

The Use of Mobile Phones for the Prevention and Control of Arboviral Diseases: A Scoping Review

Maria Angelica Carrillo (✉ angelik1only@gmail.com)

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0876-289X>

Axel Kroeger

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

Rocio Cardenas Sanchez

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

Sonia Diaz Monsalve

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

Silvia Runge Ranzinger

Heidelberg University

Research article

Keywords: Mobile phone, mobile technology, mHealth, dengue, Zika, chikungunya

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-23817/v2>

License:   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: The rapid expansion of dengue, Zika and chikungunya with large scale outbreaks are an increasing public health concern in many countries. Additionally, the recent coronavirus pandemic urged the need to get connected for fast information transfer and exchange. As response, health programmes have -among other interventions- incorporated digital tools such as mobile phones for supporting the control and prevention of infectious diseases. However, little is known about the benefits of mobile phone technology in terms of input, process and outcome dimensions. The purpose of this scoping review is to analyse the evidence of the use of mobile phones as an intervention tool regarding the performance, acceptance, usability, feasibility, cost and effectiveness in dengue, Zika and chikungunya control programmes.

Methods: We conducted a scoping review of studies and reports by systematically searching: i) electronic databases (PubMed, PLOS ONE, PLOS Neglected Tropical Disease, LILACS, WHOLIS, ScienceDirect and Google scholar), ii) grey literature, using Google web and iii) documents in the list of references of the selected papers. Selected studies were categorized using a pre-determined data extraction form. Finally, a narrative summary of the evidence related to general characteristics of available mobile health tools and outcomes was produced.

Results: The systematic literature search identified 1289 records, 32 of which met the inclusion criteria and 4 records from the reference lists. A total of 36 studies were included coming from twenty different countries. Five mobile phone services were identified in this review: mobile applications ($n = 18$), short message services ($n=7$), camera phone ($n = 6$), mobile phone tracking data ($n = 4$), and simple mobile communication ($n = 1$). Mobile phones were used for surveillance, prevention, diagnosis, and communication demonstrating good performance, acceptance and usability by users, as well as feasibility of mobile phone under real life conditions and effectiveness in terms of contributing to a reduction of vectors/ disease and improving users-oriented behaviour changes. It can be concluded that there are great opportunities for using mobile phones in the fight against arboviral diseases as well as other epidemic diseases. Further studies particularly on acceptance, cost and effectiveness at scale are recommended.

Background

Emerging or re-emerging viral diseases such as the most recent coronavirus causing Covid-19 disease or arboviruses transmitted by Aedes mosquitoes causing diseases such as dengue, Zika, chikungunya and yellow fever, represent a significant public health threat in tropical and sub-tropical countries (Kraemer et al., 2019). The rapidly emerging arbovirus infections have reached global scale since the emergence of the chikungunya virus in 2014 and the Zika virus in 2015 in the Americas (PAHO/WHO, 2017). Furthermore, dengue continues to be the most prevalent arbovirus disease, with estimates of up to 400 million infections and around 20,000 deaths per year (WHO, 2018; Paixão et al., 2018). An indication of

this concern was the WHO declaring the increase of microcephaly and Guillain-Barré syndrome caused by Zika, a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (Gulland, 2016).

The transmission, epidemiology and clinical symptoms of dengue, Zika and chikungunya are similar, mainly during the acute phase (the first days of the disease; Paixão et al., 2018) which have produced challenges particularly in the surveillance of these diseases. *Aedes aegypti* (primary vector) and *Aedes albopictus* (secondary vector) transmitting the diseases are widely spread in tropical and subtropical areas (Patterson et al., 2016). Their high adaptability to urban communities favoured by numerous larval habitats (water containers; Araújo et al., 2015; Nilsson et al., 2018; Vannavong et al., 2017; Paul et al., 2018), the abundance of human hosts, climate change and socio-environmental drivers have contributed to the geographical expansion of vector populations (Weaver et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2009, Akter et al., 2017).

The key measure for preventing the transmission continues to be vector control since the first dengue vaccine (CYD-TDV, or Dengvaxia®) is still limited and several others are under development (WHO, 2016). However, vector control methods have often a limited success rate, not only because of increasing insecticide resistance where chemical methods are used (Nathan, 2013; Barrera, 2016;), but also because of the lack of community participation and the unsustainability of resource intensive vector control in some countries (Lin et al., 2016). The need to prevent the diseases has resulted in new technological innovations including the use of drones with cameras to identify breeding places, computing systems for monitoring and tracking high transmission areas, case tracking of index cases, software for epidemiological surveys and mobile devices for communication and networking (Boger and Low, 2016; Sood and Mahajan, 2017; Sareen et al., 2017; de Souza Silva et al., 2018). These tools may support the management, surveillance, prevention and control of arboviral and other outbreak-prone viral diseases.

One promising tool is the use of mobile phones to support vector control efforts (Bartumeus et al., 2018). These devices are widely used and continuously further developed for several health purposes (Kahn et al., 2010; Klasnja and Pratt, 2012; Kaindoa et al., 2017; Mildon and Sellen, 2019). Their use in the health sector is referred to as mobile health (m-health) which is accepted as a component of eHealth. This term has no a single definition, but according to the WHO, eHealth is the use of information and communication technologies for health (WHO, 2020). Likewise, a standardized definition of mHealth has not been established. However, mHealth, according to the WHO, is defined as a medical and public health practice supported by mobile devices, such as mobile phones, patient monitoring devices, personal digital assistants (PDAs), and other wireless devices (WHO, 2011).

The enormous boom of mobile phones around the world has led to the design of new models with integrated operating systems and other complex functionalities called “smartphones”. Most of these devices are equipped with sensors and modules such as an ambient light sensor, camera, microphone, digital compass, touch-sensitive screen, accelerometer, Bluetooth, Wi-Fi and Global Positioning System (GPS, among others) which has promoted various innovative mHealth applications (Labrique et al., 2013; Ventola, 2014). A variety of applications has aimed at supporting disease surveillance (Mtema et al.,

2016), promoting health education and behavioral change (Nilsson et al., 2017, Crane et al., 2015), supporting the diagnosis (Meyer et al., 2018) as well as improving the treatment and adherence to medication (Morrissey et al., 2018), among others. Apart from mobile apps, other mobile phone services (e.g. short message services, SMS) have contributed to improving patient compliance and as appointment reminders (Schwebel and Larimer, 2018). In low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), the use of the mobile technology has been an innovative solution to overcome health barriers such as challenging areas with difficult access, inadequate workforce and restricted financial resources (Folaranmi et al., 2014; Tomlinson et al., 2018).

Despite the potential benefits of mobile phones in health programmes, little is known about their contributions regarding the prevention and control of vector borne diseases, particularly dengue, Zika and chikungunya and no study to date has analysed and summarized the costs or effects in terms of acceptance and effectiveness. Most mobile phone-based studies have focused on other diseases (Cole-Lewis and Kershaw, 2010; Hoffman et al., 2010; Asiimwe et al., 2011; Hamine et al., 2015) and the few studies addressing arbovirus diseases that deployed mobile technology, have not included an analysis of the health outcomes (de Souza Silva et al., 2018; Culquichicón-Sánchez et al., 2015).

Therefore, this scoping review has been undertaken to analyse the use of mobile phones as an intervention tool for arbovirus disease programmes focussing on three arboviral diseases transmitted by *Aedes* mosquitoes: dengue, Zika and chikungunya. We aimed to identify countries where mobile phone-based studies have been conducted, the type of mobile phone services most frequently used, main purposes of the use of mobile phones as well as to analyse outputs and outcomes regarding performance, feasibility, costs, effectiveness and acceptability.

Methods

Scoping review

The scoping review was conducted based on Arksey and O'Malley's scoping review framework (Arksey and O'Malley; 2005; Tricco et al., 2018). Additional processual advice, particularly in the identification of relevant studies were used to enhance the selection process of publications (Moher et al., 2009). It has been shown that a scoping review is useful to summarize and disseminate research findings and identify research gaps in the existing literature (Arksey and O'Malley, 2005; Levac et al., 2010). As opposed to systematic reviews, scoping reviews can include a diversity of sources to map the existing literature in a field of interest in terms of the volume, nature, and characteristics of the primary research (Arksey and O'Malley, 2005). This allows researchers to gain a better overview on a broad topic which has not yet been extensively reviewed or is of complex or heterogeneous nature (Mays et al., 2001).

The review team consisted of five co-authors with multidisciplinary expertise in infectious diseases, engineering, epidemiology, knowledge of quantitative-qualitative research methods and research synthesis.

Review Question and Scope

This scoping review was conducted to answer the question “What is the current evidence of the use of mobile phones as an intervention tool for arboviral disease programmes (namely dengue, Zika and chikungunya) in terms of their acceptance, usability, performance, feasibility, cost and effectiveness?”.

Mobile phones are electronic devices used for mobile voice and/or data transmission over a wireless network (Turel and Serenko, 2010). A mobile phone is also called a cellular phone or cell phone, but when it is integrated with advanced features similar to a computer it is called a smartphone. This scoping review included mobile phone, smartphone and other mobile phone services such as mobile applications (mobile apps), short message service (SMS), call detail records (CDR) and other mobile phone sensors. Although there are mobile technology-based studies for different health purpose available, there were only a few studies with a high level of evidence, considering output and outcome dimensions. Therefore, this scoping review was particularly interested in providing information on the feasibility of application in the real world, cost, effectiveness and acceptance indicating whether the mobile technology has a realistic chance to be effective, affordable and socially accepted for fighting against arbovirus diseases. Some previous studies that assessed outcome dimensions on technology for health were identified to determine potential outcomes (Proctor et al., 2011; Osorio et al., 2018; Krick et al., 2019). However, modifications and considerations were developed based on included studies.

Search strategy

The search strategy was conducted through online databases (PubMed, PLOS ONE, PLOS Neglected Tropical Disease, LILACS, WHOLIS, ScienceDirect and Google scholar). Search terms were defined that described two categories: 1) mobile phone technology and 2) arboviral diseases (table 1). Each term was separately entered into the advanced search bar from the online database and then combinations were applied following the basic search structure “mobile phone-based terms” AND “arbovirus-based terms” (as appropriate). Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) were used to ensure an accurate search while this option was available in search command. For Google scholar search the terms “mobile phone” AND dengue Zika chikungunya arbovirus were used to collect a more precise information. A complementary search was performed on Google Web to identify relevant documents in the grey literature (academic reports, theses, and dissertations) which were considered to extend the possible small numbers of published articles in scientific journals. Google search was limited to the 100 most relevant hits. Additionally, the list of references of included articles were used to identify additional sources. Online databases and grey literature were reviewed from 2009 to 2019 in order to assess the most recent evidence of this technological tool. The search was updated on January 12, 2020.

Table 1 Search keywords

Category	Keywords
Mobile phone technology	Mobile phone, cellular phone, cell phone, smartphone, mHealth, mobile device, mobile application, SMS, text messaging
Arboviral diseases	Zika, dengue, chikungunya, arbovirus
Time frame	2009-2019

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria were mobile phone studies focusing on 1) dengue, Zika and chikungunya and 2) reporting at least one health outcome relating to costs, effectiveness, acceptability and performance. The review was based on scientific articles using different methodologies (intervention studies, observational studies, pilot studies, qualitative and/or quantitative methods, literature and systematic reviews) as well as grey literature such as academic reports, thesis and dissertations. All articles had to be in English or Spanish published in the last ten years (January 2009 to December 2019). SMS, text messaging, mobile apps or others mobile service involving mobile phone/smartphone were included. Only studies with a full text were considered.

Exclusion criteria were: 1) study protocols, opinion papers, conference proceedings, reflection articles, letters, book abstracts and posters due to the limitation of the information 2) studies without mention of mobile phone and/or its use, 3) studies without evaluation of the effect of mobile phone interventions 4) Other health areas other than arboviral diseases, 4) Non-English and Non-Spanish language. The inclusion and exclusion criteria are summarized in table 2.

Table 2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Study design	Any randomized or non-randomized study, review articles, meta-analysis, academic reports, thesis and dissertations	Opinion papers, conferences, letters, book abstracts, study protocols
Disease	Dengue, Zika, chikungunya	All other diseases or health conditions
Mobile service delivery	Mobile phone as an intervention tool Short message service (SMS) Mobile applications And other mobile services	The use of mobile phones not specifically analysed
Outcomes	Arboviral disease Acceptance, usability, costs, effectiveness, performance and further findings related to health prevention and control	No outcome assessed
Languages	Spanish, English	All other languages

Study selection

All retrieved literature was imported into the program Mendeley®; duplicates were identified and deleted. Titles, abstracts and full texts were systematically screened for the inclusion and exclusion criteria during three phases. The first phase of the title screening was conducted to determine publications which could be discarded when the title was not related to the topic. Publications were included in the second screening round whenever their titles were unclear. In the second phase, all abstracts of the publications that passed the first title screening were read to select relevant information for the purpose of the review publications. Publications without abstracts were included in the third screening round. Finally, the third phase of full text screening was conducted to select publications following the inclusion criteria. By this way only eligible publications in line with the aims of the review were identified for further data extraction. During the study selection, an advisor was consulted in case of doubt whether a publication should be included or not.

Data extraction

A data extraction form was designed using a Microsoft Excel® spreadsheet. The following information were extracted for each publication: title, author, year, objective, country, target setting, targeted arbovirus disease, study design, mobile phone services (e.g. mobile app, SMS), purpose of the mobile phone for arboviruses (e.g. disease prevention, surveillance), the target users (e.g. health workers), outcome dimension (costs, performance, effectiveness, acceptability). These 12 categories were established based on expert interviews and an initial literature search which was conducted to develop a better classification for achieving the objectives (WHO, 2011; Labrique et al., 2013; WHO, 2018). Given the complexity to

classify mobile phone technologies, we iteratively added services if more mobile phone technologies were found that did not fit into any established service (e.g. mobile phone tracking data). We also removed mobile phone services that were not identified or included in the studies (e.g. interactive voice response). The data extraction form was optimized based on discussions in our research team. Each full text was reviewed once it was clearly classified with the extraction form. Following the guidelines for conducting a scoping review, no formal assessment of the methodological quality of the included articles was performed (Arksey and O'Malley, 2005; Levac et al., 2010), however the quality of the papers was defined by the study designs which were eligible for inclusion.

Synthesis

Themes emerging from the data were analysed and discussed within the research team. Descriptive numerical and thematic analyses are presented as narrative summaries given the heterogeneity of the literature. Narrative summary is a methodology that may involve a simple recounting and description of findings to produce evidence (Dixon-Woods et al., 2005). From the beginning, we were aware that a non-overlapping categorization of individual technologies was difficult due to the complexity of the mobile technology and its integration with other tools. Therefore, publications dealing with more than one mobile phone category were assigned according to the dominant tool; for instance, if a mobile application uses multiple sensors such as Bluetooth or GPS, it is classified as a mobile app, not as a sensor. Last revision was performed to fit each data of the study in their proper category.

Results

Results of the study selection process

A total of 1289 publications were retrieved for this review, including 1189 from the databases and 100 from Google search. After deleting duplicates, 1013 remained for screening the titles, of which 301 were selected for screening of abstracts. After reading abstracts, 82 full texts were considered potentially relevant, of which 32 met our criteria. In addition, 4 papers were identified from reference lists. As a result, 36 studies were included for the data extraction (see PRISMA flow diagram in Fig. 1; Moher et al., 2009). A complete list of all studies can be found in Additional file 1.

Descriptive results of geographic distribution and study designs

The studies included came from twenty different countries (see Fig. 2 Geographic distribution of mobile phone-based studies). Eighteen studies were conducted in the American region (Colombia, United States, Brazil, Guatemala, Peru and Mexico), of which one study was conducted in four countries (El Salvador, Honduras, Dominican Republic and Guatemala). Twelve were conducted in the Asia region (Nepal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, India, China, Malaysia and Pakistan), four in the Africa region (Kenya and Madagascar) and only two were identified in other regions (Fiji and Spain). Most studies were focussing on urban areas where our target diseases are prevalent, only three were specifically conducted in a rural area. Brazil and United States were the countries with the highest number of publications (each one with

six), however the studies identified in the United States were not performed under real-world conditions, but rather under controlled conditions, in particular laboratory facilities. Most studies were published in the last three years ($n=22$), reflecting a recent increase in the use of mobile phones for the prevention and control of arbovirus diseases.

From 36 identified studies, most of them had a descriptive approach ($n = 12$), of which some provided preliminary results with small groups of people who "tested" the mobile technology in controlled environments and a few studies described their lessons learned after being conducted at a large scale. Some studies included pilot/feasibility studies ($n = 6$), diagnostic test studies ($n = 6$), retrospective studies ($n = 4$), cross sectional studies ($n = 4$), randomized controlled trials ($n = 3$), quasi-experimental studies ($n = 2$), non-randomized control trial ($n = 1$), and a qualitative study ($n = 1$). Regarding our target diseases, the majority of the 36 studies focused on dengue ($n = 15$), six studies on Zika and no study on chikungunya specifically. However, seven publications covered arboviral diseases in general or *Aedes* vectors. Seven studies on the mobile health technology targeted more than one infectious disease including arboviruses.

Mobile phone services

With respect to the mobile phone technology, we classified each service of a cell phone to identify which type of mobile phone category were most frequently used in terms of our outcomes. Five mobile phone categories were identified: mobile applications (mobile apps, smartphone apps, mobile software), SMS (Short Message Services), mobile phone tracking data (call detail records, mobile phone signals), camera phone (camera module/image sensor) and simple communication service (calls). An overview is presented in Table 3. The most widely used mobile phone category was mobile applications ($n = 18$). Simple mobile communication (e.g. voice communication) were used less often.

Table 3 Mobile phone categories according to the 36 studies

Services	Definition and considerations	Number of hits	References
Mobile applications	Mobile applications, commonly referred to as mobile apps, are software programs designed to run on a mobile device, such as a smartphone or tablet. Many mobile apps have corresponding programs meant to run on desktop computers. This category comprises mobile apps, iPhone apps, smartphone apps, mobile software and m-learning platforms that were run on mobile phone or smartphone.	18	Ocampo et al., 2019; Abel Manguiera et al., 2019; Rodriguez-Valero et al., 2018; Hewavithana et al., 2018; Olso et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2017; Lwin et al., 2017; Sanavria et al., 2017; Pepin et al. 2013; Eiras and Rensende, 2009; Leal Neto et al., 2017; Mukundarajan et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2016; Reddy et al., 2015; Patil et al., 2016; Thiha and Ibrahim, 2015; Lozano-Fuentes et al., 2013; Lozano-Fuentes et al., 2012
Short message service	Short message service (SMS) is a service for sending electronic message to and from a mobile phone. Messages are usually no longer than 160 alpha-numeric characters and contain no images or graphics. SMS is also known as text messaging.	7	Kumoji and Sohail et al., 2019; Randriamiarana et al., 2018; Toda et al., 2017; Toda et al., 2016; Randrianasolo et al., 2010; Bhattarai et al., 2019; Dammert et al., 2014
Camera phone	A camera phone is a mobile phone that can take pictures and record video clips. Most new cellular phones are already equipped with cameras which include an image sensor, the lens and microelectronic mechanical system. Smartphone cameras are used for image processing and visual readout.	6	Kaarj et al., 2018; Rong et al., 2018; Ganguli et al., 2017; Priye et al., 2017; Bhadra et al., 2018; Chan et al., 2016
Mobile phone tracking data	Mobile phone tracking data are often call detail records (CDR) that log the location of mobile phone users when they make telecommunication transactions, such as a phone call or text message. This category comprises mobile phone signals.	4	Rajarethinam et al., 2019; Massaro et al., 2019; Mao et al., 2016; Wesolowski et al., 2015
Simple mobile communication	Simple mobile phone communication involves the use of mobile phone numbers to allow contact with others including voice communication (e.g. calls).	1	Barde et al., 2018

Purpose of mobile phone use in health programmes

To analyse the support that mobile phones are promoting, we noticed that the included studies in this review were focused on four major purposes: surveillance, prevention, diagnosis, and management which are summarized in table 4. Three studies were identified for both purposes: surveillance and prevention (Reddy et al., 2015, Lwin et al., 2017; Rodriguez et al., 2018), thus those were assigned for both purposes in table 4, resulting in 39 studies. This review also identified specific aims in each purpose which are presented in table 4. Some mobile applications, were able to perform more than one aim in surveillance such as data collection, taking mosquitoes photos, geolocation, among others (e.g. The App, Mosquito Alert; Palmer et al. 2017).

In total, the mobile phone-based studies included 25 for surveillance, 7 for disease prevention, 6 for diagnosis and 1 for management. The mobile phone technology, mainly taking advantage of mobile applications, has been most frequently used for multiple aims in surveillance, followed by prevention and diagnosis. The use of simple voice communication (mobile phone number) focussing on communication management between health staff and patients was less explored. Short message services were used for surveillance (data collection and reporting) and prevention (health education and promoting behavioural change). Camera phones coupled to diagnostic platforms and/or assays were aimed at diagnosis of arboviruses and identification of mosquito species.

Table 4. Mobile phone-based studies by purpose and mobile technology category

Purpose	Specific aims in mobile phones	Mobile phone Service	Application or system' names / Mobile phone projects	References
surveillance (n = 25 studies)	Data collection and reporting mosquitoes, symptoms, socio-demographic factors on population	mobile apps (n=15)	VECTOS system; *OlympTRIP app; Google maps®app; Vigilant-e app; Mosquito Alert; *Mo-Buzz; ***MI-Dengue system, Healthy cup app; Abuzz project; Mobile device with OruxMaps, AutoNavi navigation and Baidu Map; *Monitoring app in Fiji; **Chaak system	Ocampo et al., 2019; Rodriguez-Valero et al., 2018; Hewavithana et al., 2018; Olso et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2017; Lwin et al., 2017; Sanavria et al., 2017; Pepin et al. 2013; Eiras and Rensende, 2009; Leal Neto et al., 2017; Mukundarajan et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2016; Reddy et al., 2015; Lozano-Fuentes et al., 2013; Lozano-Fuentes et al., 2012
	Tracking and monitor disease and outbreaks	SMS (n=5)	SMS survey in four countries; SMS for IDSR system in Madagascar; **mSOS project; SMS for sentinel surveillance	Kumoji and Sohail et al., 2019; Randriamiarana et al., 2018; Toda et al., 2017; Toda et al., 2016; Randrianasolo et al., 2010
	Geolocation of users or breeding sites to visualizing hotspots	Mobile phone tracking data (n=4)	Two studies using CDR in Singapore; mobile phone signals (SS7) in China; CDR in Pakistan	Rajarethinam et al., 2019; Massaro et al., 2019; Mao et al., 2016; Wesolowski et al., 2015
	Estimation of human movements to predict outbreaks or possible risk areas	camera phone (n=1)	Smartphone imaged LAMP-OSD assay	Bhadra et al., 2018
Prevention (n = 7)	Health education	mobile apps (n=5)	m-learning platform, *OlympTRIP; *Mo-buzz; Mobile social app in India; *Monitoring app in Fiji	Abel Manguera et al., 2019; Rodriguez-Valero et al., 2018; Lwin et al. 2017; Patil et al., 2016; Reddy et al., 2015
	Promotion of behaviour change	SMS (n=2)	SMS conducted in Nepal; SMS conducted in Perú	Bhattarai et al., 2019; Dammert et al., 2014
Diagnosis (n = 6)	m-learning approach	camera phone (n=5)	Four diagnostic studies using smartphone camera in USA and one in China	Kaarj et al., 2018; Rong et al., 2018; Ganguli et al., 2017; Priye et al., 2017; Chan et al., 2016
	Point of care diagnosis for detecting viruses of dengue, Zika and chikungunya	mobile app (n=1)	Mobile app for image processing in Malaysia	Thiha and Ibrahim, 2015
Management (n = 1)	Facilitating communication between health staff and patients for timely diagnosis	simple mobile communication (n = 1)	Contact using mobile phone number of patients in India	Barde et al., 2018

*Mobile phone projects addressing both surveillance and prevention; **The same mobile phone tool used in two studies; *** The same mobile phone tool used in three studies.

Among the included studies, we assessed the different target groups or users of the mobile phone technology. Health workers were the main target group for receiving mobile phone services ($n = 12$). This group consisted of vector control staff, healthcare workers, physicians, practitioners, health managers and other health specialists. The second most frequent group were researchers ($n=11$) who conducted studies that used mobile phone tracking data or designed platforms with smartphone cameras under controlled settings. The third most frequent group was the general public ($n = 9$), which includes communities and specific population groups (students, athletes, police officers). Three mobile phone interventions targeted both groups, general public and health workers. Only one mobile phone service was designed for patients.

Outcome dimensions

This review assessed the following outcome dimensions: performance, acceptance, feasibility, usability, costs and effectiveness. A description is given in table 5 summarizing the scope of expected outcomes in the 36 studies. Although, the description was developed following prior definitions (Osorio et al, 2018; Proctor et al., 2011), some adjustments were developed deductively from the included articles.

Table 5. Description of outcome dimensions in 36 studies

Outcome	Description
Performance	Operational characteristics of the mobile phone technology in terms accuracy, completeness, quality data, timeliness, speed, and concordance with other medical reports
Feasibility	The extent to which the mobile health intervention implemented under real conditions can be successfully used in a specific context
Acceptance	User' attitudes towards the mobile phone technology perceived to be satisfactory and user-friendly.
Usability	Users who are testing the mobile phone technology. This comprises users who downloaded the application/service and used it or active users
Cost	Monetary effort of the use of a mobile technology in a specific context
Effectiveness	Positive effects of mobile phone implementation on public health or health-related behaviour changes.

The analysis of outcome dimensions (table 6) showed that a large number of studies assessed the performance of their mobile phone services (52%), particularly mobile applications, followed by studies that assessed feasibility (30%). It can be seen that few studies have provided information on acceptance, usability, and effectiveness. Costs analysis or at least estimated prices by mobile phone services were the least explored in this review. Mobile applications were the only service that assessed all outcome dimensions. Usability was only described by mobile apps-based studies. Table 6 summarizes the number of mobile phone services dealing with one or more outcome measurements.

Table 6 Number of studies by mobile phone category and outcome dimensions

Mobile phone services	Performance	Feasibility	Acceptance	Usability	Costs	Effectiveness
Mobile applications	9	6	3	5	2	2
Short message service (SMS)	2	2	2	n.a.	1	3
Mobile phone tracking data	2	3	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Camera phone	5	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	1	n.a.
Simple mobile communication	1	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
	19 (52%)	11 (30%)	5 (13%)	5 (13%)	4 (11%)	5 (13%)

n.a.= not available (No study provided information on that outcome).

The variability of mobile phone-based study designs makes it difficult to assess individual intervention or to identify the most effective and socially accepted mobile phone service. In the following the six outcome dimensions for mobile phone programmes will be described in more detail.

Performance

A variety of operational characteristics were assessed in performance studies. Mobile applications and simple voice communications (calls) reported improvements in terms of completeness, for example, reporting more houses to conduct vector control activities (Barde et al. 2018; Hewavithana et al. 2018; Ocampo et al., 2019). Familiarity health workers with the application and using well known apps (Google maps) and geographic information systems (GIS) helped in locating more houses in real-time. It was also demonstrated that mobile applications were more useful in ensuring data quality and timeliness rather than traditional capturing methods. For instance, Chaak app reported a 19% reduction in the time spent per survey, along with fewer errors in data transfer in comparison with the pen-and-paper data capturing methods (Lozano-Fuentes et al., 2012). The use of different modes of data transmission from mobile phones to the central server (transference with or without internet), good storing capacity of mobile phones, design of the app (white background and black lettering for better visibility), easy navigation (use of predefined terms, radio buttons and buttons in data entry fields instead of free text input) and trained health workers favoured the good performance of this mobile phone service (Lozano–Fuentes et al. 2013). The Mobile app, Vigilant-e, designed with question algorithms with simple terminology and visual aids demonstrated good agreement (concordance) between syndromic data reported by the general public and by nurses (Olso et al., 2017). However, the success of this intervention depends on the availability of mobile phones and internet connectivity in households as well as the willingness of people to use it. The use of smartphones has also led to the development of innovations to identify mosquito species using the acoustic sensor of mobile phones. For example, the Abuzz application was capable of sensitively identifying mosquito species at 10 to 50 mm distance, including *Aedes aegypti* (Mukundarajan et al., 2017).

SMS also demonstrated good performance in terms of completeness. Two studies conducted in Madagascar achieved to transmit more than 70% of patient's data within 24 hours (Randrianasolo et al., 2010; Randriamiarana et al., 2018). However, one of them reported problems regarding timeliness and data quality, 90% of health workers had more than 4 errors during data transmission and only 43% of SMS were received in time (Randriamiarana et al., 2018). Lack of guidelines and trainings to use mobile applications, high workload, and technical problems (poor telecommunication network, phone battery, energy cuts), were reported by health workers as main challenges of this SMS intervention.

Two papers also identified a promising strategy for tracking users through mobile phone data based on the Signalling System 7 (SS7) and Call Records Details (CRDs; Mao et al., 2016; Massaro et al. 2019). They showed a good performance in terms of predictive values allowing to identify areas with an increased transmission risk. The coordination with telecommunication companies was crucial to capture a large number of mobile phone data and thus to have a better representation of population.

Recently, the use of smartphone camera-based diagnostic platforms has been explored to acquire images and read assays such as ELISA tests (Thiha and Ibrahim), RT-LAMP reactions (Kaarj et al., 2018; priye et al., 2018, Gangulie et al., 2018), RT-PCR and RT-RPA assays (Chan et al., 2015) in arboviruses diseases. They demonstrated high accuracy in terms of sensitivity and specificity as well as a rapid detection of arbovirus (range between 10 to 20 minutes; Chan et al., 2016; Ganguli et al., 2017; Priye et al., 2017; Kaarj et al., 2018; Rong et al., 2018). Using a mobile application is an enabler for processing data and interpreting various tests. For example, Thiha and Ibrahim (2015), developed an ELISA reader for point-of-care dengue detection using the smartphone camera and mobile app. As a result, high performance was demonstrated, with 95% sensitivity and 100% specificity for dengue detection in comparison with standard ELISA microplate readers. These prototypes of smartphone-based diagnostic platforms require qualified personnel to take biological samples and further studies to validate its performance and impact in a real working environment (patient's home or clinic).

Feasibility

Mobile apps interventions have been shown to achieve their aims under real conditions. They were particularly used for collecting and transferring entomological information to assess the transmission risk of arboviral diseases. For example, the entomological data (collected by Vectos app, OruxMaps, AutoNavi Navigation and Baidu Map) were analysed in a web platform or central server that successfully identified the level of vector infestation (larval indices; Ocampo et al, 2019) as well as the most abundant breeding sites (Wu et al., 2016). Moreover, mobile phones together with traditional methods (ovitrap) have also implemented for tracking and monitoring mosquitoes. For example, a study used mobile phones for submitting ovitrap data to a web database that was able to estimate the index of female *Aedes aegypti* (Sanavria et al. 2017).

Mobile applications have also proved to be feasible for early detection of arboviral disease, using a participatory approach (Olson et al., 2017; Leal Neto et al., 2017; Rodriguez-Valero et al., 2018). These applications required medical staff to validate the data reported by users and checked their health status

during the intervention. All these mobile applications were accompanied by a web-based application to facilitate the data management in real time.

Recent studies using mobile phone tracking data through CDR and mobile phone signals have been conducted in Asia region (Wesolowski et al., 2015; Mao et al., 2016; Rajarethinam et al., 2019). This strategy, mobile phone tracking data -when integrated with disease surveillance data and environmental data- has the potential to estimate human mobility in order to predict the spread of arbovirus diseases and outbreaks.

Acceptance

Mobile apps were generally well received in studies conducted in India, Fiji and Guatemala. User's satisfaction with mobile interventions offered was commonly based on how they felt using the app, whether they found it helpful or useful, and whether they would recommend it to others. For example, users from Vigilant-e app in Guatemala showed high user satisfaction: 98.8% of families reported that the application was beneficial to them and 96.6% that it was beneficial to the community (Olson et al., 2017). Another example was the M-learning app in India where 80% of students had a positive attitude and 76% acknowledged the importance of using it as a learning tool (Narayan Patil et al., 2016). On the other hand, a study in Fiji showed positive feedback on user-satisfaction, but its results depended more on connectivity to the internet (Reddy et al., 2015). Moreover, socio-economic factors of population might be related to people who did not accept the app (Olson et al., 2017).

The use of SMS was highly acceptable for the prevention and surveillance of arbovirus. The acceptability was assessed on how much participants enjoyed the service and whether they perceived it an informative and trustworthy strategy (Bhattarai et al., 2019). Another study also checked if their health workers could easily use the SMS (Toda et al., 2017). Health workers reported that the SMS was user-friendly service. The participation of stakeholders was key to promote SMS as media for the prevention of dengue and facilitate its acceptance amongst the community.

Usability

Most mobile applications showed a good proportion of active users out of all participants who downloaded the app (Rodrigo-Valero et al., 2018; Leal Neto et al., 2017; Patil et al., 2016), but some researchers thought more incentives, educational campaigns and constant communication between users and study personal were needed to keep them motivated (Olso et al. 2017, Lwin et al., 2017; Leal Neto et al., 2017). Some concerns related to additional expenses of mobile technology (e.g. mobile data plan), mobile phone features (less storage space, slow internet connection), lack of interest and ignorance regarding purpose of mobile phone intervention were associated with a proportion of users who did not use it (Patil et al., 2016). Fear and mistrust of adopting a new technology were other reasons for low usability, perceived by health staff in Mo-buzz (Lwin et al., 2017). Other external factors such as period of high staff turnover, cellular tower collapse and socio-politic events were associated with a decreased reporting (Olso et al. 2017).

Costs

Cost calculations were done in different ways. Description of market cost of mobile device (Bhadra et al., 2018), estimations of the mobile phone network including calculations of staff salary (Lozano-Fuentes et al., 2013), costs calculations on coverage of mobile phone intervention (Palmer et al., 2017) and description of each product or service for the whole intervention, identifying cost savings (Pepin et al., 2013).

Most studies on costs compared their mobile phone intervention with standards methods for vector surveillance. For example, Mosquito Alert app based on citizen-science initiatives demonstrated a reduction in the cost of coverage in comparison with ovitraps (Mosquito alert costed 1.23 Euros per km² per month while ovitraps costed about 9.36 Euros per km² per month). Vector surveillance with ovitraps required much effort to be installed and checked by qualified staff, while mobile application was mostly associated with community buildings and non-recurring investments in technology (Palmer et al., 2017). Similar economic benefits were briefly reported by Bhadra et al., 2018 in the discussion section, indicating a reduction of cost to capture fluorescent signals of treated mosquitoes with a phone camera in comparison with conventional laboratory equipment. In contrast, Chaak app, reported costs equal or slightly higher than traditional capturing methods (cost per household were U.S.\$0.10 for the pen-and-paper method compared with a cheap mobile phone plan U.S.\$0.10 and an expensive mobile phone plan U.S.\$2.13 for Chaak system). Its cost was an issue associated with the type mobile phone network (Lozano-Fuentes et al., 2013). Additionally, a software developer or a person with technological skills is required to manage the central server which could add costs to the mobile phone intervention. On the other hand, one study analysed cost-effectiveness of the MI-Dengue system using multivariate models to estimate the median cost savings per case prevented which was median \$58 (Pepin et al., 2013). This system based on the concept that vector control strategies should be applied in targeted areas with higher densities of gravid female mosquitoes, showed a better allocation of resources, saving hundreds of thousands of dollars in direct costs (health care and vector control) and approximately \$7 million in lost wages (societal effect; Pepin et al., 2013). The cost analysis of this system not only included estimations on technological components (e.g., computers, mobile phones) but also costs associated with vector control inspections.

For the diagnosis of arboviral diseases, Chan et al., (2016) mentioned that smartphones are a more affordable alternative to collect fluorescent signals for point-of-care detection of arboviruses in comparison with other portable devices (ESEQuant Tubescanner, Chan et al., 2016). However, information regarding the cost of these diagnostic platforms was limited.

Effectiveness

Few studies showed effective m-health interventions in terms of reducing the vector densities through improved dengue prevention and behaviour change and/or performing as an early warning indicator for outbreaks. The analysis of effectiveness was based on well-defined methodologies (randomized

controlled trials or quasi-experimental designs), but some studies were conducted in specific setting with a short interventional period.

SMS-based studies were the only ones that reported effectiveness in term of improving knowledge and practices of arboviral disease. Preventive messages via mobile phone were able to produce positive changes in household behaviour improving dengue practices in population and consequently affecting vector densities in domestic settings. Dammert et al. (2014), showed that households exposed to repeated preventative messages in Peru reported an increase in dengue practices, (the use of window screening and/or mosquito bed nets increased 4.5%) and a reduction in infestation (e.g. vector water containers testing positive for dengue larvae was 1.44% in the exposed group with SMS vs 2.47% in non-exposed group). Additionally, SMS with conventional education methods were able to bring a major effect in the prevention of arboviral diseases. In Nepal, SMS together with a prevention leaflet were sent to the community, which increased knowledge and practice of people towards dengue prevention (Bhattarai et al, 2019). Availability of mobile phones in households and shared responsibility of the community were identified as enablers of SMS interventions. In contrast, limited network access in remote areas, reaching private network users and lack of knowledge concerning the purpose of using mobile phones were the main obstacles perceived in the implementation of this mobile phone service.

For surveillance, the use of SMS has demonstrated to be effective for reporting immediately notifiable diseases. (Toda et al., 2016). Likewise, mobile applications plus traps were effective for monitoring of *Aedes. Aegypti* in real time (Pepin et al., 2013; Palmer et al., 2017). Their integration with geographic information systems enabled the development of early warning mechanisms. For example, GIS datasets obtained from mobile application provided early warning signals in low endemicity areas where traditional surveillance was limited (Palmer et al., 2017). Positive results were also observed in MI-Dengue system using a website platform, a mobile device (plus mosquito traps) and vector control inspections. Researchers showed that, in Brazil, the system was able to identify high risk areas which were then targeted for vector control and consequently prevented 27,191 cases of dengue fever (Pepin et al., 2013; Sanavria et al., 2017). Evidence suggests that using both approaches together (standard surveillance methods (traps) and mobile apps) are effective as entomological surveillance instruments for decision-making in the control of *Aedes* mosquitoes and subsequent action.

Discussion

Overview of findings

This scoping review presents evidence on mobile phone technology regarding dengue, Zika and chikungunya. Mobile applications, short message services, phone camera, mobile phone tracking data and simple mobile communication are mostly being used in urban areas of American and Asian countries, which is consistent with the high burden of three arboviruses reported in these regions (L'Azou et al., 2016; Paixão et al., 2018). Our review shows that the most dominant purpose is surveillance while research on management of arboviral disease is limited which is consistent with another review (Abaza

and Marschollek, 2017). However, we also observed an increasing interest in the use of mobile phones addressed to diagnose arboviral diseases in the last three years. Mobile application is the most popular mobile phone service. Given the capacities of smartphones, health programmes have taken advantage of mobile apps to respond to different needs (Fedele et al, 2017).

Findings of outcome dimensions

A variety of mobile phone services showed to be potential for data collection and geolocation of arbovirus cases. Other benefits included reliable self-reporting of symptoms, high ability to identify mosquitoes and adequate resolution to display images on diagnostic platforms. We observed that some attributions of mobile phones (e.g. data quality) are related to interface design, navigation and terminology, which is similar to other studies (Kirwan et al., 2013; Schnall et al., 2016; Stephan et al. 2017). However, other building capacities such as, competence of users to use the mobile phone service, good wireless data service, participation of stakeholders and integration with other technologies, were key to ensure good performance of mHealth intervention and improving other outcome dimensions.

In general, mobile phone interventions reported good usability and acceptance, but some small incentives are required to keep users motivated. A study suggests offering incentives based on use and improved outcome (Aitken & Lyle, 2017). However, we identified that providing mobile phones was probably unnecessary strategy to improve outcomes (Olso et al., 2017; Toda et al., 2017). Perceptions related to costs and mistrust that might be related with the initial low uptake (Patil et al., 2016; Lwin et al., 2017). This barrier was also reported in another study in Madagascar where is being conducted a mobile technology for improving maternal health care services (Muller et al., 2020). Researchers have also suggested that more promotional, and educational efforts will be needed to encourage people and increase the uptake (Cocosila & Arcer, 2017; Dwivedi et al., 2016). In addition, constant training and supervision could help users (health workers) feel more familiar with the mobile phone service (Adokiya et al., 2015).

As reported in other studies (Zafar et al., 2014; St Clair-Sullivan et al., 2019; Laar et al., 2019), the main difficulties using a mobile phone service were internet connectivity (mobile app in particular), poor network access and phone ownership. This issues still represent barriers to access for some portions of the population (Laar et al., 2019). Previous studies also showed that cultural and socio-demographic factors (age, gender, education, among others) can influence usage and adoption a mobile technology (Bol et al., 2018; Tran et al., 2015). Thereby, mobile phone interventions should be implemented according to local realities and needs of the community (Royston et al., 2015).

Evidence suggests that mobile applications with other approaches such as community involvement and traditional vector control methods (traps for mosquitoes) have been demonstrated to be an effective complementary tool as an early warning indicator for arboviral disease outbreaks (Sanavria et al., 2017; Palmer et al., 2017) and thus triggering an early outbreak response (Pepin et al., 2013). This finding substantiates the results of earlier conclusions, where the combination with other interventions helped improve health outcomes (Kuyo et al., 2018). SMS demonstrated to be effective for dengue prevention.

This service in combination with other conventional informative media brings major benefits to the knowledge and preventive practices in the population. This evidence is in concordance with a study conducted in the United Kingdom that reported positive results using SMS and other promotional media (Sallis et al., 2019). Further research is needed to select media for transmission that suits the target audience. (Robertson, 2008).

There is limited evidence on costs associated with mobile phone technology. Mobile applications could be a cost-effective strategy in vector surveillance programmes. Nevertheless, we identified that mobile phone intervention costs will depend on the mobile phone network and the initial investment of mobile phones. According to WHO, a surveillance system based on mobile technology requires to enhance technological capabilities (e.g. computers, software developers; WHO, 2011), adding more costs. Our results must be considered with caution, given the scarcity of information related to this outcome. However, positive cost outcomes using mHealth interventions in other diseases have been confirmed in various studies (Prinja et al., 2018; Iribarren et al. 2017). Further studies are needed in order to better understand their economic benefit for the prevention and control of arboviral diseases.

Recommendations

The following recommendations can be given for implementing mHealth interventions for combating arbovirus and other infectious diseases:

Table 7 Recommendations for implementing a mobile phone intervention

Technical requirements

- Development of applications with friendly design, easy navigability, simple language and visual aids help optimize the operational characteristics of mobile phone service
- According to the purpose and complexity of mHealth intervention, qualified staff with technological skills will be required to manage the central server and database and other technological needs. (e.g. software developers)
- Coordination with telecommunication companies will be the enabler to reach private network users.

General considerations

- Initial assessments on mobile phone penetration, connectivity of the internet, environmental, socio-demographic conditions, and other external factors (e.g. staff turnover) should be studied before starting an mHealth programme
- Active participation of stakeholders facilitates the acceptance of mobile strategy and disseminate awareness in population
- Use of existing technologies (e.g. Google Maps) for tracking and geolocation of arboviruses should be flexible for da
- Regular training and supervision are required to increase capacities and skills of health staff to use the mobile phone.
- Promoting the download of mobile applications onto the mobile phones of users can potentially reduce costs and be sustainable for disease surveillance programmes.
- Constant communication between general public and health staff can be enhanced by the use of mobile applications for participatory surveillance.
- Encourage users to participate in mobile phone intervention by providing some small incentive and ensuring that the download and use is for free.
- Use of traditional vector surveillance methods (ovitraps or adult traps) combined with the mobile phone technology can produce better results for early warning information for hot spots of disease transmission.
- Investing more efforts in communication, marketing, and advertising could be required to increase user participation, improve social engagement and to create and maintain awareness.

- The combination of the mobile phone technology with promotional media can provide better results for achieving behavioural change in the community.

Future research

- Further research over an extended period of time and in diverse settings is necessary to understand the long-term influence of the intervention implemented in this study
- Smartphone-diagnostic platforms required to be more validated and tested under real world, particularly in developing countries to understand its economic benefits and specific requirements.
- Mobile phone data tracking required to be more implemented and extended to other regions to assess its real impact
- Further studies related to acceptance, costs, usability are needed to assess the mobile phone intervention with more accuracy.

Conclusions

This scoping review describes how mobile phones are leveraged in the fight against arboviral diseases. Thirty-six publications coming from twenty countries were described using different mobile phone services: mobile applications, short message services (SMS), phone camera, mobile phone tracking data and simple mobile communication. A variety of mobile phone services (mobile applications, short message services, mobile phone tracking data, smartphone camera and simple voice communication) have been used to enhance surveillance, prevention, diagnosis, and arbovirus management. Most interventions that involved a mobile phone reported positive results in terms of outcome dimensions (performance, feasibility, acceptance, usability, costs and effectiveness). Further research over an extended period of time and in diverse settings is necessary to understand the long-term influence of the intervention implemented in this study. Further studies at a larger scale are required to assess the impact with more precision.

Limitations

Although the scoping review was conducted in line with the guidelines of the methodology, we still need to acknowledge some limitations. Some articles might not have been identified due to the language restriction (English and Spanish), or indexed with English key terms. This may have resulted in an

underrepresentation of some geographic regions, such as French speaking Africa. The importance of these exclusions is unknown but most likely not substantial.

The majority of scoping reviews did not assess the methodological quality of the individual studies (Munn Z et al., 2018; Pham et al., 2014). However, looking at all 36 studies included in this review, it was noticeable that some mobile technologies were conducted in a short period of time and tested with small sample size. This made it difficult to assess their relevant information. Due to the shortage of randomized trials, this review could not provide much information about the effectiveness of the mobile technology in terms of contributing to reduce vector density and disease incidence. Also, the diversity of mobile phone programmes including different approaches and procedures made it difficult to compare and identify the most effective, acceptable and affordable mobile phone category. However, we described characteristics, purposes and opportunities of using mobile phones in arboviral disease programmes which can be adapted to specific user needs.

Declarations

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

MAC and RCS have a scholarship from Minciencias and Gobernación de Norte de Santander to support their doctoral studies (grant number 753).

The article processing charge was funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) and the University of Freiburg in the funding programme Open Access Publishing.

Author's contributions

All authors contributed to the concept and design of the study. MAC and AK handled a large part of the screening in all stages, interpreted results and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. SRR shared work in all stages of the screening process. MAC, RCS and SDM conceptualised the data extraction form. AK, RCS, SDM and SRR read and provided substantial edits on the manuscript. All authors approval the final version of the manuscript that was submitted.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the team of the Centre for Medicine and Society, Master Programme Global Urban Health at Freiburg University for their encouragement and support on this work. We thank Johanna Yañez from the State Health Institute (IDS) for hosting the study team. The authors would also like to thank Adrian Ostre from Freiburg University for fundamental assistance. MAC and RCS also thank Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación, and Gobernación de Norte de Santander from Colombia for supporting our doctoral studies.

Abbreviations

WHO: World Health Organization

PAHO: Pan American Health Organization

app: application

SMS: Short Message Service

CDRs: Call Detail Records

GPS: Global Positioning System

GIS: Geographic Information System

mHealth: mobile health

M-learning: mobile learning.

References

1. Abaza H, Marschollek M. mHealth Application Areas and Technology Combinations*. A Comparison of Literature from High and Low/Middle Income Countries. *Methods Inf Med.* 2017 Aug 8;56(7):e105-e122. doi: 10.3414/ME17-05-0003. PMID: 28925418; PMCID: PMC6291822.
2. Abel Manguera FF, Smania-Marques R, Dutra Fernandes I, Alves Albino V, Olinda R., Acácia Santos-Silva T, Traxler J, Matheson D, Santos S. The prevention of arboviral diseases using mobile devices: a preliminary study of the attitudes and behaviour change produced by educational interventions. *Trop Med Int Health.* 2019;24(12):1411-1426. doi: 10.1111/tmi.13316
3. Adokiya MN, Awoonor-Williams JK, Beiersmann C, Müller O. The integrated disease surveillance and response system in northern Ghana: challenges to the core and support functions. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2015 Jul 28; 15():288
4. Aitken M, & Lyle J. Patient adoption of mHealth: Use, evidence and remaining barriers to mainstream acceptance. Parsippany, NJ: IMS Institute for Health care Informatics. 2015

5. Akter R, Naish S, Hu W, Tong S. Socio-demographic, ecological factors and dengue infection trends in Australia. *PLoS One*. 2017;12: e0185551 10.1371/journal.pone.0185551
6. Akter S & Ray P. mHealth - an Ultimate Platform to Serve the Unserved. *Yearb Med Inform*. 2010;14:94–100
7. Araújo HR, Carvalho DO, Ioshino RS, Costa-da-Silva AL, Capurro ML. Review *Aedes aegypti* Control Strategies in Brazil: Incorporation of New Technologies to Overcome the Persistence of Dengue Epidemics. *Insects*. 2015; 6(2):576-94
8. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. 2005;8(1):19–32
9. Asiimwe C, Gelvin D, Lee E, Amor YB, Quinto E, Katureebe C, Sundaram L, Bell D, Berg M. Use of an innovative, affordable, and open-source short message service-based tool to monitor malaria in remote areas of Uganda. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2011;85 (1): 26-33. 10.4269/ajtmh.2011.10-0528
10. Barde PV, Mishra N, Singh N. Timely diagnosis, use of information technology and mosquito control prevents dengue outbreaks: Experience from central India. *J Infect Public Health*. 2018;11(5):739-741. doi: 10.1016/j.jiph.2018.03.002
11. Barrera R. Considerations for Disrupting Dengue Virus Transmission; Ecology of *Aedes aegypti* and Current (Nongenetic) Methods of Control. *Genetic Control of Malaria and Dengue*. 2016;103–124. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-800246-9.00006-5>
12. Bartumeus F, Oltra A, Palmer J. Citizen Science: A Gateway for Innovation in Disease-Carrying Mosquito Management? *Trends in Parasitology*. 2018;34(9), 727–729. pmid:29793805
13. Bhadra S, Riedel TE, Saldaña MA, Hegde S, Pederson N, Hughes GL, Ellington AD. Direct nucleic acid analysis of mosquitoes for high fidelity species identification and detection of *Wolbachia* using a cellphone. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*. 2018;12(8): e0006671 Epub 2018/08/31. 10.1371/journal.pntd.0006671
14. Bhattarai AH, Sanjaya GY, Khadka A, Kumar R, Ahmad RA. The addition of mobile SMS effectively improves dengue prevention practices in community: an implementation study in Nepal. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2019;19(1):699. doi: 10.1186/s12913-019-4541-z
15. Boger RA and Low R. GLOBE Goes GO with Mosquitoes, AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts. 2016
16. Bol N, Helberger N, Van Weert JCM. Differences in mobile health app use: A source of new digital inequalities? *The Information Society*. 2018;34(3):183-193. doi: 10.1080/01972243.2018.1438550
17. Buckee CO, Wesolowski A, Eagle NN, Hansen E, & Snow RW. Mobile phones and malaria: modeling human and parasite travel. *Travel medicine and infectious disease*. 2013;11(1), 15–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmaid.2012.12.003>
18. Chan K, Weaver S, Wong P et al. Rapid, Affordable and Portable Medium-Throughput Molecular Device for Zika Virus. *Sci Rep* 6. 2016. 38223. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep38223>
19. Cocosila M, Archer N. An Empirical Investigation of Mobile Health Adoption in Preventive Interventions. *Proceedings of the 22nd BLED eConference eEnablement: Facilitating an Open, Effective and Representative eSociety; BLED'09; June 14-17, 2009; Bled, Slovenia*. 2009. pp. 189–202

20. Cole-Lewis H, Kershaw T. "Text messaging as a tool for behavior change in disease prevention and management", *Epidemiol. Rev*; 2010. vol. 32, no. 1, p. 56-69
21. Crane D, Garnett C, Brown J, West R, Michie S. Behavior change techniques in popular alcohol reduction apps: content analysis. *J Med Internet Res*. 2015;17(5):e118
22. Culquichicón-Sánchez C, Ramos-Cedano E, Chumbes-Aguirre D, Araujo-Chumacero M, Díaz Vélez C, Rodríguez-Morales AJ. *Rev Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs): alternative or complement for surveillance, prevention and control of dengue in the Americas?. Chilena Infectol*. 2015;32(3):363-4. doi: 10.4067/S0716-10182015000400019.
23. Dammert AC, Galdo JC, Galdo V. Preventing dengue through mobile phones: Evidence from a field experiment in Peru. *Journal of Health Economics*; 2014,35, p. 147-161, 10.1016/j.jhealeco.2014.02.002
24. Déglise C, Suggs LS, Odermatt P. SMS for disease control in developing countries: a systematic review of mobile health applications. *J. Telemed. Telecare*; 2012;18:273–281
25. de Souza Silva GC, Peltonen LM, Pruinelli L, Yoshikazu Shishido H, Jacklin Eler G. Technologies to Combat Aedes Mosquitoes: A Model Based on Smart City. *Stud Health Technol Inform*. 2018;250:129-133
26. Dixon-Woods M, Agarwal S, Jones D, Young B, Sutton A. Synthesising qualitative and quantitative evidence: a review of possible methods. *J Health Serv Res Policy*. 2005;10(1):45-53. doi:10.1177/135581960501000110
27. Dwivedi YK, Shareef MA, Simintiras AC, Lal B, Weerakkody V. A generalised adoption model for services: a cross-country comparison of mobile health (m-health) *Gov Inform Q*. 2016 Jan;33(1):174–87. doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2015.06.003
28. Eiras A.E. & Resende MC. Preliminary evaluation of the "Dengue-MI" technology for Aedes aegypti monitoring and control. *Cad. Saúde Pública*. 2009. vol.25 supl.1. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-311X2009001300005>
29. Fedele DA, Cushing CC, Fritz A, Amaro CM, Ortega A. Mobile health interventions for improving health outcomes in youth: a meta-analysis. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2017;171(5):461–469. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2017.0042
30. Fiordelli M, Diviani N, Schulz PJ. Mapping mHealth research: a decade of evolution. *J Med Internet Res*. 2013;15(5):e95. doi: 10.2196/jmir.2430
31. Folaranmi T. mHealth in Africa: challenges and opportunities. *Perspect Public Health*. 2014;134 (1): 14–5. doi: 10.1177/1757913913514703
32. Ganguli A, Ornob A, Yu H, Damhorst GL, Chen W, Sun F, Bhuiya A, Cunningham BT, Bashir R. Hands-free smartphone-based diagnostics for simultaneous detection of Zika, Chikungunya, and Dengue at point-of-care. *Biomed. Microdevices*. 2017;19:73. doi: 10.1007/s10544-017-0209-9
33. Gulland A. Zika virus is a global public health emergency, declares WHO. *BMJ*. 2016: i657
34. Hall CS, Fottrell E, Wilkinson S, Byass P. Assessing the impact of mHealth interventions in low- and middle-income countries – what has been shown to work?. *Global Health Action*. 2014;7:1-12

35. Hamine S, Gerth-Guyette E, Faulx D, Green BB, Ginsburg AS. "Impact of mHealth chronic disease management on treatment adherence and patient outcomes: A systematic review", *J. Med. Internet Res.* 2015. vol. 17, no. 2, p. e52, Feb. 2015
36. Hewavithana JS, Palangasinghe DR, Dahanayaka NJ. Feasibility of mapping of dengue fever patients admitted to medical wards of Teaching Hospital Karapitiya using Google maps® app in mobile phones or tablets. *Ceylon Medical Journal.* 2018;63(2):90. doi: 10.4038/cmj.v63i2.8675
37. Hoffman JA, Cunningham JR, Suleh AJ, Sundsmo A, Dekker D, Vago F, Munly K, Igonya EK, Hunt-Glassman J. Mobile direct observation treatment for tuberculosis patients: a technical feasibility pilot using mobile phones in Nairobi, Kenya. *Am J Prev Med.* 2010;39 (1): 78-80. 10.1016/j.amepre.2010.02.018
38. Iribarren SJ, Cato K, Falzon L, Stone PW. What is the economic evidence for mHealth? A systematic review of economic evaluations of mHealth solutions. *PLoS One.* 2017 Feb 2;12(2):e0170581. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0170581. PMID: 28152012; PMCID: PMC5289471
39. Jones KH, Daniels H, Heys S, Ford DV. Challenges and Potential Opportunities of Mobile Phone Call Detail Records in Health Research: Review. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth.* 2018 Jul 19;6(7):e161. doi: 10.2196/mhealth.9974. PMID: 30026176; PMCID: PMC6072975
40. Kaarj K, Akarapipad P, Yoon JY. Simpler, Faster, and Sensitive Zika Virus Assay Using Smartphone Detection of Loop-mediated Isothermal Amplification on Paper Microfluidic Chips. *Scientific Reports.* 2018. vol 8, Article number: 12438
41. Kaindoa E. W., Ngowo H. S., Limwagu A., Mkandawile G., Kihonda J., Masalu J. P., et al. New evidence of mating swarms of the malaria vector, *Anopheles arabiensis* in Tanzania. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2017;2, 88. pmid:29184918
42. Kirwan M, Duncan MJ, Vandelanotte C, Mummery WK. Design, development, and formative evaluation of a smartphone application for recording and monitoring physical activity levels: the 10,000 Steps "iStepLog" *Health Educ Behav.* 2013 Apr;40(2):140–51. doi: 10.1177/1090198112449460
43. Klasnja P, Pratt W. Healthcare in the pocket: Mapping the space of mobilephone health interventions. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics.* 2012;45, 1, 184 – 198
44. Kraemer MUG, Reiner RC Jr, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Gilbert M, Pigott DM, Yi D, Johnson K, Earl L, Marczak LB, Shirude S, Davis Weaver N, Bisanzio D, Perkins TA, Lai S, Lu X, Jones P, Coelho GE, Carvalho RG, Van Bortel W, Marsboom C, Hendrickx G, Schaffner F, Moore CG, Nax HH, Bengtsson L, Wetter E, Tatem AJ, Brownstein JS, Smith DL, Lambrechts L, Cauchemez S, Linard C, Faria NR, Pybus OG, Scott TW, Liu Q, Yu H, Wint GRW, Hay SI, Golding N. Past and future spread of the arbovirus vectors *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus*. *Nat Microbiol.* 2019; 4(5):854-863
45. Krick, T., Huter, K., Domhoff, D. et al. Digital technology and nursing care: a scoping review on acceptance, effectiveness and efficiency studies of informal and formal care technologies. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019. 19, 400. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4238-3>

46. Kumoji E, Khan Sohail S. Use of short message service for monitoring Zika-related behaviors in four Latin American countries: lessons learned from the field. *Mhealth* 2019;5:23. doi: 10.21037/mHealth.2019.07.01. eCollection 2019
47. Kuyo RO, Muiruri L, Njuguna S. Organizational factors influencing the adoption of the district health information system 2 in Uasin Gishu County, Kenya. *International J Med Res Health Sci.* 2018;7(10):48–57
48. Laar AS, Bekyieriya E, Isang S, Baguune B. Assessment of mobile health technology for maternal and child health services in rural Upper West Region of Ghana. *Public Health* 2019;168:1-8. DOI: 10.1016/j.puhe.2018.11.014
49. Labrique AB, Vasudevan L, Kochi E, Fabricant R, Mehl G. mHealth innovations as health system strengthening tools: 12 common applications and a visual framework. *Glob Health Sci Pract.* 2013;1(2):160–71. doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-13-00031. <http://www.ghspjournal.org/cgi/pmidlookup?view=long&pmid=25276529>
50. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implementation Science.* 2010;5(1):69
51. Lin H, Liu T, Song T, Lin L, Xiao J, Lin J, He J, Zhong H, Hu W, Deng A, Peng Z, Ma W and Zhang Y. Community Involvement in Dengue Outbreak Control: An Integrated Rigorous Intervention Strategy. *PLoS neglected tropical diseases.* 2016;10(8):e0004919 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4993447. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0004919
52. Lozano–Fuentes S, Ghosh S, Bieman J, Sadhu D, Hernandez–Garcia E, Garcia–Rejon J, Wedyan F, Tep-Chel D, Eisen L. Using cell phones for mosquito vector surveillance and control. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Software Engineering & Knowledge Engineering.* Presented at the The Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering (SEKE 2012) Knowledge Systems Institute Graduate School; Redwood City, CA. 2012. p. 763–767
53. Lozano-Fuentes S, Wedyan F, Hernandez-Garcia E, Sadhu D, Ghosh S, Bieman JM, Tep-Chel D, García-Rejón JE, Eisen L. Cell phone-based system (Chaak) for surveillance of immatures of dengue virus mosquito vectors. *Journal of medical entomology.* 2013;50(4), 879–889. <https://doi.org/10.1603/me13008>
54. Lwin MO, Jayasundar K, Sheldenkar A, Wijayamuni R, Wimalaratne P, Ernst KC, Foo S. Lessons from the implementation of Mo-Buzz, a mobile pandemic surveillance system for dengue. *JMIR Public Health Surveill.* 2017;3(4):e65. doi: 10.2196/publichealth.7376
55. L'Azou M, Moureau A, Sarti E, et al. Symptomatic dengue in children in 10 Asian and Latin American countries. *N Engl J Med* 2016;374:1155–66. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1503877
56. Mao L, Yin L, Song X, Mei S. Mapping intra-urban transmission risk of dengue fever with big hourly cellphone data. *Acta Trop.* 2016;162: 188–95
57. Massaro E, Kondor D, Ratti C. Assessing the interplay between human mobility and mosquito borne diseases in urban environments. *Sci Rep* 9, 2019. 16911 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-53127->

Z

58. Mays, N., Roberts, E., & Popay, J. Synthesising research evidence. In *Studying the organisation and delivery of health services: Research methods*. 2001. 220
59. Meyer AND, Thompson PJ, Khanna A, et al. Evaluating a mobile application for improving clinical laboratory test ordering and diagnosis. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2018. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocy026
60. Mildon A, Sellen D. Use of mobile phones for behavior change communication to improve maternal, newborn and child health: a scoping review. *J Glob Health*. 2019; 9(2): 020425. doi: 10.7189/jogh.09.020425
61. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman D. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement. *The British Medical Journal*, 2009;339 (b2535), 1-8
62. Morrissey EC, Casey M, Glynn LG, Walsh JC, Molloy GJ. Smartphone apps for improving medication adherence in hypertension: patients' perspectives. *Patient preference and adherence*. 2018;12, 813–822. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S145647>
63. Mtema Z, Changalucha J, Cleaveland S, et al. Mobile phones as surveillance tools: implementing and evaluating a large-scale intersectoral surveillance system for rabies in Tanzania. *PLoS Med*. 2016;13(4):e1002002
64. Mukundarajan H, Hol FJH, Castillo EA, Newby C, Prakash M. Using mobile phones as acoustic sensors for high-throughput mosquito surveillance. *eLife*. 2017;6:e27854. doi: 10.7554/eLife.27854
65. Munn Z, Peters MDJ, Stern C, Tufanaru C, McArthur A, Aromataris E. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2018 Nov 19;18(1):143. doi: 10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x. PMID: 30453902; PMCID: PMC6245623
66. Nathan M. Introduction. *Pathogens and Global Health*. 2013;106(8), 427–427. <https://doi.org/10.1179/2047772412z.00000000095>
67. Nilsson PM, Todsén T, Subhi Y, Graumann O, Nolsøe CP, Tolsgaard MG. Cost-effectiveness of mobile app-guided training in extended focused assessment with sonography for trauma (eFAST): a randomized trial. *Ultraschall Med*. 2017; 38(6):642-647
68. Nilsson LKJ, Sharma A, Bhatnagar RK, Bertilsson S, Terenius O. Presence of *Aedes* and *Anopheles* mosquito larvae is correlated to bacteria found in domestic water-storage containers. *FEMS Microbiol Ecol*. 2018, 94:fiy058. <https://doi.org/10.1093/femsec/fiy058>
69. Ocampo CB, Mina NJ, Echavarría MI, Acuña M, Caballero A, Navarro A, Aguirre A, Criollo IS, Forero F, Azuero O, Alexander ND. VECTOS: An Integrated System for Monitoring Risk Factors Associated With Urban Arbovirus Transmission. *Glob Health Sci Pract*. 2019;7(1):128-137. doi: 10.9745/GHSP-D-18-00300. Print 2019 Mar 22
70. Olson D, Lamb M, Lopez MR, Colborn K, Paniagua-Avila A, Zacarias A, et al. Performance of a Mobile Phone App-Based Participatory Syndromic Surveillance System for Acute Febrile Illness and Acute Gastroenteritis in Rural Guatemala. *J Med Internet Res*. 2017;19 10.2196/jmir.8041

71. Osorio, L., Garcia, J. A., Parra, L. G., Garcia, V., Torres, L., Degroote, S., & Ridde, V. A scoping review on the field validation and implementation of rapid diagnostic tests for vector-borne and other infectious diseases of poverty in urban areas. *Infectious diseases of poverty*. 2018;7(1), 87. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40249-018-0474-8>
72. Patterson J, Sammon M, Garg, M. Dengue, Zika and Chikungunya: Emerging Arboviruses in the New World. *The western journal of emergency medicine*. 2016;17(6), 671–679. <https://doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2016.9.30904>
73. PAHO/WHO. Organización Panamericana de la Salud (OPS)/Organización Mundial de la Salud (OMS). Zika - Actualización Epidemiológica, 25 de mayo de 2017. Washington, DC: OPS/OMS. <https://www.paho.org/hq/dmdocuments/2017/2017-may-25-phe-actualizacion-epi-virus-zika.pdf>. Accessed February 12, 2019
74. Paixão ES; Teixeira MG; Rodrigues LC. Zika, Chikungunya and dengue: The causes and threats of new and re-emerging arboviral diseases. *BMJ Glob. Health*. 2018;3 (Suppl. 1), e000530
75. Palmer JRB, Oltra A, Collantes F et al. Citizen science provides a reliable and scalable tool to track disease-carrying mosquitoes. *Nat Commun* 8. 2017. 916. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00914-9>
76. Patil RN, Almale BD, Patil M, Gujrathi A, Dhakne-Palwe S, Patil AR, et al. Attitudes and perceptions of medical undergraduates towards Mobile learning (M-learning) *J Clin Diagn Res*. 2016;10(10):JC06–JC10
77. Paul KK, Dhar-Chowdhury P, Haque CE, Al-Amin HM, Goswami DR, Kafi MAH, Drebot MA, Lindsay LR, Ahsan GU, Brooks WA. Risk factors for the presence of dengue vector mosquitoes, and determinants of their prevalence and larval site selection in Dhaka, Bangladesh. *PLoS One*. 2018 Jun 21;13(6):e0199457. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0199457. PMID: 29928055; PMCID: PMC6013170
78. Pepin KM, Marques-Toledo C, Scherer L, Morais MM, Ellis B, Eiras AE, et al. Cost-effectiveness of novel system of mosquito surveillance and control, Brazil. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2013;19: 542–50
79. Pham MT, Rajić A, Greig JD, Sargeant JM, Papadopoulos A, McEwen SA. A scoping review of scoping reviews: advancing the approach and enhancing the consistency. *Res Synth Methods*. 2014 Dec;5(4):371-85. doi: 10.1002/jrsm.1123. Epub 2014 Jul 24. PMID: 26052958; PMCID: PMC4491356
80. Prinja S, Gupta A, Bahuguna P, Nimesh R. Cost analysis of implementing mHealth intervention for maternal, newborn & child health care through community health workers: assessment of ReMIND program in Uttar Pradesh, India. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2018 Oct 3;18(1):390. doi: 10.1186/s12884-018-2019-3. PMID: 30285669; PMCID: PMC6171293
81. Priye A, Bird S, Light Y. et al. A smartphone-based diagnostic platform for rapid detection of Zika, chikungunya, and dengue viruses. *Sci Rep* 7. 2017. 44778. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep44778>
82. Proctor E, Silmere H, Raghavan R, Hovmand P, Aarons G, Bunger A, Griffey R, Hensley M. Outcomes for implementation research: conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and research agenda. *Adm Policy Ment Health*. 2011 Mar;38(2):65-76. doi: 10.1007/s10488-010-0319-7. PMID: 20957426; PMCID: PMC3068522

83. Rajarethinam J, Ong J, Lim SH, Tay YH, Bounliphone W, Chong CS, Yap G, Ng LC. Using Human Movement Data to Identify Potential Areas of Zika Transmission: Case Study of the Largest Zika Cluster in Singapore. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*. 2019;16:808. doi: 10.3390/ijerph16050808
84. Randriamiarana R, Raminosoa G, Vonjitsara N, et al. Evaluation of the reinforced integrated disease surveillance and response strategy using short message service data transmission in two southern regions of Madagascar, 2014-15. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2018;18 10.1186/s12913-018-3081-2
85. Randrianasolo L, et al. Sentinel surveillance system for early outbreak detection in Madagascar. *BMC Public Health*. 2010;10:31
86. Reddy E, Kumar S, Rollings N, Chandra R. Mobile Application for Dengue Fever Monitoring and Tracking via GPS: Case Study for Fiji. arXiv:1503.00814v1. 2015.
URL:<https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.00814>
87. Robertson R. Using Information to Promote Healthy Behaviours. King's Fund. April 2008. Accessed on: 28th August 2020. Available on https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/sites/default/files/field/field_document/information-promote-healthy-behaviours-kicking-bad-habits-supporting-paper-ruth-robertson.pdf
88. Rodriguez-Valero N, Oroz ML, Sanchez DC, Vladimirov A, Espriu M, Vera I, et al. Mobile based surveillance platform for detecting Zika virus among Spanish delegates attending the Rio de Janeiro Olympic games. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(8):e0201943. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0201943
89. Rong Z, Wang Q, Sun N, Jia X, Wang K, Xiao R, Wang S. (2018). Smartphone-based fluorescent lateral flow immunoassay platform for highly sensitive point-of-care detection of Zika virus nonstructural protein 1. *Analytica Chimica Acta*. 2018;1055, 140–147. DOI: 10.1016/j.aca.2018.12.043
90. Royston G, Hagar C, Long LA, McMahon D, Pakenham-Walsh N, Wadhwani N, Mobile health-care information for all: a global challenge. mHIFA Working Group (Mobile Healthcare Information For All). *Lancet Glob Health*. 2015 Jul; 3(7):e356-7
91. Sallis A, et al. Pre-notification and reminder SMS text messages with behaviourally informed invitation letters to improve uptake of NHS Health Checks: a factorial randomised controlled trial. *BMC Public Health*. 2019;19(1):1162
92. Sanavria A. et al. Intelligent monitoring of *Aedes aegypti* in a rural area of Rio de Janeiro State. *Revista do Instituto de Medicina Tropical de São Paulo*. 2017;59, e51:1-e51:9
93. Sareen S, Gupta SK, Sood SK. An intelligent and secure system for predicting and preventing Zika virus outbreak using Fog computing, *Enterprise Information Systems*. 2010;11(9), 1436–1456
94. Schnall R, Rojas M, Bakken S, Brown W, Carballo-Dieiguez A, Carry M, Gelaude D, Mosley JP, Travers J. A user-centered model for designing consumer mobile health (mHealth) applications (apps) *J Biomed Inform*. 2016 Apr;60:243–51. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2016.02.002
95. Schwebel FJ, Larimer ME. Using text message reminders in health care services: a narrative literature review. *Internet Interv*. 2018;13:82–104. doi: 10.1016/j.invent.2018.06.002

96. Sood SK, Mahajan I. Wearable IoT sensor based healthcare system for identifying and controlling chikungunya virus, *Computers in Industry* 91(Supplement C). 2017, p. 33–44
97. St Clair-Sullivan N, Mwamba C, Whetham J, Bolton Moore C, Darking M, Vera J. Barriers to HIV care and adherence for young people living with HIV in Zambia and mHealth. *Mhealth*. 2019 Sep 30;5:45. doi: 10.21037/mhealth.2019.09.02. PMID: 31620472; PMCID: PMC6789205
98. Stephan LS, Dytz Almeida E, Guimaraes RB, Ley AG, Mathias RG, Assis MV, Leiria TL. Processes and Recommendations for Creating mHealth Apps for Low-Income Populations. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2017 Apr 3;5(4):e41. doi: 10.2196/mhealth.6510. PMID: 28373155; PMCID: PMC5394264
99. Thiha A, Ibrahim F. A colorimetric enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) detection platform for a point-of-care dengue detection system on a lab-on-compact-disc. *Sensors* 2015;15:11431–11441. doi: 10.3390/s150511431
100. Toda M, Njeru I, Zurovac D, et al. Effectiveness of a mobile short-message-service-based disease outbreak alert system in Kenya. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2016; 22:711–5
101. Toda M, Njeru I, Zurovac D, Kareko D, O-Tipo S, Mwau M, et al. Understanding mSOS: A qualitative study examining the implementation of a text-messaging outbreak alert system in rural Kenya. *PLoS ONE*. 2017; 12(6):e0179408. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179408>
102. Tomlinson M, Rotheram-Borus MJ, Swartz L, Tsai AC. Scaling up mhealth: Where is the evidence?. *PLoS Med*. 2013; 10(2). doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed
103. Tran MC, Labrique AB, Mehra S, Ali H, Shaikh S, Mitra M, Christian P, West Jr K. Analyzing the mobile digital divide: changing determinants of household phone ownership over time in rural Bangladesh. *JMIR mHealth uHealth*, 3. 2015
104. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, Straus SE. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2018; 169(7), 467. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
105. Turel O, Serenko A. Mobile Telephony as a Universal Service. *Encyclopedia of E-Business Development and Management in the Global Economy*. 2010. DOI: 10.4018/978-1-61520-611-7.ch085
106. Vannavong N, Seidu R, Stenström TA, Dada N, Overgaard HJ. Effects of socio-demographic characteristics and household water management on *Aedes aegypti* production in suburban and rural villages in Laos and Thailand. *Parasit Vectors*. 2017 Apr 4;10(1):170. doi: 10.1186/s13071-017-2107-7. PMID: 28376893; PMCID: PMC5381031
107. Ventola CL. Mobile devices and apps for health care professionals: uses and benefits. *Pharm Ther*. 2014;39(5):356–64. <http://europepmc.org/abstract/MED/24883008>
108. Weaver SC, Charlier C, Vasilakis N, Lecuit M. Zika, Chikungunya, and Other Emerging Vector-Borne Viral Diseases. *Annu Rev Med*. 2018; 69():395-408
109. Wesolowski A, Qureshi T, Boni MF, Sundsøy PR, Johansson MA, Rasheed SB, Engø-Monsen K, Buckee CO. Impact of human mobility on the emergence of dengue epidemics in Pakistan. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 2015;112, 11887–11892

110. World Health Organization. mHealth: new horizons for health through mobile technologies Geneva, Switzerland: WHO; 2011
111. World Health Organization. Dengue vaccine: WHO position paper, July 2016. Weekly epidemiological record 2016; 91(30): 349–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.10.070>
112. World Health Organization. Dengue y dengue grave. Organización Mundial de la Salud website. <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs117/es>. Published September 13, 2018 Accessed February 12, 2019
113. World Health Organization. eHealth. Available online: <https://www.who.int/ehealth/en/>. Accessed on 4 August 2020
114. Wu PC, Lay JG, Guo HR, Lin CY, Lung SC, Su HJ Sci Total Environ. Higher temperature and urbanization affect the spatial patterns of dengue fever transmission in subtropical Taiwan. 2009; 407(7):2224-33
115. Wu TP, Tian JH, Xue RD, Fang YL, Zheng AH. Mosquito (Diptera: Culicidae) Habitat Surveillance by Android Mobile Devices in Guangzhou, China. Insects; 2016;7(4). pii: E79. doi: 10.3390/insects7040079
116. Zafar, F., Hassan, R.S., Mahmood, Z.: Effective use of ictand emerging cellulartechnologies for health care: E-govt reshaping governanceinto good governance.Journal of Economics, Business and Management. 2, 3, 236 – 241 2014

Figures




Figure 1

Selection process in the PRISMA flow diagram




Figure 2

Geographic distribution of mobile phone-based studies

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Additionalfile1.docx](#)