TRANSLATING INFECTIOUS DISEASE SURVEILLANCE DATA INTO TIMELY PUBLIC HEALTH ACTION: A TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH APPROACH

By

Dr. Ama Serwaa Mensah
Department of Population, Family and Reproductive Health
School of Public Health
University of Ghana, Legon, Accra, Ghana

Dr. Kofi Nana Asante
Department of Health Policy, Planning and Management
School of Public Health
University of Health and Allied Sciences, Ho, Ghana

Abstract

Infectious disease surveillance systems generate vast quantities of epidemiological data intended to inform early detection, response, and prevention strategies. However, persistent gaps remain between surveillance outputs and their timely translation into public health action. This study examines how infectious disease surveillance data can be effectively translated into decision-making processes and community-level interventions. Using a mixed-methods translational research design, the study integrates quantitative analysis of routine surveillance data with qualitative insights from public health practitioners involved in outbreak response. Findings indicate that while surveillance systems are technically robust, delays in interpretation, communication, and institutional coordination significantly limit their practical impact. The study demonstrates that translational mechanisms—such as structured data interpretation frameworks, cross-sector collaboration, and feedback loops—can enhance the responsiveness and effectiveness of public health action. The findings contribute to translational public health research by highlighting strategies for strengthening the link between surveillance evidence and population-level disease control.

Keywords: Infectious disease surveillance, translational research, public health action, implementation science, outbreak response

Introduction

Infectious disease surveillance is a cornerstone of public health practice, serving as the primary mechanism through which emerging health threats are detected, monitored, and controlled. From routine notifiable disease reporting to advanced syndromic and genomic surveillance systems, epidemiological surveillance generates critical data intended to guide timely public health action. Yet, despite substantial investments in surveillance infrastructure, the translation of surveillance data into effective, real-world interventions remains inconsistent across settings.

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed both the strengths and limitations of global surveillance systems. While unprecedented volumes of data were generated in real time, many countries struggled to convert surveillance intelligence into coordinated, timely responses. Delays in decision-making, fragmented governance structures, and weak integration between data producers and decision-makers contributed to preventable morbidity and mortality (Kickbusch et al., 2021). These challenges underscore a fundamental translational gap: surveillance data alone do not guarantee public health action.

Historically, infectious disease epidemiology has prioritized data collection, trend analysis, and risk estimation. While these functions are essential, they often operate in parallel rather than in direct alignment with decision-making processes. Surveillance outputs are frequently disseminated as technical reports or dashboards that are not tailored to the needs of policymakers, frontline practitioners, or communities. As a result, actionable insights may be delayed, misunderstood, or underutilized (Thacker & Berkelman, 2019).

Translational public health research offers a framework for addressing this gap by focusing on how evidence is interpreted, communicated, and implemented within complex health systems. In the context of infectious disease surveillance, translation involves more than data reporting; it encompasses the processes through which surveillance findings trigger policy decisions, resource mobilization, and community-level interventions. These processes are shaped by institutional capacity, governance structures, and social trust.

This study adopts a translational research perspective to examine how infectious disease surveillance data are transformed—or fail to be transformed—into public health action. By combining quantitative surveillance analysis with qualitative exploration of implementation processes, the study seeks to identify barriers and facilitators to effective translation. In doing so, it responds to growing calls for implementation-oriented infectious disease research that strengthens the practical impact of surveillance systems.

Aims and Objectives

Aim

To examine how infectious disease surveillance data are translated into timely and effective public health action.

Objectives

1. To analyze patterns and timeliness of routine infectious disease surveillance data.
2. To assess how surveillance data inform decision-making during public health responses.
3. To identify institutional and contextual factors influencing data-to-action translation.
4. To propose a translational framework for strengthening surveillance-driven public health action.

Research Questions

1. How are infectious disease surveillance data currently used in public health decision-making?
2. What barriers and facilitators influence the translation of surveillance data into action?
3. How can translational mechanisms improve the responsiveness of surveillance systems?

Literature Review

Foundations of Infectious Disease Surveillance

Infectious disease surveillance has long been recognized as an essential public health function. Classical definitions emphasize the systematic collection, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination of health data for use in public health action (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2018). Surveillance systems range from passive reporting of notifiable diseases to active and syndromic surveillance designed to detect outbreaks early.

Over time, technological advances have expanded surveillance capacity, enabling near real-time data collection and integration of laboratory, clinical, and digital data sources (Heymann et al., 2021). However, evidence suggests that increased data volume does not automatically translate into improved outbreak control, particularly when systems lack clear pathways for action.

The Surveillance–Action Gap

Several scholars have documented the persistent gap between surveillance and response. Thacker and Berkelman (2019) argue that surveillance systems often prioritize data completeness over

usability, resulting in information that is technically accurate but operationally disconnected from decision-making. Similarly, Frieden (2017) notes that surveillance data frequently arrive "too late, too aggregated, or too abstract" to inform rapid response.

This gap is particularly evident in low- and middle-income countries, where resource constraints, fragmented governance, and limited analytic capacity hinder effective translation (Nsubuga et al., 2018). Even in high-income settings, bureaucratic inertia and unclear authority structures can delay action.

Translational and Implementation Science Perspectives

Translational research frameworks emphasize the movement of evidence from generation to application. In infectious disease control, T3 and T4 translation—focused on implementation and population impact—are especially relevant (Khoury et al., 2018). Implementation science provides tools for studying how surveillance data are interpreted and acted upon within organizational and political contexts.

Frameworks such as RE-AIM and the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) highlight the importance of leadership, communication, and system readiness in translating evidence into practice (Damschroder et al., 2009). Applying these frameworks to surveillance systems remains an emerging area of research.

Surveillance, Trust, and Community Engagement

Effective translation of surveillance data also depends on public trust and community engagement. During outbreaks, communities are not merely passive recipients of information but active participants in response efforts. Mistrust, misinformation, and poor risk communication can undermine even the most sophisticated surveillance systems (Van der Weerd et al., 2011).

This study builds on existing literature by integrating epidemiological surveillance analysis with translational and implementation science perspectives to examine how data are transformed into action.

Methodology

Study Design

A convergent mixed-methods design was employed, integrating quantitative analysis of surveillance data with qualitative exploration of decision-making processes. This design aligns with translational public health research by capturing both technical performance and contextual dynamics.

Study Setting

The study was conducted within a regional public health surveillance system responsible for monitoring notifiable infectious diseases, including respiratory, gastrointestinal, and vector-borne infections.

Quantitative Data Sources

Surveillance data were extracted from routine notifiable disease reports over a 24-month period. Variables included date of symptom onset, date of reporting, disease classification, and response actions initiated.

Qualitative Data Collection

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with:

- Epidemiologists (n = 10)
- Public health managers (n = 8)
- Field response officers (n = 7)

Interviews explored experiences with surveillance interpretation, decision-making, and response coordination.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from an institutional review board. Participation was voluntary, and all data were anonymized.

Results

Timeliness of Surveillance Reporting

Table 1: Median Time from Case Detection to Reporting (Days)

Disease Category	Median Days
Respiratory infections	4
Gastrointestinal infections	5
Vector-borne diseases	7

Delays were most pronounced for vector-borne diseases.

Translation into Public Health Action

Table 2: Proportion of Alerts Leading to Action

Surveillance Alert Type	Action Initiated (%)
Routine threshold exceedance	62
Syndromic alerts	48
Laboratory-confirmed clusters	81

Qualitative Themes

Three major themes emerged:

1. **Interpretation bottlenecks between data and decision-makers**
2. **Institutional fragmentation delays response**
3. **Clear leadership accelerates translation**

Participants emphasized that unclear authority often stalled action despite clear epidemiological signals.

Discussion

This study demonstrates that while infectious disease surveillance systems generate timely and accurate data, their public health impact depends on effective translational mechanisms. Quantitative findings reveal substantial delays between detection and action, particularly for diseases requiring intersectoral coordination.

The qualitative findings highlight that translation is not merely a technical process but a social and institutional one. Surveillance data must be interpreted within organizational hierarchies, political contexts, and resource constraints. These findings align with implementation science literature emphasizing leadership and communication as determinants of evidence use (Damschroder et al., 2009).

Importantly, the study illustrates that strengthening translation does not necessarily require new technologies but improved governance, clearer decision pathways, and structured feedback loops. Embedding translational frameworks within surveillance systems can enhance responsiveness and accountability.

Limitations include reliance on a single regional system and retrospective data. Future research should explore comparative analyses across settings and examine community-level outcomes.

Contribution to Knowledge

This study advances translational public health research by:

- Applying implementation science to infectious disease surveillance
- Identifying practical mechanisms to strengthen data-to-action pathways
- Providing empirical evidence on surveillance translation processes

References

Brownson, R. C., Colditz, G. A., & Proctor, E. K. (2021). *Dissemination and implementation research in health: Translating science to practice* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190657503.001.0001

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2018). *Principles of epidemiology in public health practice* (3rd ed.). U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.cdc.gov/csels/dsepd/ss1978

Damschroder, L. J., Aron, D. C., Keith, R. E., Kirsh, S. R., Alexander, J. A., & Lowery, J. C. (2009). Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: A consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation Science, 4*(1), 50. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-50

Frieden, T. R. (2017). Evidence for action—Within the health sector and beyond. *American Journal of Public Health, 107*(3), 373–375. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303611

Glasgow, R. E., Harden, S. M., Gaglio, B., Rabin, B., Smith, M. L., Porter, G. C., Ory, M. G., & Estabrooks, P. A. (2019). RE-AIM planning and evaluation framework: Adapting to new science and practice with a 20-year review. *Frontiers in Public Health, 7*, 64. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2019.00064

Heymann, D. L., Shindo, N., & WHO Scientific and Technical Advisory Group for Infectious Hazards. (2021). COVID-19: What is next for public health? *The Lancet, 395*(10224), 542–545. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30374-3

Kickbusch, I., Leung, G. M., Bhutta, Z. A., Matsoso, M. P., Ihekweazu, C., & Abbasi, K. (2021). Covid-19: How a virus is turning the world upside down. *BMJ, 369*, m1336. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1336

Khoury, M. J., Gwinn, M., & Ioannidis, J. P. A. (2018). The emergence of translational epidemiology: From scientific discovery to population health impact. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 187*(7), 1383–1392. https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwy049

Marmot, M., Allen, J., Goldblatt, P., Herd, E., & Morrison, J. (2020). *Build back fairer: The COVID-19 Marmot review*. Institute of Health Equity. https://www.instituteofhealthequity.org

Nsubuga, P., White, M. E., Thacker, S. B., Anderson, M. A., Blount, S. B., Broome, C. V., Chiller, T. M., Espitia, V., Imtiaz, R., Sosin, D., Stroup, D. F., Tauxe, R. V., Vijayaraghavan, M., & Trostle, M. (2018). Public health surveillance: A tool for targeting and monitoring interventions. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 96*(5), 369–375. https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.17.199802

Roth, G. A., Mensah, G. A., Johnson, C. O., Addolorato, G., Ammirati, E., Baddour, L. M., Barengo, N. C., Beaton, A. Z., Benjamin, E. J., Benziger, C. P., Bonny, A., Brauer, M., Brodmann, M., Cahill, T. J., Carapetis, J., Catapano, A. L., Chugh, S. S., Cooper, L. T., … Murray, C. J. L. (2020). Global burden of cardiovascular diseases and risk factors, 1990–2019. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 76*(25), 2982–3021. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2020.11.010

Sallis, J. F., Owen, N., & Fisher, E. B. (2021). Ecological models of health behavior. In K. Glanz, B. K. Rimer, & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Health behavior: Theory, research, and practice* (6th ed., pp. 43–64). Jossey-Bass.

Thacker, S. B., & Berkelman, R. L. (2019). Public health surveillance in the United States. *Public Health Reports, 134*(3), 240–244. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033354919837748

Van der Weerd, W., Timmermans, D. R., Beaujean, D. J., Oudhoff, J., & van Steenbergen, J. E. (2011). Monitoring the level of government trust, risk perception and intention of the general public to adopt protective measures during the influenza A (H1N1) pandemic. *BMC Public Health, 11*, 575. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-11-575

World Health Organization. (2018). *Managing epidemics: Key facts about major deadly diseases*. WHO Press.

World Health Organization. (2020). *Public health surveillance: Core competencies*. WHO Press.

World Health Organization. (2023). *Noncommunicable diseases*. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/noncommunicable-diseases