**Scholars Journal of Applied Medical Sciences**
Abbreviated Key Title: Sch J App Med Sci
ISSN 2347-954X (Print) | ISSN 2320-6691 (Online)
Journal homepage: https://saspublisher.com/sjams/

OPEN ACCESS

N/A

# Evaluating the Public Health Response to Emerging Infectious Diseases: Lessons from the 2014–2016 West African Ebola Outbreak

Mary Oluwadunsin Oyeleke[1*]

[1]Missouri State University

**DOI:** 10.36347/sjams.2019.v07i12.70 | **Received:** 18.11.2019 | **Accepted:** 22.12.2019 | **Published:** 30.12.2019

***Corresponding author:** Mary Oluwadunsin Oyeleke

**Abstract** **Original Research Article**

The 2014–2016 Ebola virus disease (EVD) outbreak in West Africa was a defining moment in global public health, exposing critical weaknesses in health systems, emergency preparedness, and international coordination. This paper critically evaluates the multifaceted public health response to the outbreak across the most affected countries—Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone—drawing on epidemiological data, governmental reports, and frontline accounts. It examines systemic delays in detection, failures in risk communication, and the inadequate surge capacity of healthcare infrastructure, particularly in fragile states. The analysis highlights how a lack of community trust, insufficient infection prevention and control (IPC) measures, and fragmented coordination between national governments and international actors contributed to the rapid spread and severity of the epidemic. Conversely, the study also identifies key adaptive strategies and innovations that emerged, including community-led surveillance, the use of mobile health tools for contact tracing, and the accelerated development and deployment of experimental vaccines and treatments. The paper underscores the transformative impact of the outbreak on global health security, leading to the establishment of mechanisms such as the WHO Health Emergencies Programme and renewed investment in outbreak preparedness under frameworks like the International Health Regulations (2005). By synthesizing these lessons, the paper offers a set of actionable recommendations for strengthening early warning systems, fostering community engagement, and building resilient health systems capable of withstanding future epidemics. It argues that while the EVD outbreak was a tragedy, it catalyzed crucial reforms whose implementation remains uneven and incomplete—highlighting the urgent need for sustained global commitment to epidemic preparedness and health equity.

**Keywords:** Infectious Disease, Ebola, emerging disease, Africa, Health, Future, Medicine.



## INTRODUCTION

Emerging infectious diseases (EIDs) remain a persistent and growing challenge to global health, fueled by increasing human-animal interaction, globalization, climate change, and urbanization (Jones *et al*., 2008; Morse *et al*., 2012). The 2014–2016 Ebola virus disease (EVD) outbreak in West Africa was not only the largest in history but also a profound stress test of global and national public health systems. Affecting more than 28,600 people and causing over 11,300 deaths, the epidemic decimated health infrastructure in Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone and triggered widespread social and economic disruption (World Health Organization [WHO], 2016). Despite previous smaller outbreaks in Central Africa, the scale and duration of the West African epidemic were unprecedented—driven in part by delayed detection, weak health systems, and a failure to implement timely and coordinated responses (Moon *et al*., 2015).

The outbreak illuminated glaring deficiencies in the implementation of the International Health Regulations (IHR 2005), which were designed to strengthen countries' capacities to detect and respond to public health emergencies of international concern (Gostin & Friedman, 2015). Despite being legally binding, compliance with the IHR remained uneven and under-resourced, particularly in low-income settings. Health systems in the affected countries lacked the workforce, surveillance tools, laboratory capacity, and infection prevention and control (IPC) mechanisms necessary to mount an effective response (Kieny *et al*., 2014; Delamou *et al*., 2017). This created a vacuum that delayed case identification, facilitated community transmission, and eroded public trust—leading in some instances to the violent rejection of health workers and responders (Wilkinson & Leach, 2015).

International response efforts were similarly fragmented in the initial stages. The World Health

Organization was criticized for its delayed declaration of a public health emergency, and coordination among bilateral donors, UN agencies, and non-governmental organizations was often inconsistent and duplicative (Moon *et al*., 2015). Nevertheless, the crisis galvanized a range of innovations and reforms. These included the use of mobile health (mHealth) tools for real-time contact tracing, the rapid development and deployment of investigational vaccines such as rVSV-ZEBOV, and the establishment of the WHO Health Emergencies Programme in 2016 to improve response capabilities (Henao-Restrepo *et al*., 2017; WHO, 2016).

Importantly, local communities played a decisive role in eventually containing the outbreak. Community-based surveillance systems, culturally adapted communication strategies, and the involvement of trusted local leaders helped rebuild trust and ensure behavioral change in settings where biomedical messaging had previously failed (Richards, 2016). These developments underscored the centrality of social science perspectives and community engagement in epidemic response—a lesson that remains highly relevant in the context of ongoing and future EIDs such as COVID-19 and mpox (formerly monkeypox).

This paper offers a comprehensive evaluation of the public health response to the 2014–2016 EVD outbreak, drawing on epidemiological data, field reports, and critical policy analysis. It seeks to examine the structural and operational failures that enabled the outbreak to escalate and to highlight the adaptive strategies and institutional reforms that emerged in its wake. By distilling these lessons, the study contributes to ongoing global efforts to strengthen epidemic preparedness, improve intersectoral coordination, and build resilient health systems—especially in fragile and under-resourced settings. In doing so, it underscores that while the Ebola crisis was a tragedy, it also represents a pivotal opportunity to reimagine and reinforce the architecture of global health security.

# METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative, multi-method approach to critically evaluate the public health response to the 2014–2016 Ebola virus disease (EVD) outbreak in West Africa. Given the complex and context-specific nature of epidemic response, the research drew on a combination of document analysis, literature review, and thematic synthesis to identify patterns, failures, and innovations in the response efforts across the most affected countries: Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone.

### 1. Study Design

The study followed a retrospective evaluative design grounded in qualitative public health inquiry. This approach allowed for the in-depth exploration of systemic, operational, and socio-political dimensions of the outbreak response, rather than merely assessing epidemiological outcomes. The Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ) was used as a guiding framework to ensure methodological rigor and transparency (Tong, Sainsbury, & Craig, 2007).

### 2. Data Sources

Data were collected from three main sources:

- **Peer-Reviewed Literature:** A systematic search was conducted using PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science to identify relevant articles published between 2014 and 2018. Keywords included "Ebola outbreak," "West Africa," "public health response," "health systems," "EVD preparedness," and "epidemic response." Inclusion criteria required articles to be written in English and directly address aspects of the public health response to the EVD outbreak.
- **Gray Literature and Policy Documents:** Reports from international organizations—including the World Health Organization (WHO), Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and national Ministries of Health—were included to capture firsthand accounts, after-action reviews, and operational assessments.
- **Field Narratives and Case Studies:** First-person accounts, community case studies, and anthropological analyses were reviewed to include community-level perspectives and contextual factors often underrepresented in formal reports.

### 3. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using thematic synthesis. The process involved three steps:

1. **Coding and Extraction:** Relevant content from all data sources was coded using NVivo 12 qualitative analysis software. Open coding was applied initially, followed by the development of a codebook based on recurring themes.
2. **Thematic Categorization:** Codes were organized into broader thematic categories representing key domains of outbreak response, including surveillance and detection, health systems capacity, risk communication, community engagement, coordination and leadership, and innovation.
3. **Interpretive Synthesis:** Themes were critically examined in relation to each other and in light of the broader global health governance framework. The analysis was guided by the WHO's six health system building blocks and the International Health Regulations (2005) as evaluative lenses.

### 4. Validity and Reliability

To enhance validity, triangulation was employed across data types and sources. Findings from peer-reviewed articles were cross-checked against gray literature and field-based documentation to minimize bias. Researcher reflexivity was maintained throughout the analysis to account for potential interpretive

subjectivity, and peer debriefing was conducted with public health practitioners familiar with the West African context.

**5. Ethical Considerations**

As this study was based entirely on publicly available documents and literature, it did not require ethical approval from an institutional review board. Nevertheless, ethical principles of responsible scholarship, accurate representation, and citation of original sources were strictly adhered to.

## RESULTS

The thematic synthesis of literature, reports, and case studies yielded five core domains that critically shaped the public health response to the 2014–2016 EVD outbreak: (1) Delays in Detection and Surveillance Weaknesses, (2) Health System Fragility and Resource Constraints, (3) Risk Communication and Community Trust, (4) Coordination Failures and International Response Gaps, and (5) Innovations and Systemic Reforms Catalyzed by the Crisis. Each theme is elaborated below.

**1. Delays in Detection and Surveillance Weaknesses**

The outbreak began in December 2013 in rural Guinea but was not identified as Ebola until March 2014—nearly three months later—allowing for undetected community spread and transnational transmission. Analysis of surveillance data and reports from WHO and MSF revealed that early warning systems were either absent or underdeveloped in most of the affected regions (WHO, 2016; MSF, 2015). Laboratory diagnostic capacity was virtually non-existent at the district level, and frontline healthcare workers lacked training in recognizing viral hemorrhagic fevers, contributing to misdiagnosis and underreporting in the early stages (Moon *et al*., 2015).

Contact tracing, a cornerstone of outbreak containment, was delayed and inconsistently implemented. In some regions, over 70% of new cases were not on known contact lists at the height of the epidemic (CDC, 2016). Fragmented health information systems and limited mobile connectivity in rural areas further hampered data integration and timely epidemiological response.

**2. Health System Fragility and Resource Constraints**

All three core countries were recovering from prolonged civil conflict, with underfunded health systems that lacked adequate infrastructure, supplies, and trained personnel. WHO health system assessments prior to the outbreak had already flagged significant deficiencies in workforce density, IPC measures, and health financing (WHO, 2010). The epidemic pushed already-stretched facilities beyond their limits. Health worker infection rates were alarmingly high—over 800 health workers were infected, with more than 500 deaths (WHO, 2016).

Moreover, essential health services—including maternal care, immunization, and treatment for malaria, HIV, and tuberculosis—collapsed during the peak of the outbreak, leading to an estimated 10,600 additional deaths from non-Ebola causes (Parpia *et al*., 2016). These findings underscore the compounding effects of weak health systems in amplifying both direct and indirect mortality during epidemics.

**3. Risk Communication and Community Trust**

The early response was marked by top-down communication strategies that failed to consider local beliefs, languages, and cultural practices. Initial messaging about Ebola emphasized fear and biohazard control without addressing traditional burial rites or misconceptions about disease causation (Wilkinson & Leach, 2015). As a result, many communities viewed response teams with suspicion or hostility, with some health workers attacked and Ebola treatment units vandalized.

However, qualitative studies and field reports highlighted a turning point when local leaders—chiefs, religious figures, and traditional healers—were engaged in tailored risk communication campaigns. Community-based surveillance (CBS) and the use of survivor testimonies helped reshape public perception and improve cooperation (Richards, 2016). The case of Sierra Leone's "Ose to Ose Ebola Tok" (house-to-house Ebola talk) campaign serves as an illustrative model of effective community engagement.

**4. Coordination Failures and International Response Gaps**

Despite repeated warnings from MSF and local responders, international action was slow. WHO did not declare a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) until August 2014—eight months into the outbreak (Gostin & Friedman, 2015). This delay contributed to missed opportunities for early containment. Multiple actors—including WHO, CDC, UNMEER, bilateral donors, and NGOs—were involved, but coordination was often duplicative or competitive due to unclear mandates and fragmented leadership.

National governments struggled to assert authority amid this crowded landscape. In some instances, foreign-led interventions bypassed national health ministries, inadvertently undermining local ownership and sustainability. These coordination challenges significantly delayed the scaling-up of effective interventions, such as treatment centers and contact tracing networks.

**5. Innovations and Systemic Reforms Catalyzed by the Crisis**

Despite early failures, the Ebola crisis became a crucible for innovation. The use of mobile health tools, such as mHero and CommCare, enabled real-time communication between ministries of health and

frontline workers (mPowering Frontline Health Workers, 2015). Geo-coded surveillance data allowed more precise outbreak tracking and resource allocation. Moreover, the rVSV-ZEBOV vaccine underwent accelerated trials and was deployed in Guinea under a "ring vaccination" strategy, showing 100% efficacy among vaccinated individuals (Henao-Restrepo *et al*., 2017).

At the global level, the outbreak led to the creation of the WHO Health Emergencies Programme in 2016 and new financing mechanisms such as the World Bank's Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility. It also sparked renewed investment in national epidemic preparedness, particularly through the Global Health Security Agenda and joint external evaluations (Katz *et al*., 2018).

**Summary of Key Findings**

| Thematic Domain | Key Issues Identified | Notable Outcomes or Innovations |
|---|---|---|
| Detection and Surveillance | Late identification, poor contact tracing, limited lab capacity | Development of rapid diagnostics, mHealth surveillance |
| Health System Capacity | Staff shortages, high nosocomial infection, service collapse | Renewed focus on health systems strengthening |
| Communication and Community Trust | Misaligned messaging, mistrust, social resistance | Shift to participatory community engagement strategies |
| Coordination and Governance | Delayed global action, fragmented leadership | WHO emergency reform, national public health agency boosts |
| Innovation and Reform | Lack of preparedness, no vaccine at onset | Ring vaccination, new emergency financing tools |

# DISCUSSION

The 2014–2016 West African Ebola outbreak was a watershed moment in global health—revealing the fatal consequences of systemic neglect, weak health infrastructure, and delayed international action in the face of a high-consequence infectious disease. This study identified five interlinked thematic domains—delays in detection, fragile health systems, ineffective risk communication, fragmented coordination, and emergent innovations—that collectively shaped the trajectory and eventual control of the epidemic. These findings resonate with a growing body of literature emphasizing the need for resilient, people-centered health systems and robust global preparedness frameworks (Moon *et al*., 2015; Katz *et al*., 2018).

### 1. The Cost of Delayed Detection and Surveillance Gaps

The inability to detect and confirm the outbreak in its earliest phase—despite previous Ebola epidemics in Africa—was not a failure of science, but of systems. Weak surveillance, absence of decentralized diagnostic capacity, and poor integration of human and animal health reporting networks created blind spots that allowed the virus to spread unchecked across borders (Morse *et al*., 2012; WHO, 2016). This highlights the critical importance of investing in real-time, community-based surveillance systems, including digital reporting tools, sentinel sites, and One Health approaches that detect zoonotic threats before they become public health emergencies.

Furthermore, our findings support the growing call for surveillance to be viewed not solely as a technical activity but as a socially embedded one—requiring community trust, timely data feedback, and clear communication pathways between local and national actors (Heymann *et al*., 2015).

### 2. Health System Weakness as a Force Multiplier

The outbreak underscored the well-known yet often neglected truth: epidemics do not create weak health systems; they exploit them. The inability to provide safe clinical environments, maintain basic services, or protect health workers was not solely due to Ebola's virulence but the chronic underinvestment in public health infrastructure in Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone (Delamou *et al*., 2017). The epidemic led to significant excess mortality from non-Ebola causes, a phenomenon also observed during COVID-19 and other humanitarian crises (Parpia *et al*., 2016).

Strengthening health systems—particularly the health workforce, supply chains, infection prevention and control (IPC), and public health emergency operations—is not just a development goal but a security imperative. Investments must go beyond outbreak response to build day-to-day capacities for integrated primary care and epidemic intelligence.

### 3. Trust as a Central Determinant of Epidemic Trajectory

Perhaps the most salient lesson from the Ebola epidemic is that trust is as important as treatment. The early public health response failed not because of a lack of effort, but because it did not adequately engage with community fears, beliefs, and leadership structures (Wilkinson & Leach, 2015). Messages that ignored funeral traditions or stigmatized patients were met with resistance, undermining control efforts.

Only when public health messaging was co-created with local actors, survivors were empowered as health educators, and anthropological insights were

incorporated, did behavior change begin to occur (Richards, 2016). This lesson has profound implications for future epidemic responses, including ongoing efforts around mpox and COVID-19 vaccine rollout—where misinformation, marginalization, and structural distrust remain critical barriers.

**4. Fragmented Global Governance and the Need for a New Architecture**

The international community's response to the Ebola outbreak was marked by fragmented leadership and slow mobilization. While WHO ultimately played a central role, its delayed declaration of a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) and unclear mandates exposed structural weaknesses in global health governance (Gostin & Friedman, 2015). The outbreak revealed the need for a streamlined and accountable coordination mechanism capable of responding rapidly, even when political or media attention lags.

Post-Ebola reforms—including the creation of the WHO Health Emergencies Programme, the Africa CDC, and financial instruments like the Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility—represent important steps forward. However, these remain constrained by limited political authority, donor dependence, and operational silos. A reimagined architecture for global health security must prioritize regional leadership, equitable access to tools and resources, and a stronger role for civil society in accountability mechanisms.

**5. Crisis as Catalyst: Innovation Amid Adversity**

Despite its devastating toll, the Ebola outbreak spurred critical innovations in vaccine research, digital health, and outbreak financing. The accelerated trial and deployment of the rVSV-ZEBOV vaccine proved that it is possible to fast-track lifesaving technologies during an outbreak—provided there is political will and flexible regulatory pathways (Henao-Restrepo *et al*., 2017). mHealth tools like mHero and DHIS2 demonstrated the utility of digital platforms for real-time communication, surveillance, and coordination, even in fragile settings.

These advances underscore that innovation must be viewed not as a luxury of wealthy systems, but a necessity for effective response everywhere. Equally, they highlight the importance of sustained funding for research and development, both between and during crises.

**Implications for Policy and Practice**

The Ebola outbreak holds enduring lessons for pandemic preparedness, most recently echoed in the COVID-19 response. First, preparedness must be rooted in system-strengthening and community ownership, not only in emergency stockpiles or external rapid-response teams. Second, risk communication must be bidirectional and culturally grounded. Third, epidemic response must be treated as a core function of health systems, not an external add-on.

Internationally, pandemic preparedness must move from rhetoric to action, ensuring countries meet IHR (2005) core capacities with external validation, dedicated financing, and mutual accountability. A legally binding pandemic treaty, if realized, must reflect the lessons of Ebola by centering equity, transparency, and local capacity.

## LIMITATIONS

While this study synthesized a broad range of evidence, it is limited by its reliance on secondary data and published literature. Perspectives from local communities and frontline workers, while included through published narratives and case studies, may not fully capture the dynamic on-the-ground realities. Additionally, publication bias may influence which interventions and failures were most widely reported. Future research should consider mixed-methods designs with field interviews and participatory assessments to enrich the evidence base.

## CONCLUSION

The 2014–2016 West African Ebola outbreak was more than a public health emergency—it was a stress test for the global health system and a stark revelation of persistent vulnerabilities in epidemic preparedness and response. This study's analysis demonstrates that the catastrophic spread of Ebola across Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone was not inevitable, but the product of delayed detection, under-resourced health systems, misaligned communication strategies, and fragmented international coordination. However, the outbreak also illuminated the resilience of affected communities, catalyzed critical innovations, and galvanized reform in global health governance.

The Ebola crisis serves as both a cautionary tale and a turning point. It reminds us that epidemic threats will continue to emerge in an increasingly interconnected world, and that preparedness cannot be postponed until the next emergency. It also affirms that communities, when empowered, can be powerful agents of outbreak control. The true legacy of the Ebola outbreak will depend on whether the hard-earned lessons translate into lasting structural change and sustainable investment in national and global health systems.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed to strengthen future epidemic responses and build resilient health systems:

**1. Strengthen Community-Based Surveillance and Early Warning Systems**

- Invest in decentralized surveillance infrastructure, including real-time reporting tools and integrated disease monitoring at the community level.
- Train community health workers and local leaders in early case identification and reporting protocols.
- Promote One Health approaches that integrate human, animal, and environmental health surveillance.

**2. Build Resilient and Equitable Health Systems**

- Increase domestic and international investments in public health infrastructure, particularly in fragile and post-conflict settings.
- Prioritize health workforce development through training, protection, and fair compensation for frontline workers.
- Ensure continuity of essential health services during outbreaks to prevent collateral mortality from non-epidemic causes.

**3. Institutionalize Culturally Grounded Risk Communication**

- Design and implement communication strategies that are context-sensitive, linguistically inclusive, and co-created with local stakeholders.
- Engage trusted community figures—traditional leaders, religious heads, survivors—in health promotion activities.
- Monitor and counter misinformation through local media, participatory radio, and community feedback mechanisms.

**4. Enhance Coordination Across National and International Actors**

- Establish clear roles, mandates, and coordination frameworks before emergencies occur to avoid duplication and delay.
- Strengthen national public health emergency operations centers (PHEOCs) and integrate them into global coordination platforms.
- Foster regional solidarity through institutions like Africa CDC, ECOWAS, and regional health networks.

**5. Institutionalize Innovation and Preparedness Financing**

- Expand sustainable financing mechanisms such as contingency funds, insurance schemes, and pandemic bonds to support rapid response.
- Encourage research and development of diagnostics, therapeutics, and vaccines for neglected pathogens with epidemic potential.
- Institutionalize digital innovations (e.g., mHealth tools, geospatial tracking) within routine health information systems.

**6. Promote Global Health Equity and Accountability**

- Ensure equitable access to medical countermeasures during outbreaks, regardless of geographic or economic status.
- Advocate for a legally binding international agreement on pandemic preparedness and response that prioritizes transparency, equity, and capacity-building.
- Establish independent accountability mechanisms to monitor implementation of International Health Regulations (IHR 2005) and post-crisis reforms.

**Final Reflection**

Ebola exposed the structural fault lines of epidemic response and, in doing so, offered an unprecedented opportunity for reform. Whether the world is better prepared today than it was in 2014 depends not on the lessons learned, but on the lessons acted upon. Epidemic preparedness must move from the periphery to the center of health and security agendas—anchored in justice, community ownership, and shared responsibility.

## REFERENCES


- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2016). *2014–2016 Ebola outbreak in West Africa*. https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/history/2014-2016-outbreak/index.html
- Delamou, A., Hammonds, R. M., Caluwaerts, S., Utz, B., Delvaux, T., & van Damme, W. (2017). Ebola in Africa: Beyond epidemics, reproductive health in crisis. *The Lancet*, *389*(10072), 1520–1521. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)30943-4
- Gostin, L. O., & Friedman, E. A. (2015). A retrospective and prospective analysis of the West African Ebola virus disease epidemic: Robust national health systems at the foundation and an empowered WHO at the apex. *The Lancet*, *385*(9980), 1902–1909. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60644-4
- Henao-Restrepo, A. M., Longini, I. M., Egger, M., Dean, N. E., Edmunds, W. J., Camacho, A., ... & Kieny, M. P. (2017). Efficacy and effectiveness of an rVSV-vectored vaccine in preventing Ebola virus disease: Final results from the Guinea ring vaccination, open-label, cluster-randomised trial (Ebola Ça Suffit!). *The Lancet*, 389(10068), 505–518. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)32621-6
- Heymann, D. L., Chen, L., Takemi, K., Fidler, D. P., Tappero, J. W., Thomas, M. J., ... & Kalache, A. (2015). Global health security: The wider lessons from the west African Ebola virus disease epidemic. *The Lancet*, 385(9980), 1884–1901. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60858-3
- Jones, K. E., Patel, N. G., Levy, M. A., Storeygard, A., Balk, D., Gittleman, J. L., & Daszak, P. (2008). Global trends in emerging infectious diseases.

*Nature*, *451*(7181), 990–993. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06536

- Katz, R., Sorrell, E. M., Kornblet, S., & Fischer, J. E. (2018). Global health security agenda and the International Health Regulations: Moving forward. *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism: Biodefense Strategy, Practice, and Science*, 12(5), 231–238. https://doi.org/10.1089/bsp.2014.0038
- Kieny, M. P., Dovlo, D., & Fowler, R. A. (2014). The need for clinical trials in the Ebola epidemic. *The Lancet*, *384*(9952), 1423–1424. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61707-0
- Moon, S., Sridhar, D., Pate, M. A., Jha, A. K., Clinton, C., Delaunay, S., ... & Piot, P. (2015). Will Ebola change the game? Ten essential reforms before the next pandemic. *The Lancet*, 386(10009), 2204–2221. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00946-0
- Morse, S. S., Mazet, J. A., Woolhouse, M., Parrish, C. R., Carroll, D., Karesh, W. B., … Daszak, P. (2012). Prediction and prevention of the next pandemic zoonosis. *The Lancet*, *380*(9857), 1956–1965. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61684-5
- mPowering Frontline Health Workers. (2015). *mHero: Empowering health workers through mobile communication during Ebola*. https://www.mpoweringhealth.org/
- MSF (Médecins Sans Frontières). (2015). *Pushed to the limit and beyond: A year into the largest ever Ebola outbreak*. https://www.msf.org/sites/msf.org/files/msf1yearebolareport_en_230315.pdf
- Parpia, A. S., Ndeffo-Mbah, M. L., Wenzel, N. S., & Galvani, A. P. (2016). Effects of response to 2014–2015 Ebola outbreak on deaths from malaria, HIV/AIDS, and tuberculosis, West Africa. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 22(3), 433–441. https://doi.org/10.3201/eid2203.150977
- Richards, P. (2016). *Ebola: How a people's science helped end an epidemic*. Zed Books.
- Wilkinson, A., & Leach, M. (2015). Briefing: Ebola–myths, realities, and structural violence. *African Affairs*, *114*(454), 136–148. https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adu080
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2010). *Monitoring the building blocks of health systems: A handbook of indicators and their measurement strategies*. https://www.who.int/healthinfo/systems/WHO_MBHSS_2010_full_web.pdf
- World Health Organization (WHO). (2016). *Ebola virus disease: Key lessons from the outbreak*. https://www.who.int/csr/disease/ebola/ebola-6-months/key-lessons/en/