percent of staff offered that participate	None excluded. All maternal health related staff participated including midwives and nurses.				
17.	Characteristics of staff participants v nonparticipating staff or typical staff	No comparison has been done because all staff participated.				
18.	Use of qualitative methods to understand staff participation or staff level adoption	Summarized in adoption evaluation report.				
Impleme						
19.	Percent of perfect delivery or calls completed (e.g. fidelity)	Summarized in Table 2.				
20.	Adaptations made to intervention during study (not fidelity)	Summarized in appendix 4. Challenges were identified at the first month of the intervention and relevant measures were taken.				
21.	Cost of intervention: money	Two follow-up training for personnel change.				
22. 23.	Cost of intervention: money Consistency of implementation across staff, time,	Change for damaged materials and consumables: low cost Routines specified, monitored, and fed back in quality improvement				
24.	settings, subgroups Use of qualitative methods to understand	cycle. Summarized in implementation evaluation report.				
M	implementation					
Mainten Mair	ance ntenance: individual					
25.	Measure or primary outcome (with comparison with a public health goal) at >=6 months follow-up after final treatment contact	No available data regarding >=6 months follow-up after final treatment contact.				

Continued collection of demographic and health surveillance of each

	follow-up after final treatment contact	study site.
27.	Measure of broader outcome (e.g. measure of quality of life or potential negative outcome) or use of multiple criteria at follow-up	Continued collection of demographic and health surveillance of each study site.
28.	Robustness data: something about subgroup effects over the long-term	Continued collection of demographic and health surveillance of each study site.
29.	Measure of long-term attrition (%) and differential rates by patient characteristics or treatment condition	Continued collection of demographic and health surveillance of each study site.
30.	Use of qualitative methods data to understand long-term effects	Continued collection of demographic and health surveillance of each study site.
Main	tenance: setting	
31.	If program is still ongoing at>=6 months post-treatment follow-up	The intervention was piloted for 6 months in another regions of Ghana: Ashanti, Upper West, and Central.
32.	If and how program was adopted long-term (which elements retained after program completion)	One part of the intervention (CoC card) was be adopted in the new Maternal and Child Health Record Book.
33.	Some measure or discussion of alignment to organization mission or sustainability of business model	Discussion of including CoC completion rate into one of the indicators of the demographic and health surveillance system.
34.	Use of qualitative methods data to understand setting level institutionalization	CoC card was institutionalized into the Maternal and Child Health Record Book.

^{1.} Ghana statistical service, Ghana health service, international. I. Ghana demographic and health survey 2014. MD USA: 2015.

 $^{2. \}quad Ministry \ of \ Health \ Ghana. \ Holistic \ assessment \ of \ the \ health \ sector \ programme \ of \ work \ 2013. \ Accra, \ Ghana: \ 2014.$

Appendix S3. Challenges identified at the first month of the intervention and relevant measures during continuous monthly monitoring.

Intervention type	Challenges to implementation	Relevant measure
Use of the CoC card (A-1)	 CoC cards were out of stock in health facilities. 	 The research team developed a job aid for a logistical communication system to avoid logistics problems.
	CHOs provided CoC cards twice to the same mother.CHOs did not provide CoCs to mothers	 Supervisors of the DHMT and SDHMT administered instructions to CHOs how to use the CoC card during supervision.
	due to some misunderstanding.CHOs did not fill CoC cards correctly.	
CoC reorientation for health workers (A-2)	 Knowledge and skill acquired during the orientation were not taken over to the incoming health workers. 	 The DHMT and the research team provided training to newly assigned health workers.
24-hour retention of women and newborns at a health facility after delivery (B-1)	 Mothers could not stay for 24 hours after delivery due to the renovation of the maternity ward. Mothers did not stay for 24 hours after 	 CHOs followed up postnatal care of mothers and babies with a home visit. Group message application of smartphone (Whatsapp[©]) was used to
	delivery due to lack of a bathroom.	send messages from health facility staff to the CHOs of the community to determine the follow-up postnatal care of the mother.
Postnatal care by home visits (B-2)	- CHOs had trouble riding motorbikes and were unable to visit mothers.	 The DHMT and SDHMT provided motorbike training to CHOs. CHOs asked volunteers to ride.

CoC: Continuum of Care, CHO: Community Health Officer, DHMT: District Health Management Team, SDHMT: Sub-District Health Management Team.