

BMJ Open

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

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

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

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

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

BMJ Open

HealthPathways implementation in a New Zealand health region: a qualitative study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-025094
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Jun-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Stokes, Tim; Otago University, General Practice & Rural Health Tumilty, Emma; University of Texas Medical Branch School of Health Professions, Institute for Translational Sciences Doolan-Noble, F; University of Otago, General Practice and Rural Health Gauld, Robin; University of Otago, Otago Business School
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

HealthPathways implementation in a New Zealand health region: a qualitative study

Tim Stokes^{1*}, Emma Tumilty², Fiona Doolan-Noble¹, Robin Gauld³.

1. Department of General Practice & Rural Health, Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

2. Institute for Translational Sciences, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, Texas, United States

3. Otago Business School, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

*Corresponding Author: tim.stokes@otago.ac.nz

Department of General Practice & Rural Health, Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago, PO Box 56, Dunedin 9054, New Zealand

ABSTRACT

Objectives To explore the process of implementation of an online health information web-based portal and referral system (HealthPathways) using relevant implementation science theory: the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR).

Setting The Southern Health Region of New Zealand (Otago and Southland).

Participants Key Informants (providers and planners of health care) (n=10) who were either involved in the process of implementing HealthPathways or who were intended end-users of HealthPathways.

Methods Semi-structured interviews were undertaken. A deductive thematic analysis using CFIR was conducted using the framework method.

Results CFIR postulates that for an intervention to be implemented successfully account must be taken of both the intervention's core components and the adaptable periphery. The core component of the HealthPathways intervention – the web portal and referral system – had been addressed well by the product developers. Little attention had, however, been paid to the adaptable periphery – it was seen as sufficient to deliver the web portal populated with new HealthPathways to effect successful implementation. In terms of CFIR's "inner setting" corporate and professional cultures, the implementation climate and readiness for implementation were not properly addressed during implementation. There were also multiple failures of the implementation process. As a consequence, implementation of HealthPathways was highly problematic.

Conclusions The use of implementation science theory (CFIR) has furthered our understanding of the factors needed for the successful implementation of a complex health intervention (HealthPathways) in the New Zealand health system. Those charged with implementing complex health interventions should always consider the local context within which they will be implemented and tailor their implementation strategy to address these.

Word Count: 259

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first process evaluation of HealthPathways implementation in New Zealand using qualitative methods and the first evaluation internationally to use an implementation science theory framework.
- The use of implementation science theory (Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research) allowed us to “unpack” the reasons why the implementation of HealthPathways in the Southern Region of New Zealand was so challenging.
- The study focused on a single health region as it was designed in partnership with the local health system to provide context specific findings that would be of benefit to the local health system.
- We were only able to recruit small number of participants who were not involved with the implementation process.

INTRODUCTION

The New Zealand (NZ) health system, in common with those of other jurisdictions,¹ struggles to provide integration of health services across primary and secondary care. One important quality improvement initiative promoted internationally since the 1980s to improve health care integration is care pathways. Care pathways have five key characteristics, they: 1) provide a structured multidisciplinary plan of care; 2) translate national evidence-based clinical guidelines into local structures; 3) detail the components of care required in an algorithm or pathway; 4) provide a time frame or criterion-based progression through the health system; and 5) aim to standardise care for a specific clinical condition in a specific local population.² In NZ a key adaptation has been the embedding of a web-based pathway into general practice-hospital electronic referral management systems (ERMS). The use of care pathways in NZ has been championed by Canterbury District Health Board (DHB), who in 2008 developed an online health information web-based portal and referral system called HealthPathways.³ Currently HealthPathways provides health practitioners with guidance and a referral pathway for over 550 conditions (<https://www.healthpathwayscommunity.org/About.aspx>). There has been rapid adoption of HealthPathways and similar systems across NZ's DHBs and in Australia.⁴⁻⁶ Its advocates claim that HealthPathways is an important means of achieving health care integration,^{7 8} which has been a NZ government priority since the 2009 publication of *Better Sooner More Convenient*.⁹ This claim is supported by an emerging evidence base, chiefly uncontrolled before and after studies, which suggest that HealthPathway use is associated with an improvement in referral quality from primary care to secondary

1
2
3 care and more timely access to secondary care.³ End users of HealthPathways also
4
5 report, in online surveys⁸ and qualitative case studies,^{5 6 10} that they improved their
6
7 knowledge of local services and changed their clinical management decisions.
8
9

10
11
12 One key challenge in evaluating the implementation of HealthPathways is that they can
13
14 be conceptualised as a complex health care intervention¹¹ and thus without a qualitative
15
16 process evaluation it is not possible to determine which aspects of the intervention in a
17
18 defined health care context are likely to lead to its success. In understanding how
19
20 quality improvement initiatives work there is also increasing emphasis on the use of
21
22 theory drawn from the social sciences to better develop quality improvement
23
24 interventions, optimise their design and identify aspects of context necessary for their
25
26 success.^{12 13}
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 In the Southern Health Region of NZ's South Island (Otago and Southland), the
34
35 Southern DHB and the WellSouth Primary Health Network (Primary Health
36
37 Organisation: PHO) are working to further health service integration through Alliance
38
39 South¹⁴, which is a contractual alliance between the two organisations aimed at
40
41 improving care coordination and integration. In 2013 Alliance South embarked upon the
42
43 implementation of HealthPathways in the Southern Region – Southern HealthPathway -
44
45 and by 2017 over 400 HealthPathways had been developed
46
47 (<https://southern.healthpathways.org.nz/>). In 2016 a team of researchers from the
48
49 Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago, partnered with the local health system
50
51 through Alliance South to conduct a mixed methods evaluation of the Southern
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 HealthPathway programme. The overall aim of the collaboration was consistent with the
4
5 United Kingdom's successful Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research
6
7 and Care (CLAHRC) which is to improve patient outcomes through the conduct and
8
9 application of applied health research.¹⁵
10
11
12

13
14 We report here the findings of the qualitative process evaluation. Our study aim was to
15
16 understand the process by which Southern HealthPathways were being implemented
17
18 using a commonly used implementation science theory: the Consolidated Framework
19
20 for Implementation Research (CFIR).^{16 17}
21
22
23

24 25 26 *Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR)*

27
28 The CFIR provides an overarching typology of implementation, providing a
29
30 comprehensive, standardised list of constructs which allow researchers to identify
31
32 variables that are most relevant to a particular intervention. The CFIR addresses
33
34 intervention delivery (context; implementation; mechanisms of action) through 26
35
36 constructs organized into five major domains: intervention characteristics (eight
37
38 constructs), outer setting (four constructs), inner setting (five constructs), characteristics
39
40 of the individuals involved (five constructs), and the process of implementation (four
41
42 constructs) (Table 1) [insert Table 1 here]. CFIR has been widely used to inform
43
44 qualitative process evaluations across a range of complex interventions.¹⁷
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **METHODS**

52 53 54 *Design and sampling*

1
2
3 Semi-structured interviews were conducted by ET between May and November 2016
4
5 with key informants (providers and planners of care) from the Southern DHB catchment
6
7 area (Otago and Southland). The Southern DHB is the southernmost DHB in NZ and is
8
9 responsible for planning, funding and providing health and disability services to a
10
11 population of over 300,000 and serves the largest geographic region of all NZ's DHBs
12
13 (<https://www.southerndhb.govt.nz/index.php?page=654>). The key informants were
14
15 sampled purposively in order to construct a maximum variation sample that aimed to
16
17 include primary care (general practitioners), hospital specialists, community nursing
18
19 services and service planners from the Southern DHB and WellSouth PHO who were to
20
21 a greater or lesser extent involved in implementing Southern HealthPathways.
22
23
24
25

26 27 *Data collection*

28
29
30 The semi-structured interviews used a topic guide based on a literature review and
31
32 discussions within the research team. The topic guide (see Additional File 1) covered: a)
33
34 views concerning the acceptability and utility of HealthPathways; b) the implementation
35
36 of the HealthPathways initiative in Southern Region, with a focus on context specific
37
38 barriers and facilitators to implementation; and c) any specific issues relating to the
39
40 actual use of HealthPathways by participants (if a health care practitioner). The topic
41
42 guide was used flexibly to allow participants to construct their accounts in their own
43
44 terms. All interviews were digitally-recorded and transcribed verbatim.
45
46
47
48

49 *Data analysis*

1
2
3 A deductive thematic analysis was conducted using the framework method.¹⁸ Interviews
4 were coded deductively by ET, assisted by NVivo 10 qualitative analysis software, into
5 the five domains of the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research
6 (<http://www.cfirguide.org/qual.html>) and, as appropriate, into each domains' constructs.
7
8 TS independently checked the assignment of a sample of data to the domains and
9 constructs. Interpretation of the data, in particular the linkage between the CFIR
10 domains and constructs, was an iterative process which was led by ET and TS, with
11 input from FDN and RG. In addition, reports and relevant documents were sought from
12 the Alliance South HealthPathways Steering Group to provide background information
13 and timelines.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 27 **RESULTS**

28
29
30 Five general practitioners (GPs) and five hospital specialists were interviewed. Of the
31 ten participants four had a Southern DHB planning/management, Alliance South or
32 other clinical leadership role. Three participants had direct involvement with the Alliance
33 South Health Pathways work programme.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 As the interviews progressed and analysis was undertaken it became apparent that
41 there were significant problems with the implementation of HealthPathways in the
42 Southern Region. Thus the focus of the analysis shifted to using the relevant CFIR
43 domains and constructs (Table 1) to systematically explore the question as to why
44 implementation was proving problematic. Illustrative participant quotes are presented.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

Domain 1: Intervention Characteristics

Core component and adaptable periphery

The CFIR framework conceptualizes complex interventions as having both core components (defined as the essential and indispensable elements of the intervention itself) *and* an adaptable periphery (adaptable elements, structures and systems related to the intervention and the organization into which it is being implemented).¹⁶ In order for an intervention to be implemented successfully account must be taken of both the core components and the adaptable periphery.

Participants reported that the core component of the HealthPathways intervention – the web portal – had been addressed well by the product developers. It was considered to be well designed and easy to access, the pathways for each clinical condition were appropriate and the web portal supported use of the ERMS that generated the referral letter from primary to secondary care:

This has changed my life in primary care. This is the best thing If I have a problem, if I have a woman come in with postmenopausal bleeding I go tick, tick, tick, there it is. "Have you done this, this, and this? Is it this or that?" Do that. If it is this and this, then refer here [ERMS] and she will get an appointment. It's just e-mail off, she'll get an appointment within three weeks. (Participant 4)

On the whole I'm a big fan of Health Pathways. I'm a fan of it and ERMS linking up well together General Practice in New Zealand is probably more electronically savvy than any other place in the world. (Participant 5)

1
2
3 What was apparent, however, in participants' accounts of how the core component (web
4 portal) was implemented was limited or no consideration of the adaptable periphery.
5
6
7 There was no clear understanding by the local team leading the implementation process
8
9
10 of the need to both construct and populate a web portal (core component) and to
11
12 address related issues that were necessary for the Canterbury HealthPathways to be
13
14 successfully adapted and used in the Southern Health System (adaptable periphery).
15
16 As a consequence, the implementation project was resourced to deliver the web portal
17
18 but not to do the necessary related activities. Thus there was little or no funding of
19
20 primary care time to allow engagement with project development and with secondary
21
22 care. Support for the key activity of communicating about the intervention, its benefits,
23
24 and how it can be used to further integration across primary and secondary care was
25
26 also lacking:
27
28
29

30
31 *I don't think you can go back to what Canterbury did [to achieve successful*
32 *implementation] because the time and resources aren't there. (Participant 3)*
33
34

35
36 In short, it was apparent that the adaptable periphery had not been addressed - it was
37
38 seen as simply sufficient to deliver the web portal populated with minimally edited
39
40 HealthPathways to effect successful implementation:
41
42

43
44 *What they would do would be to take the Pathways that had been developed in*
45 *Canterbury and simply cross out Canterbury and write Southern on them, and*
46 *that would be fine and behaviours would change and everything would be hunky-*
47 *dory. This mistaken view that what's on the flowchart on the piece of paper at the*
48 *end is the process, which it isn't. I said to them on numerous occasions it is like*
49
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3 *taking somebody else's holiday snapshots and thinking that you've then had a*
4 *holiday, which is complete nonsense. Most of them you won't understand. The*
5 *essential part of HealthPathways is the conversation. (Participant 1)*
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 **Domain 3 – Inner Setting**

14
15
16 CFIR's "inner setting" is defined as the structural and cultural contexts through which
17 the implementation process occurs.¹⁶
18
19

20 *Culture*

21
22
23
24 Implementation of the HealthPathways took place in a local health system where two
25 strong corporate and professional cultures mitigated against the successful
26 implementation of an intervention that straddled both primary and secondary care. The
27 first of these, the local corporate culture – expressed through the relationships between
28 the DHB, PHO, secondary care clinicians and general practice – was seen as being
29 both resistant to change and characterized by a low trust relationship between the DHB
30 and the other actors in the system. Resistance to change was considered at least in
31 part due to a continued environment of financial austerity and a need for the DHB to
32 "balance its books":
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 *A resistance to change, which I think was about the whole health system being*
46 *so stressed at the time with focus on financial deficit. (Participant 8)*
47
48
49

50
51 A low trust relationship was considered to exist between the DHB and the other actors,
52 notably general practice. Participants considered HealthPathways was yet another
53
54
55

1
2
3 transient initiative to improve health care, which would likely fail to deliver its intended
4
5 outcomes:
6
7

8 *Mistrust, it's being done to us and what are the DHB, they're sending me*
9
10 *negative vibes about management in this DHB. This is another effort and just one*
11
12 *of their things, and like other things it will come and go. (Participant 2).*
13
14

15 The second prevalent culture was one where secondary care (hospital specialists) and
16 primary care (GPs) were seen as having different cultures based on their different
17 scopes of medical practice and funding models. This culture of an embedded division
18 between primary and secondary care had not to date been addressed in the Southern
19 Region through formal facilitated initiatives to get both groups working collaboratively
20 across primary and secondary care:
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 *I don't think that there's any particular antipathy. The way I see it from the*
31 *secondary care perspective, by and large, and I don't really know what our*
32 *colleagues in primary care think, but I do think that from secondary care*
33 *clinicians, they've never had the opportunity of being in the same room and*
34 *working out processes with primary care. I don't think they're opposed to it, it's*
35 *just a foreign idea. (Participant 1)*
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 *Implementation climate*

45
46
47 A key aspect of the implementation climate that was not addressed properly was
48 organizational incentives and rewards. The implementation process failed to consider
49 ways in which using the Pathways would be rewarded for either secondary or primary
50 care. That is to say, for clinicians that understood the purpose of pathways then using
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 them made sense and was rewarding because there was an appreciation that things
4 were being done more efficiently. For clinicians who had not yet bought into pathways
5 not using them meant business as usual (i.e. no direct penalty was incurred other than
6 having to either write referrals that were denied or receive referrals that did not include
7 all the information). Thus, there was little incentive to engage with the intervention which
8 required getting used to a new system and undertaking extra effort (i.e. for GPs more
9 tests prior to referral in primary care; for hospital specialists more explicit triaging of
10 referrals based on pathway criteria):

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 *I know the secondary care champion on the steering group is finding it very*
23 *difficult to engage other clinicians. Until there's some pressure to treat people, or*
24 *to manage and triage people according to Health Pathways there, then you won't*
25 *get the buy-in. (Participant 9)*
26
27
28
29
30

31 *Readiness for implementation*

32
33
34 This CFIR construct is defined as the tangible and immediate indicators of the
35 organisation's decision to implement an intervention¹⁶ (in this case the organisation is
36 defined as the DHB and the PHO working together through an Alliancing framework). It
37 consists of three sub-constructs (leadership engagement, available resources and
38 access to information and knowledge). Overall, readiness for implementation was
39 limited. Apart from the HealthPathways steering group, which was engaged with the
40 project, there was variable leadership engagement with primary and secondary care. In
41 terms of access to information and knowledge about HealthPathways this was strong in
42 primary care, but less so in secondary care:
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 *Buy-in is very limited from the secondary care system, whereas the PHO have*
4 *helped to put Health Pathways on everyone's workstation, or nearly everyone's*
5 *workstation, and so at least it's there, available to use, and there's some buy-in*
6 *that way. (Participant 3)*
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 As already explored in Domain 1, lack of available resources was a main reason why
14 there was a lack of readiness to implement HealthPathways. Most participants
15 considered an appropriately funded adaptation would have included dedicated time for
16 secondary and primary care to meet and interact meaningfully. This had not been the
17 case:
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 *The key to it [Canterbury HealthPathways] was that people in the primary care*
26 *sector were able to sit down in a room with secondary care clinicians and talk*
27 *about the experience for patients and what that meant. (Participant 1)*
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Domain 5 – Process**

36
37
38 Participants considered that there had been multiple failures of the implementation
39 process across all its four components: planning, engaging, executing and
40 reflecting/evaluating.
41
42
43
44

45 *Planning*

46
47
48 This was perceived as an omission by participants. They considered that those who set
49 up the programme to take the Canterbury HealthPathways and adapt them for use in
50 the Southern region had only planned for the technical production of a suite of adapted
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 pathways and a basic “roll out”, with a limited amount of promotion. This was
4
5 considered to show a lack of understanding about what was achieved in Canterbury
6
7 during the planning phase and what was important to the successful uptake and use of
8
9 HealthPathways. Various initiatives were then undertaken after the fact with champions
10
11 appointed in secondary and primary care and communications disseminated more
12
13 regularly across the health sector.
14
15

16 17 *Engagement*

18
19 Engagement with the actual users of the HealthPathways was limited. Participants
20
21 raised the issue of a lack of planning to ensure the socialization of HealthPathways with
22
23 the wider community in primary and secondary care:
24
25

26
27 *Then I think the hardest part is probably how do you actually socialize it amongst*
28
29 *clinicians so that they regularly use the pathways. (...) I think that's probably*
30
31 *where things have not gone as well as they need to or could have. (Participant*
32
33 *7).*
34
35

36
37 *It's an uphill battle to get access to my secondary care colleagues, and when I*
38
39 *meet up with them, the first question I ask is, "How many of you know about*
40
41 *HealthPathways?" One or two might put up their hands. "How many of you use*
42
43 *it?" Then it's sort of deafening silence. A huge lack of knowledge about what*
44
45 *HealthPathways are and how they can benefit everybody, primarily the patient,*
46
47 *but they can help all of us in what we do. A lack of knowledge, and there's been*
48
49 *still no concerted drive from the powers that be to propagate the concept of*
50
51 *HealthPathways and how everybody can benefit from it. (Participant 2)*
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 Although a secondary care and a primary care clinician (hospital specialist and GP) had
4 been identified as champions for Pathways (both formally and informally) their work was
5 frustrated by a lack of managerial support during the implementation process:
6
7
8
9

10 *If you have something taken from outside and imposed on you, without any*
11 *background and information as to how you can benefit from this, individuals like*
12 *me trying to propagate that, I can easily be seen as just somebody the DHB has*
13 *put there to try and wave the flag. With no support from above, I'm fighting a*
14 *losing battle. (Participant 2)*
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *Executing*

23
24
25 Executing the implementation was problematic for the reason, as explored in Domain 1,
26 that it focused on the core component (web portal) and not on the adaptable periphery.
27
28 What this meant was that significant work was devoted to technology (website and web
29 portal) development – thus clinical editors (GPs who consulted with selected secondary
30 care clinicians) were contracted by the DHB to produce a large suite of edited pathways
31 - but there was inadequate resourcing to allow meaningful engagement with the wider
32 secondary care community. As a consequence buy in was limited.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 *Evaluation/Reflection*

42
43
44 There appeared to be very limited evaluation of the implementation. The only data that
45 was reported were regular updates on the number of live HealthPathways. Information
46 on the numbers of health practitioners actually using the pathways was not consistently
47 reported across speciality areas.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

DISCUSSION

This is the first process evaluation of HealthPathways implementation in NZ using qualitative methods and the first evaluation internationally to use an implementation science theory framework. The use of implementation science theory (CFIR) allowed us to “unpack” the reasons why the implementation of HealthPathways in the Southern Region of NZ was so challenging. CFIR postulates that for an intervention to be implemented successfully account must be taken of both the intervention’s core components and the adaptable periphery. We found that the core component of the HealthPathways intervention – the web portal – had been addressed well by the product developers. Little attention had, however, been paid to the adaptable periphery – it was seen as sufficient just to deliver the web portal populated with new HealthPathways to effect successful implementation. In terms of CFIR’s “inner setting” corporate and professional cultures, the implementation climate and readiness for implementation were not properly addressed during implementation. There was a culture of low trust between the DHB and other actors in the health system and an embedded division between primary and secondary care clinicians. There were no organizational rewards or incentives for end users to use HealthPathways (poor implementation climate). There was also a lack of readiness to implement, notably a lack of funding to allow for dedicated time for secondary and primary care clinicians to meet and interact meaningfully as part of HealthPathway development. There were also multiple failures of the implementation process across all its four components: planning, engaging, executing and reflecting/evaluating.

1
2
3
4
5
6 This qualitative interview study utilised purposive sampling to recruit a sample that
7 varied by health care professional group (primary care and secondary care) and by
8 degree of involvement with the Southern HealthPathways programme. The choice of
9 individual interviews was appropriate as it allowed participants to talk openly about the
10 problems that were being encountered with the HealthPathways programme. It was
11 appropriate that the study focused on a single NZ health region as it was designed in
12 partnership with the local health system (Alliance South) to provide context specific
13 findings that would be of benefit to the local health system.¹⁵ Accepting that context will
14 differ in other settings, it is likely that the findings are transferable to other NZ health
15 regions and other health systems in which HealthPathways are being implemented. A
16 strength of the chosen implementation science framework (CFIR) is that it is “meta-
17 theoretical”, including constructs from a synthesis of existing implementation theories,
18 and it is designed to allow researchers to test out empirically mechanisms theorized to
19 promote or hinder implementation of a given intervention.¹⁶ It is also intended to be
20 used flexibly, with the researchers selecting and identifying constructs which best
21 explain their findings. We did not have an a priori view of which CFIR domains would
22 explain the problems in the implementation process, we deductively coded into all of the
23 five CFIR domains and through an iterative process of reviewing the domain categories
24 we were able to identify those which were most relevant to HealthPathways
25 implementation and thereby explain why the implementation had been problematic in
26 this specific context.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

1
2
3 We found the recruitment of participants challenging and, while we had not set a fixed
4 number of planned interviews, were only able to recruit small number of participants
5 (three) who were not involved with the implementation process. We believe this difficulty
6 reflects the findings, in that the project was not well planned and implemented and so
7 interest in speaking about HealthPathways was adversely affected. We had originally
8 intended to combine this qualitative process evaluation with a quantitative component to
9 determine if HealthPathways were effective in improving care of people with two
10 exemplar clinical conditions through a before and after comparison of key process and
11 outcome measures. We were unable to meet this second objective as we were
12 informed, after award of the research grant, that the Health Pathways team would not
13 be able to collect this data due to delays in implementing the project and project
14 planning. It was a requirement of the study that Alliance South would set up the data
15 collection process, not the research team.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 There has to date been no formative evaluation of HealthPathways in NZ. The
36 Canterbury HealthPathways programme, for example, has conducted a limited
37 evaluation consisting of an online survey of primary and secondary care clinicians and
38 audits of pathways use.^{3 8 19} In contrast, two different Australian states have conducted
39 a process evaluation of HealthPathways using a qualitative case study approach: New
40 South Wales (Hunter and New England)⁵ and Victoria (Barwon).^{6 10} Neither Australian
41 studies used an explicit implementation science framework; instead, they descriptively
42 list the “barriers” and “facilitators” to implementation. These two evaluations considered
43 that implementation had been successful and the Hunter and New England study’s list
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 of “critical success factors” are the mirror image of a number of the key implementation
4 issues identified in this study: senior management support, senior clinical leadership,
5 involvement of clinicians in development, need for pathways to add value for clinicians
6 and engagement with hospital specialists.⁵ Both evaluations’ list of “barriers” highlighted
7 lack of awareness by GPs of the HealthPathways programme.^{5 6}
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 CFIR now has a good evidence base as it has been applied across a wide variety of
16 implementation study designs and settings.¹⁷ A recent CFIR-informed qualitative
17 process evaluation study (exploring the barriers affecting implementation of an online
18 frailty tool into primary care), using a similar methodology, also found that it was
19 necessary to report empirical findings that related to the most important CFIR domains
20 to best “make sense” of the data.²⁰
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Given we intended that this evaluation should help Alliance South in its implementation
34 of HealthPathways in line with a university-health sector collaboration¹⁵ we are able to
35 report how these findings have been used. During the study interview phase (2016) we
36 were able to feedback highlights of our emerging findings to the Alliance South
37 HealthPathways workstream who then shared with us their own internal report (Bridget-
38 Mary McGown, Alliance South, personal communication). The latter report
39 independently highlighted several of our emerging findings. On completion of our
40 preliminary analysis (2017) our findings were presented to the Alliance South
41 HealthPathways Steering Group. At the same time the DHB had undergone a
42 restructure with a new Chief Executive who wished to prioritise HealthPathways
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 implementation. There was therefore senior management team support to initiate a re-
4
5 launch of the programme which has taken account of the key findings of this study.
6
7
8
9

10
11 It is not always the case that quality improvement initiatives, such as HealthPathways,
12
13 are successfully implemented and thereby lead to positive outcomes for patients and
14
15 health practitioners. Publication bias may also mean that there are less published
16
17 studies reporting negative quality improvement research findings.²¹ We argue there is
18
19 great benefit in understanding why, and under what circumstances and in which
20
21 contexts, some quality improvement interventions fail. Although we currently have
22
23 limited evidence as to whether HealthPathways improve health outcomes for patients
24
25 (as opposed to being viewed by health practitioners as improving referral quality and
26
27 promoting integration of care) it is clear that there is rapid adoption of HealthPathways
28
29 both within other regions of NZ, Australia and also in the UK.⁶ A consequence of this is
30
31 that they are being implemented in very different contexts than those present in
32
33 Canterbury NZ in 2007-2008 when the programme was first developed and
34
35 implemented. What we have shown, using the CFIR framework, is that a focus on the
36
37 core component of HealthPathways (web-portal and referral system) without adequate
38
39 consideration of the adaptable periphery (which is context dependent) when
40
41 implementing HealthPathways into a health system means implementation will likely fail.
42
43 Others have similarly shown the importance of the local context in determining whether
44
45 or not local implementation works or fails when rolling out a national quality
46
47 improvement programme in secondary care.²² We therefore consider that the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 implication of our work for future implementers of HealthPathways and similar complex
4
5 interventions is always to consider the local context within which they are to be
6
7 implemented and to tailor the implementation approach to address these.
8
9

10
11 *Word count: 4387*
12

13 *Acknowledgements*

14
15
16
17 The authors would like to thank the participants for their time and the Southern DHB
18
19 HealthPathways Steering Committee for their sharing of information.
20
21
22

23 *Contributors*

24
25
26 TS conceived and designed the study with input from RG and FDN. ET conducted the
27
28 interviews and led on the data analysis with input from TS. TS drafted the manuscript.
29
30 All authors read, provided critical review and approved the final manuscript.
31
32

33 *Competing interests*

34
35
36 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
37
38

39 *Authors' information*

40
41
42 RG was independent chair of Alliance South at the time the study was conducted.
43
44

45 *Funding*

46
47
48 University of Otago Research Grant (UORG) and the Dean's Bequest Fund, Dunedin
49
50 School of Medicine. The funding body had no involvement in the design of the study
51
52 and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.
53
54
55

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval was obtained from the Otago University Human Ethics Committee (16/024). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Data sharing statement

Full de-identified interview transcripts will not be shared. Informed consent, in line with the approving ethics committee, only allows for the use of de-identified extracts within research reporting and writing, in order to maintain the privacy of participants based in a defined regional area and population, thus making their identification with full transcripts more likely.

Table 1 CFIR Domains and associated constructs. Domains and constructs used in the study are in bold.

1. Intervention Characteristics	3. Inner Setting
• <i>Intervention source</i>	• <i>Structural characteristics</i>
• <i>Evidence strength and quality</i>	• <i>Networks and communication</i>
• <i>Relative advantage</i>	• Culture
• Adaptability	• Implementation climate
• <i>Trialability</i>	• Readiness for implementation
• <i>Complexity</i>	4. Characteristics of Individuals
• <i>Design quality and packaging</i>	• Knowledge and beliefs about the intervention
• <i>Cost</i>	• Self-efficacy
2. Outer Setting	• Individual stage of change
• <i>Patient needs and resources</i>	• Other personal attributes
• <i>Cosmopolitanism</i>	5. Process
• <i>Peer pressure</i>	• Planning
• <i>External policy and incentives</i>	• Engaging
	• Executing
	• Reflecting and Evaluating

REFERENCES

1. Armitage GD, Suter E, Oelke ND, et al. Health systems integration: state of the evidence. *International journal of integrated care* 2009;9:e82. [published Online First: 2009/07/11]
2. Kinsman L, Rotter T, James E, et al. What is a clinical pathway? Development of a definition to inform the debate. *BMC medicine* 2010;8:31. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-8-31 [published Online First: 2010/05/29]
3. McGeoch G, Anderson I, Gibson J, et al. Consensus pathways: evidence into practice. *The New Zealand medical journal* 2015;128(1408):86-96. [published Online First: 2015/02/11]
4. Robinson S, Varhol R, Bell C, et al. HealthPathways: creating a pathway for health systems reform. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2014 doi: 10.1071/ah14155 [published Online First: 2014/12/01]
5. Gray JS, Swan JR, Lynch MA, et al. Hunter and New England HealthPathways: a 4-year journey of integrated care. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2018;42(1):66-71. doi: 10.1071/ah16197 [published Online First: 2017/02/20]
6. Gill SD, Mansfield S, McLeod M, et al. HealthPathways improving access to care. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2018;early online publication doi: 10.1071/ah17090 [published Online First: 2018/02/09]
7. Timmins N, Ham C. The quest for integrated health and social care. A case study in Canterbury, New Zealand. London, 2013.
8. McGeoch G, McGeoch P, Shand B. Is HealthPathways effective? An online survey of hospital clinicians, general practitioners and practice nurses. *The New Zealand medical journal* 2015;128(1408):36-46. [published Online First: 2015/02/11]
9. Ministry of Health. Better, Sooner, More Convenient Health Care in the Community. Wellington: Ministry of Health, 2011.
10. Mansfield SJ, Quirk F, von Treuer K, et al. On the right path? Exploring the experiences and opinions of clinicians involved in developing and implementing HealthPathways Barwon. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2016;40(2):129-35. doi: 10.1071/ah15009 [published Online First: 2015/12/23]
11. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, et al. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ* 2008;337:a1655.
12. Davidoff F, Dixon-Woods M, Leviton L, et al. Demystifying theory and its use in improvement. *BMJ quality & safety* 2015;24(3):228-38. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2014-003627 [published Online First: 2015/01/27]
13. The Improved Clinical Effectiveness through Behavioural Research Group. Designing theoretically-informed implementation interventions. *Implementation Science* 2006;1(1):4. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-1-4

14. Gauld R. What should governance for integrated care look like? New Zealand's alliances provide some pointers. *The Medical journal of Australia* 2014;201(3 Suppl):S67-8. [published Online First: 2014/07/23]
15. Soper B, Yaqub O, Hinrichs S, et al. CLAHRCs in practice: combined knowledge transfer and exchange strategies, cultural change, and experimentation. *Journal of health services research & policy* 2013;18(3 Suppl):53-64. doi: 10.1177/1355819613499903 [published Online First: 2013/10/09]
16. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, et al. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation science : IS* 2009;4:50. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-4-50 [published Online First: 2009/08/12]
17. Kirk MA, Kelley C, Yankey N, et al. A systematic review of the use of the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research. *Implementation science : IS* 2016;11:72. doi: 10.1186/s13012-016-0437-z [published Online First: 2016/05/18]
18. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, et al. Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2013;13(1):117. doi: 1471-2288-13-117 [pii];10.1186/1471-2288-13-117 [doi]
19. Kenealy TW, Sheridan NF, Connolly MJ. HealthPathways website: making the right thing the easy thing to do? *The New Zealand medical journal* 2015;128(1408):6-9. [published Online First: 2015/02/11]
20. Warner G, Lawson B, Sampalli T, et al. Applying the consolidated framework for implementation research to identify barriers affecting implementation of an online frailty tool into primary health care: a qualitative study. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2018;18(1):395. doi: 10.1186/s12913-018-3163-1 [published Online First: 2018/06/02]
21. Kringos DS, Sunol R, Wagner C, et al. The influence of context on the effectiveness of hospital quality improvement strategies: a review of systematic reviews. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2015;15:277. doi: 10.1186/s12913-015-0906-0 [published Online First: 2015/07/23]
22. Dixon-Woods M, Leslie M, Tarrant C, et al. Explaining Matching Michigan: an ethnographic study of a patient safety program. *Implementation science : IS* 2013;8:70. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-8-70 [published Online First: 2013/06/22]

INTERVIEW GUIDE:

So following on from the information sheet, just to reiterate, we're hoping to explore your views and experiences of the HealthPathways initiative in the Southern Region, including what has been challenging or beneficial in relation to their implementation."

"CONSENT PROCESS"

Before we begin, do you have any further questions?

The following questions are examples rather than a set of specific questions.

Question
<p>When did you first hear about HealthPathways in the Southern Region? What do you understand them to be? What were your initial thoughts? Did you feel they met a need?</p>
<p>What do you know about how HealthPathways in the Southern Region came about and how they created? Who was involved? What did you think of the process?</p>
<p>How useful do you think the HealthPathways initiative in the Southern Region is? How were you introduced to them? What were your initial thoughts? Did you feel they met a need? What gap does it fill? What problem does it solve? If not, why not? What is not being addressed? Is this a fix to a problem you don't perceive? Is there a problem about communication/process, etc. rather than concept/content?</p>
<p>What has been your experience of using a pathway? Did they fit well with normal practice? Have you used a healthpathway; if yes which one? How was that for you? What was better than before/what wasn't so good?</p>
<p>What has worked well in Southern Region initiative to implement HealthPathways in your opinion? Why? Communication; resourcing; support; clinical leadership; IT; patient information; effective governance of the work etc.</p>
<p>What has not worked so well in Southern Region initiative to implement HealthPathways in your opinion? Why? Communication; resourcing; support; clinical leadership; IT; patient information; effective governance of the work etc.</p>
<p>If you were asked to make a recommendation about the continuation of HealthPathways, what recommendation would you make? Why?</p>
<p>If you were asked to suggest further conditions for HealthPathways what would you suggest? Why? Are these conditions, particular prevalent or is the care (care coordination) for these conditions particularly fractured/complicated?</p>
<p>Is there anything else you would like to make comment on in regard to HealthPathways in general or the HealthPathways initiative in the Southern Region?</p>

COREQ (Consolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) 32 item Checklist

Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

Domain	Item Number	Comment	Reported on page number or not applicable (N/A)
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
<i>Personal characteristics</i>			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	The Assistant Research Fellow (Dr Emma Tumilty) conducted the interviews	7
Credentials	2	All four research team members have extensive experience of conducting qualitative health research	N/A
Occupation	3	ET was an Assistant Research Fellow at the University of Otago at the time of conducting the research	1
Gender	4	Two male-identifying and two female identifying researchers (interviewer, female-identifying)	
Experience and training	5	All four research team members have extensive experience of conducting qualitative health research	N/A
<i>Relationship with participants</i>			
Relationship established	6	The assistant research fellow had no relationships with participants prior to the study, while the broader research team had varying relationships with the health community at large. It was felt the interviewer should be seen as an unbiased enquirer rather than a person with a particular stance or opinion about the topic.	5-6
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	The interviewer introduced herself to participants stating she was not a medical professional, etc. as well as describing the research team, its funding, the purpose of the project and answering any questions participants may have had about the project and those involved in it.	N/A
Interviewer characteristics	8	The interviewer was not a medical professional, but aware of the medical system in New Zealand and had read the literature on care pathways prior to beginning the project.	N/A

Domain 2: Study design			
<i>Theoretical framework</i>			
Methodological orientation and theory	9	Deductive thematic analysis using the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research	8
<i>Participant selection</i>			
Sampling	10	Purposive sampling was used	7
Method of approach	11	Various methods of approach were used, group emails were sent via a third party, invitations were added to newsletters, emails were sent to practices, and then those taking part or responding were also asked to pass on information to others.	N/A
Sample size	12	Ten	8
Non-participation	13	A number of key informants did not respond to the invitation to participate, however no person responded directly to decline taking part, nor did anybody drop out once agreeing to take part.	N/A
<i>Setting</i>			
Setting of data collection	14	Participants could determine whether the interview took place in their place of work or in a private meeting room arranged by the interviewer on the university campus.	N/A
Presence of nonparticipants	15	None	N/A
Description of sample	16	Fully presented in results section	8
<i>Data collection</i>			
Interview guide	17	The interview guide was open, but listed a number of key questions and potential prompts. Interviews generally followed a similar approach although questions themselves varied depending on the participant.	Supplemental file
Repeat interviews	18	No	N/A
Audio/visual recording	19	All interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed.	7
Field notes	20	Yes, the interviewer wrote brief field notes after each interview regarding the nature of the interview and her perceptions of the participants responses, etc.	N/A
Duration	21	Interview times varied but were generally around 60mins	N/A
Data saturation	22	Not applicable as a deductive thematic analysis	N/A
Transcripts returned	23	No	N/A
Domain 3: analysis and			

findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	The interviewer coded the data and described codes and these were discussed with all members of the interview team on a regular basis	8
Description of the coding tree	25	Codes had tags and description within the software except for where they were self-explanatory	8
Derivation of themes	26	The themes were those used in the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research	8
Software	27	nVivo 11 was used	8
Participant checking	28	No	N/A
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Yes quotations are presented and identified in a manner protecting participants confidentiality	9-16
Data and findings consistent	30	Consistency between the data and the findings exists	9-16
Clarity of major themes	31	Yes, major themes are clearly identified	9-16
Clarity of minor themes	32	Yes, minor themes (CIFR constructs) are clearly identified and related to major themes.	9-16

BMJ Open

HealthPathways implementation in a New Zealand health region: a qualitative study using the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-025094.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Sep-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Stokes, Tim; Otago University, General Practice & Rural Health Tumilty, Emma; University of Texas Medical Branch School of Health Professions, Institute for Translational Sciences Doolan-Noble, F; University of Otago, General Practice and Rural Health Gauld, Robin; University of Otago, Otago Business School
Primary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6 **HealthPathways implementation in a New Zealand health region: a qualitative**
7 **study using the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research**
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Tim Stokes^{1*}, Emma Tumilty^{1,2}, Fiona Doolan-Noble¹, Robin Gauld³.
16
17

18
19
20 1. Department of General Practice & Rural Health, Dunedin School of Medicine,
21 University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
22

23
24 2. Institute for Translational Sciences, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston,
25 Texas, United States
26

27
28 3. Otago Business School, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
29
30

31
32
33
34 *Corresponding Author: tim.stokes@otago.ac.nz
35

36 Department of General Practice & Rural Health, Dunedin School of Medicine, University
37 of Otago, PO Box 56, Dunedin 9054, New Zealand
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

ABSTRACT

Objectives To explore the process of implementation of an online health information web-based portal and referral system (HealthPathways) using relevant implementation science theory: the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR).

Setting The Southern Health Region of New Zealand (Otago and Southland).

Participants Key Informants (providers and planners of health care) (n=10) who were either involved in the process of implementing HealthPathways or who were intended end-users of HealthPathways.

Methods Semi-structured interviews were undertaken. A deductive thematic analysis using CFIR was conducted using the framework method.

Results CFIR postulates that for an intervention to be implemented successfully account must be taken of both the intervention's core components and the adaptable periphery. The core component of HealthPathways – the web portal and referral system which contains a large number of localized clinical care pathways – had been addressed well by the product developers. Little attention had, however, been paid to the adaptable periphery (adaptable elements, structures and systems related to HealthPathways and the organization into which it was being implemented) – it was seen as sufficient just to deliver the web portal and referral system and the set of clinical care pathways to effect successful implementation. In terms of CFIR's "inner setting" corporate and professional cultures, the implementation climate and readiness for implementation were not properly addressed during implementation. There were also

1
2
3 multiple failures of the implementation process (for example, lack of planning and
4 engagement with clinicians). As a consequence, implementation of HealthPathways
5 was highly problematic.
6
7
8
9

10 **Conclusions** The use of CFIR has furthered our understanding of the factors needed
11 for the successful implementation of a complex health intervention (HealthPathways) in
12 the New Zealand health system. Those charged with implementing complex health
13 interventions should always consider the local context within which they will be
14 implemented and tailor their implementation strategy to address these.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 *Word Count: 297*
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first process evaluation of implementing HealthPathways in New Zealand using qualitative methods.
- The use of implementation science theory (Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research) allowed us to “unpack” the reasons why the implementation of HealthPathways in the Southern Region of New Zealand was so challenging.
- The study focused on a single health region as it was designed in partnership with the local health system to provide context specific findings that would be of benefit to the local health system.
- We were only able to recruit small number of participants who were not involved with the implementation process.

INTRODUCTION

The New Zealand (NZ) health system, in common with those of other jurisdictions, struggles to provide integration of health services across primary and secondary care.¹ One important quality improvement initiative promoted internationally since the 1980s to improve health care integration is care pathways. Care pathways have five key characteristics, they: 1) provide a structured multidisciplinary plan of care; 2) translate national evidence-based clinical guidelines into local structures; 3) detail the components of care required in an algorithm or pathway; 4) provide a time frame or criterion-based progression through the health system; and 5) aim to standardise care for a specific clinical condition in a specific local population.² In NZ a key adaptation has been the embedding of web-based clinical care pathways into general practice-hospital electronic referral management systems (ERMS). The use of care pathways in NZ has been championed by Canterbury District Health Board (DHB), who in 2008 developed an online health information web-based portal (containing the individual care pathways for specific clinical conditions) and referral system called HealthPathways.³ Currently HealthPathways provides health practitioners with guidance and a referral pathway for over 550 clinical conditions (<https://www.healthpathwayscommunity.org/About.aspx>). There has been rapid adoption of HealthPathways and similar systems across NZ's DHBs and in Australia.⁴⁻⁷ Its advocates claim that HealthPathways is an important means of achieving health care integration,^{8,9} which has been a NZ government priority since the 2009 publication of *Better Sooner More Convenient*.¹⁰ This claim is supported by an emerging evidence base which suggests that HealthPathway use is associated with an improvement in referral quality from primary care to secondary care and more

1
2
3 timely access to secondary care.³ End users of HealthPathways also report, in online
4 surveys⁹ and qualitative case studies,^{5 6 11} that HealthPathways improved their
5 knowledge of local services and changed their clinical management decisions.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 In the Southern Health Region of NZ's South Island (Otago and Southland), the
13 Southern DHB and the WellSouth Primary Health Network (Primary Health
14 Organisation: PHO) are working to further health service integration through Alliance
15 South,¹² which is a contractual alliance between the two organisations aimed at
16 improving care coordination and integration. In 2013 Alliance South embarked upon the
17 implementation of the Canterbury HealthPathways in the Southern Region – Southern
18 HealthPathways. The approach used Clinical Editors ((general practitioners (GPs) who
19 consulted with selected Southern Region secondary care clinicians)) to localize/adapt
20 each individual Canterbury clinical care pathway: by 2017 over 400 individual clinical
21 care pathways had been localized and could be accessed through the Southern
22 HealthPathways web portal and referral system
23
24 (<https://southern.healthpathways.org.nz/>). The focus was on the technical development
25 of a suite of adapted pathways. In 2016 a team of researchers from the Dunedin School
26 of Medicine, University of Otago, partnered with the local health system through Alliance
27 South to conduct a mixed methods evaluation of the Southern HealthPathways
28 programme. The rationale for this university-health service partnership was to build
29 evaluation capacity in the Southern Region and the HealthPathways initiative was
30 identified as a strategic priority for evaluation by Alliance South.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We report here the findings of the qualitative process evaluation. One key challenge in
4 evaluating the implementation of HealthPathways is that they can be conceptualised as
5 a complex health care intervention¹³ and thus without a qualitative process evaluation it
6 is not possible to determine which aspects of the intervention in a defined health care
7 context are likely to lead to its success. Our study aim was therefore to understand the
8 process by which Southern HealthPathways were being implemented using a
9 commonly used implementation science theory: the Consolidated Framework for
10 Implementation Research (CFIR).^{14 15}
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **METHODS**

25 *Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR)*

26
27 In understanding how quality improvement initiatives work there is increasing emphasis
28 on the use of theory drawn from the social sciences to better develop quality
29 improvement interventions, optimise their design and identify aspects of context
30 necessary for their success.^{16 17} The CFIR is a “meta-theoretical” framework that
31 provides an overarching typology of implementation. It offers a comprehensive,
32 standardised list of constructs which allow researchers to identify variables that are
33 most relevant to a particular intervention.¹⁴ The CFIR addresses intervention delivery
34 (context; implementation; mechanisms of action) through 26 constructs organized into
35 five major domains: intervention characteristics (eight constructs), outer setting (four
36 constructs), inner setting (five constructs), characteristics of the individuals involved
37 (five constructs), and the process of implementation (four constructs) (see Table 1)
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 [insert Table 1 here]. CFIR has been widely used to inform qualitative process
4
5 evaluations across a range of complex interventions.¹⁵
6

7 *Design and sampling*

8
9
10 Semi-structured interviews were conducted by ET between May and November 2016
11
12 with key informants (providers and planners of care) from the Southern DHB catchment
13
14 area (Otago and Southland). The Southern DHB is the southernmost DHB in NZ and is
15
16 responsible for planning, funding and providing health and disability services to a
17
18 population of over 300,000 and serves the largest geographic region of all NZ's DHBs
19
20 (<https://www.southerndhb.govt.nz/index.php?page=654>). Key informants were sampled
21
22 purposively in order to construct a maximum variation sample that aimed to include
23
24 primary care (GPs), hospital specialists, community nursing services and health service
25
26 planners from the Southern DHB and WellSouth PHO. From this group of stakeholders
27
28 we also aimed to include those who had a Southern DHB planning/management,
29
30 Alliance South or other clinical leadership role, had direct involvement with the Alliance
31
32 South HealthPathways work programme or who were end users of the HealthPathways
33
34 (GPs).
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 *Data collection*

42
43
44 The semi-structured interviews used a topic guide based on a literature review, relevant
45
46 CFIR guidance (<https://cfirguide.org/>) and discussions within the research team. The
47
48 topic guide (Supplementary File 1) covered: a) views concerning the acceptability and
49
50 utility of HealthPathways; b) the implementation of the HealthPathways initiative in
51
52 Southern Region, with a focus on context specific barriers and facilitators to
53
54
55

1
2
3 implementation; and c) any specific issues relating to the actual use of HealthPathways
4 by participants (if a health care practitioner). The topic guide was used flexibly to allow
5 participants to construct their accounts in their own terms. All interviews were digitally-
6 recorded and transcribed verbatim.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 *Data analysis*

14
15
16 A deductive thematic analysis was conducted using the framework method.¹⁸ Interviews
17 were coded deductively by ET, assisted by NVivo 10 qualitative analysis software, into
18 the five domains of the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research
19 (<http://www.cfirguide.org/>) and, as appropriate, into each domains' constructs. TS
20 independently checked the assignment of a sample of data to the domains and
21 constructs. Interpretation of the data, in particular the linkage between the CFIR
22 domains and constructs, was an iterative process which was led by ET and TS, with
23 input from FDN and RG. In addition, reports and relevant documents were sought from
24 the Alliance South Southern HealthPathways Steering Group to provide background
25 information and timelines.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ)¹⁹ were used to
41 structure reporting of the methods and the findings (Supplementary File 2).
42
43
44

45 *Patient and Public Involvement*

46
47
48 No patients or the public were involved in this study.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

Five GPs and five hospital specialists were interviewed. Of the ten participants four had a Southern DHB planning/management, Alliance South or other clinical leadership role. Three participants had direct involvement with the Alliance South Health Pathways work programme. Three participants were end users of HealthPathways.

As the interviews progressed and analysis was undertaken it became apparent that there were significant problems with the implementation of HealthPathways in the Southern Region. Thus the focus of the analysis shifted to using the relevant CFIR domains and constructs (Table 1) to systematically explore the question as to why implementation was proving problematic. Illustrative participant quotes are presented.

Domain 1: Intervention Characteristics

Core component and adaptable periphery

The CFIR framework (Table 1) conceptualizes complex interventions as having both core components (defined as the essential and indispensable elements of the intervention itself) *and* an adaptable periphery (adaptable elements, structures and systems related to the intervention and the organization into which it is being implemented).¹⁴ In order for an intervention to be implemented successfully account must be taken of both the core components and the adaptable periphery.

Participants reported that the core component of the HealthPathways intervention – the web portal and referral system which contained a large number of individual clinical care

1
2
3 pathways – had been addressed well by the product developers. It was considered to
4
5 be well designed and easy to access, the pathways for each clinical condition were
6
7 appropriate and the web portal supported use of the ERMS that generated the referral
8
9 letter from primary to secondary care:
10
11

12
13 *This has changed my life in primary care. This is the best thing If I have a*
14
15 *problem, if I have a woman come in with postmenopausal bleeding I go tick, tick,*
16
17 *tick, there it is. "Have you done this, this, and this? Is it this or that?" Do that. If it*
18
19 *is this and this, then refer here [ERMS] and she will get an appointment. It's just*
20
21 *e-mail off, she'll get an appointment within three weeks. (Participant 4)*
22
23

24
25 *On the whole I'm a big fan of Health Pathways. I'm a fan of it and ERMS linking*
26
27 *up well together General Practice in New Zealand is probably more*
28
29 *electronically savvy than any other place in the world. (Participant 5)*
30
31

32
33 What was apparent, however, in participants' accounts of how the core component (web
34
35 portal and referral system) was implemented was limited or no consideration of the
36
37 adaptable periphery. There was no clear understanding by the local team leading the
38
39 implementation process of the need to both construct and populate a web portal and
40
41 referral system (core component) and to address related issues that were necessary for
42
43 the Canterbury HealthPathways to be successfully adapted and used in the Southern
44
45 Health System (adaptable periphery). As a consequence, the implementation project
46
47 was resourced to deliver the web portal and referral system but not to do the necessary
48
49 related activities. Thus there was little or no funding of primary care time to allow
50
51 engagement with project development and with secondary care. Support for the key
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 activity of communicating about the intervention, its benefits, and how it can be used to
4
5 further integration across primary and secondary care was also lacking:
6
7

8 *I don't think you can go back to what Canterbury did [to achieve successful*
9 *implementation] because the time and resources aren't there. (Participant 3)*
10
11

12
13 In short, it was apparent that the adaptable periphery had not been addressed - it was
14
15 seen as simply sufficient to deliver the web portal and referral system populated with a
16
17 minimally edited set of individual clinical care pathways (the core component of
18
19 HealthPathways) to effect successful implementation:
20
21

22
23 *What they would do would be to take the Pathways that had been developed in*
24 *Canterbury and simply cross out Canterbury and write Southern on them, and*
25 *that would be fine and behaviours would change and everything would be hunky-*
26 *dory. This mistaken view that what's on the flowchart on the piece of paper at the*
27 *end is the process, which it isn't. I said to them on numerous occasions it is like*
28 *taking somebody else's holiday snapshots and thinking that you've then had a*
29 *holiday, which is complete nonsense. Most of them you won't understand. The*
30 *essential part of HealthPathways is the conversation. (Participant 1)*
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Domain 3 – Inner Setting**

46
47 CFIR's "inner setting" (Table 1) is defined as the structural and cultural contexts through
48
49 which the implementation process occurs.¹⁴
50
51

52 *Culture*

1
2
3 Implementation of the HealthPathways took place in a local health system where two
4 strong corporate and professional cultures mitigated against the successful
5 implementation of an intervention that straddled both primary and secondary care. The
6 first of these, the local corporate culture – represented through the relationships
7 between the DHB, PHO, secondary care clinicians and general practice – was seen as
8 being both resistant to change and characterized by a low trust relationship between the
9 DHB and other actors in the system. Resistance to change was considered at least in
10 part due to a continued environment of financial austerity and a need for the DHB to
11 “balance its books”:
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 *A resistance to change, which I think was about the whole health system being*
25 *so stressed at the time with focus on financial deficit. (Participant 8)*
26
27
28

29 A low trust relationship was considered to exist between the DHB and the other actors,
30 notably general practice. Participants considered HealthPathways was yet another
31 transient initiative to improve health care, which would likely fail to deliver its intended
32 outcomes:
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 *Mistrust, it's being done to us and what are the DHB, they're sending me*
40 *negative vibes about management in this DHB. This is another effort and just one*
41 *of their things, and like other things it will come and go. (Participant 2).*
42
43
44
45

46 The second prevalent culture was one where secondary care (hospital specialists) and
47 primary care (GPs) were seen as having different cultures based on their different
48 scopes of medical practice and funding models. This culture of an embedded division
49 between primary and secondary care had not to date been addressed in the Southern
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 Region through formal facilitated initiatives to get both groups working collaboratively
4
5 across primary and secondary care:
6
7

8 *I don't think that there's any particular antipathy. The way I see it from the*
9 *secondary care perspective, by and large, and I don't really know what our*
10 *colleagues in primary care think, but I do think that from secondary care*
11 *clinicians, they've never had the opportunity of being in the same room and*
12 *working out processes with primary care. I don't think they're opposed to it, it's*
13 *just a foreign idea. (Participant 1)*
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *Implementation climate*

23
24 A key aspect of the implementation climate that was not addressed properly was
25
26 organizational incentives and rewards. The implementation process failed to consider
27
28 ways in which using the Pathways would be rewarded for either secondary or primary
29
30 care. That is to say, for clinicians that understood the purpose of pathways then using
31
32 them made sense and was rewarding because there was an appreciation that they
33
34 made clinical processes more efficient. For clinicians who had not yet bought into
35
36 pathways not using them meant business as usual (i.e. no direct penalty was incurred
37
38 other than having to either write referrals that were denied or receive referrals that did
39
40 not include all the information). Thus, there was little incentive to engage with the
41
42 intervention which required getting used to a new system and undertaking extra effort
43
44 (i.e. for GPs more tests to be done prior to referral to secondary care; for hospital
45
46 specialists more explicit triaging of referrals based on the specific clinical pathway
47
48 criteria):
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 *I know the secondary care champion on the steering group is finding it very*
4 *difficult to engage other clinicians. Until there's some pressure to treat people, or*
5 *to manage and triage people according to Health Pathways there, then you won't*
6 *get the buy-in. (Participant 9)*
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 *Readiness for implementation*

14
15 This CFIR construct is defined as the tangible and immediate indicators of the
16 organisation's decision to implement an intervention¹⁴ (in this case the organisation is
17 defined as the DHB and the PHO working together through an Alliancing framework). It
18 consists of three sub-constructs (leadership engagement, available resources and
19 access to information and knowledge). Overall, readiness for implementation was
20 limited. Apart from the HealthPathways steering group, which was engaged with the
21 project, there was variable leadership engagement with primary and secondary care. In
22 terms of access to information and knowledge about HealthPathways this was strong in
23 primary care, but less so in secondary care:
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 *Buy-in is very limited from the secondary care system, whereas the PHO have*
38 *helped to put Health Pathways on everyone's workstation, or nearly everyone's*
39 *workstation, and so at least it's there, available to use, and there's some buy-in*
40 *that way. (Participant 3)*
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 As already explored in Domain 1, lack of available resources was a main reason why
48 there was a lack of readiness to implement HealthPathways. Most participants
49 considered an appropriately funded adaptation would have included dedicated time for
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 secondary and primary care to meet and interact meaningfully. This had not been the
4
5 case:
6
7

8 *The key to it [Canterbury HealthPathways] was that people in the primary care*
9 *sector were able to sit down in a room with secondary care clinicians and talk*
10 *about the experience for patients and what that meant. (Participant 1)*
11
12
13
14
15

16 17 18 **Domain 5 – The implementation process**

19
20
21 Participants considered that there had been multiple failures of the implementation
22
23 process (Table 1) across all its four components: planning, engaging, executing and
24
25 reflecting/evaluating.
26
27

28 *Planning*

29
30
31 This was perceived as an omission by participants. They considered that those who set
32
33 up the programme to take the Canterbury HealthPathways and adapt them for use in
34
35 the Southern region had only planned for the technical production of a suite of adapted
36
37 pathways and a basic “roll out”, with a limited amount of promotion. This was
38
39 considered to show a lack of understanding about what was achieved in Canterbury
40
41 during the planning phase and what was important to the successful uptake and use of
42
43 HealthPathways. Various initiatives were then undertaken after the fact with champions
44
45 appointed in secondary and primary care and communications disseminated more
46
47 regularly across the health sector.
48
49
50
51

52 *Engagement*

1
2
3 Engagement with the actual users of the HealthPathways was limited. Participants
4
5 raised the issue of a lack of planning to ensure that the wider community in primary and
6
7 secondary care were given the opportunity to meaningfully engage with the
8
9 HealthPathways initiative, which one participant referred to as “socialization”:
10
11

12
13 *Then I think the hardest part is probably how do you actually socialize it amongst*
14
15 *clinicians so that they regularly use the pathways. (...) I think that's probably*
16
17 *where things have not gone as well as they need to or could have. (Participant*
18
19 *7).*
20
21

22
23 *It's an uphill battle to get access to my secondary care colleagues, and when I*
24
25 *meet up with them, the first question I ask is, "How many of you know about*
26
27 *HealthPathways?" One or two might put up their hands. "How many of you use*
28
29 *it?" Then it's sort of deafening silence. A huge lack of knowledge about what*
30
31 *HealthPathways are and how they can benefit everybody, primarily the patient,*
32
33 *but they can help all of us in what we do. A lack of knowledge, and there's been*
34
35 *still no concerted drive from the powers that be to propagate the concept of*
36
37 *HealthPathways and how everybody can benefit from it. (Participant 2)*
38
39
40

41 Although a secondary care and a primary care clinician (hospital specialist and GP) had
42
43 been identified as champions for Pathways (both formally and informally) their work was
44
45 frustrated by a lack of managerial support during the implementation process:
46
47

48
49 *If you have something taken from outside and imposed on you, without any*
50
51 *background and information as to how you can benefit from this, individuals like*
52
53 *me trying to propagate that, I can easily be seen as just somebody the DHB has*
54
55

1
2
3 *put there to try and wave the flag. With no support from above, I'm fighting a*
4
5 *losing battle. (Participant 2)*
6
7

8 *Executing*

9

10 Executing the implementation was problematic, as explored in Domain 1, because it
11 focused on the core component and not on the adaptable periphery. What this meant
12 was that significant work was devoted to technology development (website, web portal
13 and localising existing individual care pathways) – thus the Clinical Editors were
14 contracted by the DHB to produce a large suite of edited pathways - but there was
15 inadequate resourcing to allow meaningful engagement with the wider secondary care
16 community. As a consequence “buy in” from clinicians was limited.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *Evaluation/Reflection*

28

29 There appeared to be very limited evaluation of the Southern HealthPathways
30 implementation. The only data that was reported were regular updates on the number of
31 live HealthPathways. Information on the numbers of health practitioners actually using
32 the individual clinical pathways was not consistently reported across speciality areas.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **DISCUSSION**

44

45 This is the first process evaluation of HealthPathways implementation in NZ using
46 qualitative methods and the first such evaluation to use the CFIR framework. The use of
47 implementation science theory (CFIR) allowed us to “unpack” the reasons why the
48 implementation of HealthPathways in the Southern Region of NZ was so challenging.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 CFIR postulates that for an intervention to be implemented successfully account must
4 be taken of both the intervention's core components and the adaptable periphery. We
5 found that the core component of HealthPathways – the web portal and referral system
6 which contains a large number of individual clinical care pathways – had been
7 addressed well by the product developers. Little attention had, however, been paid to
8 the adaptable periphery (adaptable elements, structures and systems related to the
9 intervention and the organization into which it is being implemented) – it was seen as
10 sufficient just to deliver the web portal and referral system populated with a set of
11 localized clinical care pathways to effect successful implementation. In terms of CFIR's
12 "inner setting" corporate and professional cultures, the implementation climate and
13 readiness for implementation were not properly addressed during implementation.
14 There was a culture of low trust between the DHB and other actors in the health system
15 and an embedded division between primary and secondary care clinicians. There were
16 no organizational rewards or incentives for end users to use HealthPathways (poor
17 implementation climate). There was also a lack of readiness to implement, notably a
18 lack of funding to allow for dedicated time for secondary and primary care clinicians to
19 meet and interact meaningfully as part of HealthPathway development. There were also
20 multiple failures of the implementation process across all its four components: planning,
21 engaging, executing and reflecting/evaluating.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 This qualitative interview study utilised purposive sampling to recruit a sample that
51 varied by health care professional group (primary care and secondary care) and by
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 degree of involvement with the Southern HealthPathways programme. The choice of
4 individual interviews was appropriate as it allowed participants to talk openly about the
5 problems being encountered with the HealthPathways programme. It was appropriate
6 that the study focused on a single NZ health region as it was designed in partnership
7 with the local health system (Alliance South) to provide context specific findings that
8 would be of benefit to the local health system.²⁰ Nonetheless, it is likely that our key
9 finding – the need to consider the adaptable periphery when implementing interventions
10 – is transferable to other NZ health regions and other health systems in which
11 HealthPathways are being implemented. A strength of the chosen implementation
12 science framework (CFIR) is that it is “meta-theoretical”, including constructs from a
13 synthesis of existing implementation theories, and it is designed to allow researchers to
14 test out empirically mechanisms theorized to promote or hinder implementation of a
15 given intervention.¹⁴ It is also intended to be used flexibly, with the researchers selecting
16 and identifying constructs which best explain their findings. We did not have an a priori
17 view of which CFIR domains would explain the problems in the implementation process,
18 we deductively coded into all of the five CFIR domains and through an iterative process
19 of reviewing the domain categories we were able to identify those which were most
20 relevant to HealthPathways implementation and thereby explain why the
21 implementation had been problematic in this specific context.

22
23
24 We found the recruitment of participants challenging and, while we had not set a fixed
25 number of planned interviews, were only able to recruit a small number of participants
26 (three) who were categorised as end users of Health Pathways and not involved with
27 the implementation process. We believe this difficulty reflects the findings, in that the

1
2
3 project was not well planned and implemented and so interest in speaking about
4
5 HealthPathways was adversely affected. We had originally intended to combine this
6
7 qualitative process evaluation with a quantitative component to determine if
8
9 HealthPathways were effective in improving care of people with two exemplar clinical
10
11 conditions through a before and after comparison of key process and outcome
12
13 measures. We were unable to meet this second objective as we were informed, after
14
15 award of the research grant, that the Health Pathways team would not be able to collect
16
17 this data due to delays in implementing the project and project planning. It was a
18
19 requirement of the study that Alliance South would set up the data collection process,
20
21 not the research team.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 There has to date been no formative evaluation of HealthPathways in NZ. The
30
31 Canterbury HealthPathways programme, for example, has conducted a limited
32
33 evaluation consisting of an online survey of primary and secondary care clinicians and
34
35 audits of pathways use.^{3 9 21} In contrast, two different Australian states have conducted
36
37 a process evaluation of HealthPathways using a qualitative case study approach: New
38
39 South Wales (Hunter and New England)⁵ and Victoria (Barwon).^{6 11} Neither Australian
40
41 studies used an explicit implementation science framework; instead, they descriptively
42
43 list the “barriers” and “facilitators” to implementation. These two evaluations considered
44
45 that implementation had been successful and the Hunter and New England study’s list
46
47 of “critical success factors” are the mirror image of a number of the key implementation
48
49 issues identified in this study: senior management support, senior clinical leadership,
50
51 involvement of clinicians in development, need for pathways to add value for clinicians
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and engagement with hospital specialists.⁵ Both evaluations' list of "barriers" highlighted
4
5 lack of awareness by GPs of the HealthPathways programme.^{5,6}
6
7

8
9 CFIR now has a good evidence base as it has been applied across a wide variety of
10
11 implementation study designs and settings.¹⁵ A recent CFIR-informed qualitative
12
13 process evaluation study (exploring the barriers affecting implementation of an online
14
15 frailty tool into primary care), using a similar methodology, also found that it was
16
17 necessary to report empirical findings that related to the most important CFIR domains
18
19 to best "make sense" of the data.²²
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 Given we intended that this evaluation should help Alliance South in its implementation
28
29 of HealthPathways in line with a university-health sector collaboration²⁰ we are able to
30
31 report how these findings have been used. During the study interview phase (2016) we
32
33 were able to feedback highlights of our emerging findings to the Alliance South
34
35 HealthPathways workstream who then shared with us their own internal report (Bridget-
36
37 Mary McGown, Alliance South, personal communication). The latter report
38
39 independently highlighted several of our emerging findings. On completion of our
40
41 preliminary analysis (2017) our findings were presented to the Alliance South
42
43 HealthPathways Steering Group. At the same time the DHB had undergone a
44
45 restructure with a new Chief Executive who wished to prioritise HealthPathways
46
47 implementation. There was therefore senior management team support to initiate a re-
48
49 launch of the programme which has taken account of the key findings of this study,
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 notably the need to ensure dedicated time for secondary and primary care clinicians to
4
5 meet and interact as part of HealthPathways development.
6
7
8
9

10
11 It is not always the case that quality improvement initiatives, such as HealthPathways,
12
13 are successfully implemented and thereby lead to positive outcomes for patients and
14
15 health practitioners. Publication bias may also mean that there are less published
16
17 studies reporting negative quality improvement research findings.²³ We argue there is
18
19 great benefit in understanding why, and under what circumstances and in which
20
21 contexts, some quality improvement interventions fail. Although we currently have
22
23 limited evidence as to whether HealthPathways improve health outcomes for patients
24
25 (as opposed to being viewed by health practitioners as improving referral quality and
26
27 promoting integration of care) it is clear that there is rapid adoption of HealthPathways
28
29 both within other regions of NZ, Australia and also in the UK.⁶ A consequence of this is
30
31 that they are being implemented in very different contexts than those present in
32
33 Canterbury NZ in 2007-2008 when the programme was first developed and
34
35 implemented. What we have shown, using the CFIR framework, is that a focus on the
36
37 core component of HealthPathways (web-portal and referral system) without adequate
38
39 consideration of the adaptable periphery (which is context dependent) when
40
41 implementing HealthPathways into a health system means implementation will likely fail.
42
43 Others have similarly shown the importance of the local context in determining whether
44
45 or not local implementation works or fails when rolling out a national quality
46
47 improvement programme in secondary care.²⁴ We therefore consider that the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 implication of our work for future implementers of HealthPathways and similar complex
4
5 interventions is always to consider the local context within which they are to be
6
7 implemented and to tailor the implementation approach to address these.
8
9

10
11 *Word count: 4636*
12

13 *Acknowledgements*

14
15
16
17 The authors would like to thank the participants for their time and the Southern DHB
18
19 HealthPathways Steering Committee for their sharing of information.
20
21
22

23 *Contributors*

24
25
26 TS conceived and designed the study with input from RG and FDN. ET conducted the
27
28 interviews and led on the data analysis with input from TS. TS drafted the manuscript.
29
30 All authors read, provided critical review and approved the final manuscript.
31
32

33 *Competing interests*

34
35
36 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
37
38

39 *Authors' information*

40
41
42 RG was independent chair of Alliance South at the time the study was conducted. ET
43
44 was an Assistant Research Fellow in the Department of General Practice and Rural
45
46 Health, Dunedin School of Medicine at the time of conducting the research.
47
48
49

50 *Funding*

1
2
3 University of Otago Research Grant (UORG) and the Dean's Bequest Fund, Dunedin
4
5 School of Medicine. The funding body had no involvement in the design of the study
6
7 and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.
8
9

10 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

11
12
13
14 Ethical approval was obtained from the Otago University Human Ethics Committee
15
16 (16/024). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.
17

18 *Data sharing statement*

19
20
21 Full de-identified interview transcripts will not be shared. Informed consent, in line with
22
23 the approving ethics committee, only allows for the use of de-identified extracts within
24
25 research reporting and writing, in order to maintain the privacy of participants based in a
26
27 defined regional area and population, thus making their identification with full transcripts
28
29 more likely.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 CFIR Domains and associated constructs. Domains and constructs used in the study are in bold.

<p>1. Intervention Characteristics</p> <p><i>Interventions have core components (essential elements) and an adaptable periphery (adaptable elements, structures and systems related to the intervention and the organization into which it is being implemented)</i></p>	<p>3. Inner Setting</p> <p><i>The structural and cultural contexts through which the implementation process occurs</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Intervention source</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Structural characteristics</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evidence strength and quality</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Networks and communication</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Relative advantage</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation climate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Trialability</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readiness for implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Complexity</i> 	<p>4. Characteristics of Individuals</p> <p><i>The individuals involved with the intervention and/or implementation process</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Design quality and packaging</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and beliefs about the intervention
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cost</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-efficacy
<p>2. Outer Setting</p> <p><i>The economic, political and social context within which an organisation resides</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual stage of change
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Patient needs and resources</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other personal attributes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cosmopolitanism</i> 	<p>5. Implementation Process</p> <p><i>An active change process is usually required to deliver individual and organizational use of the intervention as designed</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Peer pressure</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>External policy and incentives</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflecting and Evaluating

REFERENCES

1. Armitage GD, Suter E, Oelke ND, et al. Health systems integration: state of the evidence. *International journal of integrated care* 2009;9:e82. [published Online First: 2009/07/11]
2. Kinsman L, Rotter T, James E, et al. What is a clinical pathway? Development of a definition to inform the debate. *BMC medicine* 2010;8:31. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-8-31 [published Online First: 2010/05/29]
3. McGeoch G, Anderson I, Gibson J, et al. Consensus pathways: evidence into practice. *The New Zealand medical journal* 2015;128(1408):86-96. [published Online First: 2015/02/11]
4. Robinson S, Varhol R, Bell C, et al. HealthPathways: creating a pathway for health systems reform. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2014 doi: 10.1071/ah14155 [published Online First: 2014/12/01]
5. Gray JS, Swan JR, Lynch MA, et al. Hunter and New England HealthPathways: a 4-year journey of integrated care. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2018;42(1):66-71. doi: 10.1071/ah16197 [published Online First: 2017/02/20]
6. Gill SD, Mansfield S, McLeod M, et al. HealthPathways improving access to care. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2018;early online publication doi: 10.1071/ah17090 [published Online First: 2018/02/09]
7. Reyneke A, Jaye C, Stokes T. Local clinical pathways: from 'good ideas' to 'practicality' for general practitioners. *Journal of Primary Health Care* 2018 doi: 10.1071/HC18023 [published Online First: 2018/09/05]
8. Timmins N, Ham C. The quest for integrated health and social care. A case study in Canterbury, New Zealand. London, 2013.
9. McGeoch G, McGeoch P, Shand B. Is HealthPathways effective? An online survey of hospital clinicians, general practitioners and practice nurses. *The New Zealand medical journal* 2015;128(1408):36-46. [published Online First: 2015/02/11]
10. Ministry of Health. Better, Sooner, More Convenient Health Care in the Community. Wellington: Ministry of Health, 2011.
11. Mansfield SJ, Quirk F, von Treuer K, et al. On the right path? Exploring the experiences and opinions of clinicians involved in developing and implementing HealthPathways Barwon. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2016;40(2):129-35. doi: 10.1071/ah15009 [published Online First: 2015/12/23]
12. Gauld R. What should governance for integrated care look like? New Zealand's alliances provide some pointers. *The Medical journal of Australia* 2014;201(3 Suppl):S67-8. [published Online First: 2014/07/23]
13. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, et al. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ* 2008;337:a1655.
14. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, et al. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing

- 1
2
3 implementation science. *Implementation science : IS* 2009;4:50. doi:
4 10.1186/1748-5908-4-50 [published Online First: 2009/08/12]
5
6 15. Kirk MA, Kelley C, Yankey N, et al. A systematic review of the use of the
7 Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research. *Implementation science : IS*
8 2016;11:72. doi: 10.1186/s13012-016-0437-z [published Online First:
9 2016/05/18]
10
11 16. Davidoff F, Dixon-Woods M, Leviton L, et al. Demystifying theory and its use in
12 improvement. *BMJ quality & safety* 2015;24(3):228-38. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2014-
13 003627 [published Online First: 2015/01/27]
14
15 17. The Improved Clinical Effectiveness through Behavioural Research Group.
16 Designing theoretically-informed implementation interventions. *Implementation
17 Science* 2006;1(1):4. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-1-4
18
19 18. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, et al. Using the framework method for the analysis
20 of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Med Res Methodol*
21 2013;13(1):117. doi: 1471-2288-13-117 [pii];10.1186/1471-2288-13-117 [doi]
22
23 19. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
24 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International
25 journal for quality in health care : journal of the International Society for Quality in
26 Health Care* 2007;19(6):349-57. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042 [published Online
27 First: 2007/09/18]
28
29 20. Soper B, Yaqub O, Hinrichs S, et al. CLAHRCs in practice: combined knowledge
30 transfer and exchange strategies, cultural change, and experimentation. *Journal
31 of health services research & policy* 2013;18(3 Suppl):53-64. doi:
32 10.1177/1355819613499903 [published Online First: 2013/10/09]
33
34 21. Kenealy TW, Sheridan NF, Connolly MJ. HealthPathways website: making the right
35 thing the easy thing to do? *The New Zealand medical journal* 2015;128(1408):6-
36 9. [published Online First: 2015/02/11]
37
38 22. Warner G, Lawson B, Sampalli T, et al. Applying the consolidated framework for
39 implementation research to identify barriers affecting implementation of an online
40 frailty tool into primary health care: a qualitative study. *BMC Health Serv Res*
41 2018;18(1):395. doi: 10.1186/s12913-018-3163-1 [published Online First:
42 2018/06/02]
43
44 23. Kringos DS, Sunol R, Wagner C, et al. The influence of context on the effectiveness
45 of hospital quality improvement strategies: a review of systematic reviews. *BMC
46 Health Serv Res* 2015;15:277. doi: 10.1186/s12913-015-0906-0 [published
47 Online First: 2015/07/23]
48
49 24. Dixon-Woods M, Leslie M, Tarrant C, et al. Explaining Matching Michigan: an
50 ethnographic study of a patient safety program. *Implementation science : IS*
51 2013;8:70. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-8-70 [published Online First: 2013/06/22]
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplementary file 1: INTERVIEW TOPIC GUIDE

So following on from the information sheet, just to reiterate, we're hoping to explore your views and experiences of the HealthPathways initiative in the Southern Region, including what has been challenging or beneficial in relation to their implementation."

"CONSENT PROCESS"

Before we begin, do you have any further questions?

The following questions are examples rather than a set of specific questions.

Question
<p>When did you first hear about HealthPathways in the Southern Region? What do you understand them to be? What were your initial thoughts? Did you feel they met a need?</p>
<p>What do you know about how HealthPathways in the Southern Region came about and how they created? Who was involved? What did you think of the process?</p>
<p>How useful do you think the HealthPathways initiative in the Southern Region is? How were you introduced to them? What were your initial thoughts? Did you feel they met a need? What gap does it fill? What problem does it solve? If not, why not? What is not being addressed? Is this a fix to a problem you don't perceive? Is there a problem about communication/process, etc. rather than concept/content?</p>
<p>What has been your experience of using a pathway? Did they fit well with normal practice? Have you used a healthpathway; if yes which one? How was that for you? What was better than before/what wasn't so good?</p>
<p>What has worked well in Southern Region initiative to implement HealthPathways in your opinion? Why? Communication; resourcing; support; clinical leadership; IT; patient information; effective governance of the work etc.</p>
<p>What has not worked so well in Southern Region initiative to implement HealthPathways in your opinion? Why? Communication; resourcing; support; clinical leadership; IT; patient information; effective governance of the work etc.</p>
<p>If you were asked to make a recommendation about the continuation of HealthPathways, what recommendation would you make? Why?</p>
<p>If you were asked to suggest further conditions for HealthPathways what would you suggest? Why? Are these conditions, particular prevalent or is the care (care coordination) for these conditions particularly fractured/complicated?</p>
<p>Is there anything else you would like to make comment on in regard to HealthPathways in general or the HealthPathways initiative in the Southern Region?</p>

Supplementary File 2

COREQ (COnsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) 32 item Checklist

Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. International Journal for Quality in Health Care. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

Domain	Item Number	Comment	Reported on page number or not applicable (N/A)
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
<i>Personal characteristics</i>			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	The Assistant Research Fellow (Dr Emma Tumilty) conducted the interviews	8
Credentials	2	All four research team members have extensive experience of conducting qualitative health research	N/A
Occupation	3	ET was an Assistant Research Fellow at the University of Otago at the time of conducting the research	1
Gender	4	Two male-identifying and two female identifying researchers (interviewer, female-identifying)	
Experience and training	5	All four research team members have extensive experience of conducting qualitative health research	N/A
<i>Relationship with participants</i>			
Relationship established	6	The assistant research fellow had no relationships with participants prior to the study, while the broader research team had varying relationships with the health community at large. It was felt the interviewer should be seen as an unbiased enquirer rather than a person with a particular stance or opinion about the topic.	8, 24
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	The interviewer introduced herself to participants stating she was not a medical professional, etc. as well as describing the research team, its funding, the purpose of the project and answering any questions participants may have had about the project and those involved in it.	N/A

Interviewer characteristics	8	The interviewer was not a medical professional, but aware of the medical system in New Zealand and had read the literature on care pathways prior to beginning the project.	N/A
Domain 2: Study design			
<i>Theoretical framework</i>			
Methodological orientation and theory	9	Deductive thematic analysis using the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research	9
<i>Participant selection</i>			
Sampling	10	Purposive sampling was used	8
Method of approach	11	Various methods of approach were used, group emails were sent via a third party, invitations were added to newsletters, emails were sent to practices, and those taking part or responding were also asked to pass on information to others (snowball sampling).	N/A
Sample size	12	Ten	10
Non-participation	13	A number of key informants did not respond to the invitation to participate, however no person responded directly to decline taking part, nor did anyone drop out once agreeing to take part.	N/A
<i>Setting</i>			
Setting of data collection	14	Participants could determine whether the interview took place in their place of work or in a private meeting room arranged by the interviewer on the university campus.	N/A
Presence of nonparticipants	15	None	N/A
Description of sample	16	Fully presented in results section	10
<i>Data collection</i>			
Interview guide	17	The interview guide was open, but listed a number of key questions and potential prompts. Interviews generally followed a similar approach although questions themselves varied depending on the participant.	Supplemental file
Repeat interviews	18	No	N/A
Audio/visual recording	19	All interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed.	9
Field notes	20	Yes, the interviewer wrote brief field notes after each interview regarding the nature of the interview and her perceptions of the participants responses, etc.	N/A

Duration	21	Interview times varied but were generally around 60mins	N/A
Data saturation	22	Not applicable as a deductive thematic analysis	N/A
Transcripts returned	23	No	N/A
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	The interviewer coded the data and described codes and these were discussed with all members of the interview team on a regular basis	9
Description of the coding tree	25	Codes had tags and description within the software except for where they were self-explanatory	9
Derivation of themes	26	The themes were those used in the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research	9
Software	27	nVivo 11 was used	9
Participant checking	28	No	N/A
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Yes quotations are presented and identified in a manner protecting participants confidentiality	10-18
Data and findings consistent	30	Consistency between the data and the findings exists	10-18
Clarity of major themes	31	Yes, major themes are clearly identified	
Clarity of minor themes	32	Yes, minor themes (CIFR constructs) are clearly identified and related to major themes.	10-18

BMJ Open

HealthPathways implementation in a New Zealand health region: a qualitative study using the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-025094.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Nov-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Stokes, Tim; Otago University, General Practice & Rural Health Tumilty, Emma; University of Texas Medical Branch School of Health Professions, Institute for Translational Sciences Doolan-Noble, F; University of Otago, General Practice and Rural Health Gauld, Robin; University of Otago, Otago Business School
Primary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Qualitative research
Keywords:	PRIMARY CARE, HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6 **HealthPathways implementation in a New Zealand health region: a qualitative**
7
8 **study using the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research**
9
10

11
12
13
14
15 Tim Stokes^{1*}, Emma Tumilty^{1 2}, Fiona Doolan-Noble¹, Robin Gauld³.
16
17

18
19
20 1. Department of General Practice & Rural Health, Dunedin School of Medicine,
21 University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
22

23
24 2. Institute for Translational Sciences, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston,
25 Texas, United States
26

27
28 3. Otago Business School, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
29
30

31
32
33
34 *Corresponding Author: tim.stokes@otago.ac.nz
35

36 Department of General Practice & Rural Health, Dunedin School of Medicine, University
37 of Otago, PO Box 56, Dunedin 9054, New Zealand
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

ABSTRACT

Objectives To explore the process of implementation of an online health information web-based portal and referral system (HealthPathways) using implementation science theory: the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR).

Setting Southern Health Region of New Zealand (Otago and Southland).

Participants Key Informants (providers and planners of health care) (n=10) who were either involved in the process of implementing HealthPathways or who were intended end-users of HealthPathways.

Methods Semi-structured interviews were undertaken. A deductive thematic analysis using CFIR was conducted using the framework method.

Results CFIR postulates that for an intervention to be implemented successfully account must be taken of the intervention's core components and the adaptable periphery. The core component of HealthPathways – the web portal and referral system which contains a large number of localized clinical care pathways – had been addressed well by the product developers. Little attention had, however, been paid to addressing the adaptable periphery (adaptable elements, structures and systems related to HealthPathways and the organization into which it was being implemented) – it was seen as sufficient just to deliver the web portal and referral system and the set of clinical care pathways as developed to effect successful implementation. In terms of CFIR's "inner setting" corporate and professional cultures, the implementation climate and readiness for implementation were not properly addressed during implementation.

1
2
3 There were also multiple failures of the implementation process (for example, lack of
4 planning and engagement with clinicians). As a consequence, implementation of
5 HealthPathways was highly problematic.
6
7
8
9

10 **Conclusions** The use of CFIR has furthered our understanding of the factors needed
11 for the successful implementation of a complex health intervention (HealthPathways) in
12 the New Zealand health system. Those charged with implementing complex health
13 interventions should always consider the local context within which they will be
14 implemented and tailor their implementation strategy to address these.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 *Word Count: 297*
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first process evaluation of implementing HealthPathways in New Zealand using qualitative methods.
- The use of implementation science theory (Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research) allowed us to “unpack” the reasons why the implementation of HealthPathways in the Southern Region of New Zealand was so challenging.
- The study focused on a single health region as it was designed in partnership with the local health system to provide context specific findings that would be of benefit to the local health system.
- We were only able to recruit small number of participants who were not involved with the implementation process.

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

INTRODUCTION

The New Zealand (NZ) health system, in common with those of other jurisdictions, struggles to provide integration of health services across primary and secondary care.¹ One important quality improvement initiative promoted internationally since the 1980s to improve health care integration is care pathways. Care pathways have five key characteristics, they: 1) provide a structured multidisciplinary plan of care; 2) translate national evidence-based clinical guidelines into local structures; 3) detail the components of care required in an algorithm or pathway; 4) provide a time frame or criterion-based progression through the health system; and 5) aim to standardise care for a specific clinical condition in a specific local population.² In NZ a key adaptation has been the embedding of web-based clinical care pathways into general practice-hospital electronic referral management systems (ERMS). The use of care pathways in NZ has been championed by Canterbury District Health Board (DHB), who in 2008 developed an online health information web-based portal (containing the individual care pathways for specific clinical conditions) and referral system called HealthPathways.³ Currently HealthPathways provides health practitioners with guidance and a referral pathway for over 550 clinical conditions (<https://www.healthpathwayscommunity.org/About.aspx>). There has been rapid adoption of HealthPathways and similar systems across NZ's DHBs and in Australia.⁴⁻⁷ Its advocates claim that HealthPathways is an important means of achieving health care integration,^{8,9} which has been a NZ government priority since the 2009 publication of *Better Sooner More Convenient*.¹⁰ This claim is supported by an emerging evidence base which suggests that HealthPathway use is associated with an improvement in referral quality from primary care to secondary care and more

1
2
3 timely access to secondary care.³ End users of HealthPathways also report, in online
4 surveys⁹ and qualitative case studies,^{5 6 11} that HealthPathways improved their
5 knowledge of local services and changed their clinical management decisions.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 In the Southern Health Region of NZ's South Island (Otago and Southland), the
13 Southern DHB and the WellSouth Primary Health Network (Primary Health
14 Organisation: PHO) are working to further health service integration through Alliance
15 South,¹² which is a contractual alliance between the two organisations aimed at
16 improving care coordination and integration. In 2013 Alliance South embarked upon the
17 implementation of the Canterbury HealthPathways in the Southern Region – Southern
18 HealthPathways. The approach used Clinical Editors - general practitioners (GPs) who
19 consulted with selected Southern Region secondary care clinicians (hospital specialists)
20 - to localize/adapt each individual Canterbury clinical care pathway for use in the
21 Southern health region: by 2017 over 400 individual clinical care pathways had been
22 localized and could be accessed through the Southern HealthPathways web portal and
23 referral system (<https://southern.healthpathways.org.nz/>). The focus was on the
24 technical development of a suite of adapted pathways. In 2016 a team of researchers
25 from the Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago, partnered with the local
26 health system through Alliance South to conduct a mixed methods evaluation of the
27 Southern HealthPathways programme. The rationale for this university-health service
28 partnership was to build evaluation capacity in the Southern Region and the
29 HealthPathways initiative was identified as a strategic priority for evaluation by Alliance
30 South.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

We report here the findings of the qualitative process evaluation. One key challenge in evaluating the implementation of HealthPathways is that they can be conceptualised as a complex health care intervention¹³ and thus without a qualitative process evaluation it is not possible to determine which aspects of the intervention in a defined health care context are likely to lead to its success. Our study aim was therefore to understand the process by which Southern HealthPathways were being implemented using a commonly used implementation science theory: the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR).^{14 15}

METHODS

Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR)

In understanding how quality improvement initiatives work there is increasing emphasis on the use of theory drawn from the social sciences to better develop quality improvement interventions, optimise their design and identify aspects of context necessary for their success.^{16 17} The CFIR is a “meta-theoretical” framework that provides an overarching typology of implementation. It offers a comprehensive, standardised list of constructs which allow researchers to identify variables that are most relevant to a particular intervention.¹⁴ The CFIR addresses intervention delivery (context; implementation; mechanisms of action) through 26 constructs organized into five major domains: intervention characteristics (eight constructs), outer setting (four constructs), inner setting (five constructs), characteristics of the individuals involved (five constructs), and the process of implementation (four constructs) (see Table 1)

1
2
3 [insert Table 1 here]. CFIR has been widely used to inform qualitative process
4
5 evaluations across a range of complex interventions.¹⁵
6

7 *Design and sampling*

8
9
10 Semi-structured interviews were conducted by ET between May and November 2016
11
12 with key informants (providers and planners of care) from the Southern DHB catchment
13
14 area (Otago and Southland). The Southern DHB is the southernmost DHB in NZ and is
15
16 responsible for planning, funding and providing health and disability services to a
17
18 population of over 300,000 and serves the largest geographic region of all NZ's DHBs
19
20 (<https://www.southerndhb.govt.nz/index.php?page=654>). Key informants were sampled
21
22
23 purposively in order to construct a maximum variation sample that aimed to include
24
25 primary care (GPs), secondary care clinicians, community nursing services and health
26
27 service planners from the Southern DHB and WellSouth PHO. From this group of
28
29 stakeholders we also aimed to include those who had a Southern DHB
30
31 planning/management, Alliance South or other clinical leadership role, had direct
32
33 involvement with the Alliance South HealthPathways work programme or who were end
34
35 users of the HealthPathways (GPs).
36
37
38
39
40

41 *Data collection*

42
43
44 The semi-structured interviews used a topic guide based on a literature review, relevant
45
46 CFIR guidance (<https://cfirguide.org/>) and discussions within the research team. The
47
48 topic guide (Supplementary File 1) covered: a) views concerning the acceptability and
49
50 utility of HealthPathways; b) the implementation of the HealthPathways initiative in
51
52 Southern Region, with a focus on context specific barriers and facilitators to
53
54
55

1
2
3 implementation; and c) any specific issues relating to the actual use of HealthPathways
4 by participants (if a health care practitioner). The topic guide was used flexibly to allow
5 participants to construct their accounts in their own terms. All interviews were digitally-
6 recorded and transcribed verbatim.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 *Data analysis*

14
15
16 A deductive thematic analysis was conducted using the framework method.¹⁸ Interviews
17 were coded deductively by ET, assisted by NVivo 10 qualitative analysis software, into
18 the five domains of the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research
19 (<http://www.cfirguide.org/>) and, as appropriate, into each domains' constructs. TS
20 independently checked the assignment of a sample of data to the domains and
21 constructs. Interpretation of the data, in particular the linkage between the CFIR
22 domains and constructs, was an iterative process which was led by ET and TS, with
23 input from FDN and RG. In addition, reports and relevant documents were sought from
24 the Alliance South Southern HealthPathways Steering Group to provide background
25 information and timelines.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ)¹⁹ were used to
41 structure reporting of the methods and the findings (Supplementary File 2).
42
43
44

45 *Patient and Public Involvement*

46
47
48
49 No patients or the public were involved in this study.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

Five GPs and five secondary care clinicians were interviewed. Of the ten participants four had a Southern DHB planning/management, Alliance South or other clinical leadership role. Three participants had direct involvement with the Alliance South Health Pathways work programme. Three participants were end users of HealthPathways.

As the interviews progressed and analysis was undertaken it became apparent that there were significant problems with the implementation of HealthPathways in the Southern Region. Thus the focus of the analysis shifted to using the relevant CFIR domains and constructs (Table 1) to systematically explore the question as to why implementation was proving problematic. Illustrative participant quotes are presented.

Domain 1: Intervention Characteristics

Core component and adaptable periphery

The CFIR framework (Table 1) conceptualizes complex interventions as having both core components (defined as the essential and indispensable elements of the intervention itself) *and* an adaptable periphery (adaptable elements, structures and systems related to the intervention and the organization into which it is being implemented).¹⁴ In order for an intervention to be implemented successfully account must be taken of both the core components and the adaptable periphery.

Participants reported that the core component of the HealthPathways intervention – the web portal and referral system which contained a large number of individual clinical care

1
2
3 pathways – had been addressed well by the product developers. It was considered to
4 be well designed and easy to access, the pathways for each clinical condition were
5 appropriate and the web portal supported use of the ERMS that generated the referral
6 letter from primary to secondary care:
7
8
9
10

11
12
13 *This has changed my life in primary care. This is the best thing If I have a*
14 *problem, if I have a woman come in with postmenopausal bleeding I go tick, tick,*
15 *tick, there it is. "Have you done this, this, and this? Is it this or that?" Do that. If it*
16 *is this and this, then refer here [ERMS] and she will get an appointment. It's just*
17 *e-mail off, she'll get an appointment within three weeks. (Participant 4)*
18
19
20
21
22

23
24
25 *On the whole I'm a big fan of Health Pathways. I'm a fan of it and ERMS linking*
26 *up well together General Practice in New Zealand is probably more*
27 *electronically savvy than any other place in the world. (Participant 5)*
28
29
30
31

32 What was apparent, however, in participants' accounts of how the core component (web
33 portal and referral system) was implemented was there was limited or no consideration
34 of the adaptable periphery. There was no clear understanding by the local team leading
35 the implementation process of the need to both construct and populate a web portal and
36 referral system (core component) and to address related issues that were necessary for
37 the Canterbury HealthPathways to be successfully adapted and used in the Southern
38 Health System (adaptable periphery). As a consequence, the implementation project
39 was resourced to deliver the web portal and referral system but not to do the necessary
40 related activities. Thus there was little or no funding of primary care time to allow
41 engagement with project development and with secondary care. Support for the key
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 activity of communicating about the intervention, its benefits, and how it can be used to
4
5 further integration across primary and secondary care was also lacking:
6
7

8 *I don't think you can go back to what Canterbury did [to achieve successful*
9 *implementation] because the time and resources aren't there. (Participant 3)*
10
11

12
13 In short, it was apparent that the adaptable periphery had not been addressed - it was
14
15 seen as simply sufficient to deliver the web portal and referral system populated with a
16
17 minimally edited set of individual clinical care pathways (the core component of
18
19 HealthPathways) to effect successful implementation:
20
21

22
23 *What they would do would be to take the Pathways that had been developed in*
24 *Canterbury and simply cross out Canterbury and write Southern on them, and*
25 *that would be fine and behaviours would change and everything would be hunky-*
26 *dory. This mistaken view that what's on the flowchart on the piece of paper at the*
27 *end is the process, which it isn't. I said to them on numerous occasions it is like*
28 *taking somebody else's holiday snapshots and thinking that you've then had a*
29 *holiday, which is complete nonsense. Most of them you won't understand. The*
30 *essential part of HealthPathways is the conversation. (Participant 1)*
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Domain 3 – Inner Setting**

46
47 CFIR's "inner setting" (Table 1) is defined as the structural and cultural contexts through
48
49 which the implementation process occurs.¹⁴
50
51

52 *Culture*

1
2
3 Implementation of the HealthPathways took place in a local health system where two
4 strong corporate and professional cultures worked against the successful
5
6 implementation of an intervention that straddled both primary and secondary care. The
7
8 first of these, the local corporate culture – represented through the relationships
9
10 between the DHB, PHO, secondary care clinicians and general practice – was seen as
11
12 being both resistant to change and characterized by a low trust relationship between the
13
14 DHB and other actors in the system. Resistance to change was considered at least in
15
16 part due to a continued environment of financial austerity and a need for the DHB to
17
18 “balance its books”:
19
20
21
22

23
24 *A resistance to change, which I think was about the whole health system being*
25
26 *so stressed at the time with focus on financial deficit. (Participant 8)*
27
28

29 A low trust relationship was considered to exist between the DHB and the other actors,
30 notably general practice. Participants considered HealthPathways was yet another
31
32 transient initiative to improve health care, which would likely fail to deliver its intended
33
34 outcomes:
35
36
37

38
39 *Mistrust, it's being done to us and what are the DHB, they're sending me*
40
41 *negative vibes about management in this DHB. This is another effort and just one*
42
43 *of their things, and like other things it will come and go. (Participant 2).*
44
45

46 The second prevalent culture was one where secondary care (hospital specialists) and
47
48 primary care (GPs) were seen as having different cultures based on their different
49
50 scopes of medical practice and funding models. This culture of an embedded division
51
52 between primary and secondary care had not to date been addressed in the Southern
53
54

1
2
3 Region through formal facilitated initiatives to get both groups working collaboratively
4
5 across primary and secondary care:
6
7

8 *I don't think that there's any particular antipathy. The way I see it from the*
9 *secondary care perspective, by and large, and I don't really know what our*
10 *colleagues in primary care think, but I do think that from secondary care*
11 *clinicians, they've never had the opportunity of being in the same room and*
12 *working out processes with primary care. I don't think they're opposed to it, it's*
13 *just a foreign idea. (Participant 1)*
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 *Implementation climate*

23
24 A key aspect of the implementation climate that was not addressed properly was
25
26 organizational incentives and rewards. The implementation process failed to consider
27
28 ways in which using the Pathways would be rewarded for either secondary or primary
29
30 care. That is to say, for clinicians that understood the purpose of pathways then using
31
32 them made sense and was rewarding because there was an appreciation that they
33
34 made clinical processes more efficient. For clinicians who had not yet bought into
35
36 pathways not using them meant business as usual (i.e. no direct penalty was incurred
37
38 other than having to either write referrals that were denied or receive referrals that did
39
40 not include all the information). Thus, there was little incentive to engage with the
41
42 intervention which required getting used to a new system and undertaking extra effort
43
44 (i.e. for GPs more tests to be done prior to referral to secondary care; for hospital
45
46 specialists more explicit triaging of referrals based on the specific clinical pathway
47
48 criteria):
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 *I know the secondary care champion on the steering group is finding it very*
4 *difficult to engage other clinicians. Until there's some pressure to treat people, or*
5 *to manage and triage people according to Health Pathways there, then you won't*
6 *get the buy-in. (Participant 9)*
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 *Readiness for implementation*

14
15 This CFIR construct is defined as the tangible and immediate indicator of the
16 organisation's decision to implement an intervention¹⁴ (in this case the organisation is
17 defined as the DHB and the PHO working together through an Alliancing framework). It
18 consists of three sub-constructs (leadership engagement, available resources and
19 access to information and knowledge). Overall, readiness for implementation was
20 limited. Apart from the HealthPathways steering group, which was engaged with the
21 project, there was variable leadership engagement with primary and secondary care. In
22 terms of access to information and knowledge about HealthPathways this was strong in
23 primary care, but less so in secondary care:
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 *Buy-in is very limited from the secondary care system, whereas the PHO have*
38 *helped to put Health Pathways on everyone's workstation, or nearly everyone's*
39 *workstation, and so at least it's there, available to use, and there's some buy-in*
40 *that way. (Participant 3)*
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 As already explored in Domain 1, lack of available resources was a main reason why
48 there was a lack of readiness to implement HealthPathways. Most participants
49 considered an appropriately funded adaptation would have included dedicated time for
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 secondary and primary care to meet and interact meaningfully. This had not been the
4
5 case:
6
7

8 *The key to it [Canterbury HealthPathways] was that people in the primary care*
9 *sector were able to sit down in a room with secondary care clinicians and talk*
10 *about the experience for patients and what that meant. (Participant 1)*
11
12
13
14
15

16 17 18 **Domain 5 – The implementation process**

19
20
21 Participants considered that there had been multiple failures of the implementation
22
23 process (Table 1) across all its four components: planning, engaging, executing and
24
25 reflecting/evaluating.
26
27

28 *Planning*

29
30
31 This was perceived as an omission by participants. They considered that those who set
32
33 up the programme to take the Canterbury HealthPathways and adapt them for use in
34
35 the Southern region had only planned for the technical production of a suite of adapted
36
37 pathways and a basic “roll out”, with a limited amount of promotion. This was
38
39 considered to show a lack of understanding about what was achieved in Canterbury
40
41 during the planning phase and what was important to the successful uptake and use of
42
43 HealthPathways. Various initiatives were then undertaken after the fact with champions
44
45 appointed in secondary and primary care and communications disseminated more
46
47 regularly across the health sector.
48
49
50
51

52 *Engagement*

1
2
3 Engagement with the actual users of the HealthPathways was limited. Participants
4
5 raised the issue of a lack of planning to ensure that the wider community in primary and
6
7 secondary care were given the opportunity to meaningfully engage with the
8
9 HealthPathways initiative, which one participant referred to as “socialization”:
10
11

12
13 *Then I think the hardest part is probably how do you actually socialize it amongst*
14
15 *clinicians so that they regularly use the pathways. (...) I think that's probably*
16
17 *where things have not gone as well as they need to or could have. (Participant*
18
19 *7).*
20
21

22
23 *It's an uphill battle to get access to my secondary care colleagues, and when I*
24
25 *meet up with them, the first question I ask is, "How many of you know about*
26
27 *HealthPathways?" One or two might put up their hands. "How many of you use*
28
29 *it?" Then it's sort of deafening silence. A huge lack of knowledge about what*
30
31 *HealthPathways are and how they can benefit everybody, primarily the patient,*
32
33 *but they can help all of us in what we do. A lack of knowledge, and there's been*
34
35 *still no concerted drive from the powers that be to propagate the concept of*
36
37 *HealthPathways and how everybody can benefit from it. (Participant 2)*
38
39
40

41 Although a secondary care and a primary care clinician (hospital specialist and GP) had
42
43 been identified as champions for Pathways (both formally and informally) their work was
44
45 frustrated by a lack of managerial support during the implementation process:
46
47

48
49 *If you have something taken from outside and imposed on you, without any*
50
51 *background and information as to how you can benefit from this, individuals like*
52
53 *me trying to propagate that, I can easily be seen as just somebody the DHB has*
54
55

1
2
3 *put there to try and wave the flag. With no support from above, I'm fighting a*
4
5 *losing battle. (Participant 2)*
6
7

8 *Executing*

9

10 Executing the implementation was problematic, as explored in Domain 1, because it
11 focused on the core component and not on the adaptable periphery. What this meant
12 was that significant work was devoted to technology development (website, web portal
13 and localising existing individual care pathways) – thus the Clinical Editors were
14 contracted by the DHB to produce a large suite of edited pathways - but there was
15 inadequate resourcing to allow meaningful engagement with the wider secondary care
16 community. As a consequence “buy in” from clinicians was limited.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *Evaluation/Reflection*

28

29 There appeared to be very limited evaluation of the Southern HealthPathways
30 implementation. The only data that was reported were regular updates on the number of
31 live HealthPathways. Information on the numbers of health practitioners actually using
32 the individual clinical pathways was not consistently reported across speciality areas.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **DISCUSSION**

44

45 This is the first process evaluation of HealthPathways implementation in NZ using
46 qualitative methods and the first such evaluation to use the CFIR framework. The use of
47 implementation science theory (CFIR) allowed us to “unpack” the reasons why the
48 implementation of HealthPathways in the Southern Region of NZ was so challenging.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 CFIR postulates that for an intervention to be implemented successfully account must
4 be taken of both the intervention's core components and the adaptable periphery. We
5 found that the core component of HealthPathways – the web portal and referral system
6 which contains a large number of individual clinical care pathways – had been
7 addressed well by the product developers. Little attention had, however, been paid to
8 addressing the adaptable periphery (adaptable elements, structures and systems
9 related to the intervention and the organization into which it is being implemented) – it
10 was seen as sufficient just to deliver the web portal and referral system populated with a
11 set of localized clinical care pathways as developed to effect successful implementation.
12 In terms of CFIR's "inner setting" corporate and professional cultures, the
13 implementation climate and readiness for implementation were not properly addressed
14 during implementation. There was a culture of low trust between the DHB and other
15 actors in the health system and an embedded division between primary and secondary
16 care clinicians. There were no organizational rewards or incentives for end users to use
17 HealthPathways (poor implementation climate). There was also a lack of readiness to
18 implement, notably a lack of funding to allow for dedicated time for secondary and
19 primary care clinicians to meet and interact meaningfully as part of HealthPathway
20 development. There were also multiple failures of the implementation process across all
21 its four components: planning, engaging, executing and reflecting/evaluating.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 This qualitative interview study utilised purposive sampling to recruit a sample that
51 varied by health care professional group (primary care and secondary care) and by
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 degree of involvement with the Southern HealthPathways programme. The choice of
4 individual interviews was appropriate as it allowed participants to talk openly about the
5 problems being encountered with the HealthPathways programme. It was appropriate
6 that the study focused on a single NZ health region as it was designed in partnership
7 with the local health system (Alliance South) to provide context specific findings that
8 would be of benefit to the local health system.²⁰ Nonetheless, it is likely that our key
9 finding – the need to consider the adaptable periphery when implementing interventions
10 – is transferable to other NZ health regions and other health systems in which
11 HealthPathways are being implemented. A strength of the chosen implementation
12 science framework (CFIR) is that it is “meta-theoretical”, including constructs from a
13 synthesis of existing implementation theories, and it is designed to allow researchers to
14 test out empirically mechanisms theorized to promote or hinder implementation of a
15 given intervention.¹⁴ It is also intended to be used flexibly, with the researchers selecting
16 and identifying constructs which best explain their findings. We did not have an a priori
17 view of which CFIR domains would explain the problems in the implementation process,
18 we deductively coded into all of the five CFIR domains and through an iterative process
19 of reviewing the domain categories we were able to identify those which were most
20 relevant to HealthPathways implementation and thereby explain why the
21 implementation had been problematic in this specific context.

22
23
24 We found the recruitment of participants challenging and, while we had not set a fixed
25 number of planned interviews, were only able to recruit a small number of participants
26 (three) who were categorised as end users of Health Pathways and not involved with
27 the implementation process. We believe this difficulty reflects the findings, in that the

1
2
3 project was not well planned and implemented and so interest in speaking about
4
5 HealthPathways was adversely affected. We had originally intended to combine this
6
7 qualitative process evaluation with a quantitative component to determine if
8
9 HealthPathways were effective in improving care of people with two exemplar clinical
10
11 conditions through a before and after comparison of key process and outcome
12
13 measures. We were unable to meet this second objective as we were informed, after
14
15 award of the research grant, that the Health Pathways team would not be able to collect
16
17 this data due to delays in implementing the project and project planning. It was a
18
19 requirement of the study that Alliance South would set up the data collection process,
20
21 not the research team.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 There has to date been no formative evaluation of HealthPathways in NZ. The
30
31 Canterbury HealthPathways programme, for example, has conducted a limited
32
33 evaluation consisting of an online survey of primary and secondary care clinicians and
34
35 audits of pathways use.^{3 9 21} In contrast, two different Australian states have conducted
36
37 a process evaluation of HealthPathways using a qualitative case study approach: New
38
39 South Wales (Hunter and New England)⁵ and Victoria (Barwon).^{6 11} Neither Australian
40
41 studies used an explicit implementation science framework; instead, they descriptively
42
43 list the “barriers” and “facilitators” to implementation. These two evaluations considered
44
45 that implementation had been successful and the Hunter and New England study’s list
46
47 of “critical success factors” are the mirror image of a number of the key implementation
48
49 issues identified in this study: senior management support, senior clinical leadership,
50
51 involvement of clinicians in development, need for pathways to add value for clinicians
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 and engagement with hospital specialists.⁵ Both evaluations' list of "barriers" highlighted
4
5 lack of awareness by GPs of the HealthPathways programme.^{5 6}
6
7

8
9 CFIR now has a good evidence base as it has been applied across a wide variety of
10
11 implementation study designs and settings.¹⁵ A recent CFIR-informed qualitative
12
13 process evaluation study (exploring the barriers affecting implementation of an online
14
15 frailty tool into primary care), using a similar methodology, also found that it was
16
17 necessary to report empirical findings that related to the most important CFIR domains
18
19 to best "make sense" of the data.²²
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 Given we intended that this evaluation should help Alliance South in its implementation
28
29 of HealthPathways in line with a university-health sector collaboration²⁰ we are able to
30
31 report how these findings have been used. During the study interview phase (2016) we
32
33 were able to feedback highlights of our emerging findings to the Alliance South
34
35 HealthPathways workstream who then shared with us their own internal report (Bridget-
36
37 Mary McGown, Alliance South, personal communication). The latter report
38
39 independently highlighted several of our emerging findings. On completion of our
40
41 preliminary analysis (2017) our findings were presented to the Alliance South
42
43 HealthPathways Steering Group. At the same time the DHB had undergone a
44
45 restructure with a new Chief Executive who wished to prioritise HealthPathways
46
47 implementation. There was therefore senior management team support to initiate a re-
48
49 launch of the programme which has taken account of the key findings of this study,
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 notably the need to ensure dedicated time for secondary and primary care clinicians to
4
5 meet and interact as part of HealthPathways development.
6
7
8
9

10
11 It is not always the case that quality improvement initiatives, such as HealthPathways,
12
13 are successfully implemented and thereby lead to positive outcomes for patients and
14
15 health practitioners. Publication bias may also mean that there are less published
16
17 studies reporting negative quality improvement research findings.²³ We argue there is
18
19 great benefit in understanding why, and under what circumstances and in which
20
21 contexts, some quality improvement interventions fail. Although we currently have
22
23 limited evidence as to whether HealthPathways improve health outcomes for patients
24
25 (as opposed to being viewed by health practitioners as improving referral quality and
26
27 promoting integration of care) it is clear that there is rapid adoption of HealthPathways
28
29 both within other regions of NZ, Australia and also in the UK.⁶ A consequence of this is
30
31 that they are being implemented in very different contexts than those present in
32
33 Canterbury NZ in 2007-2008 when the programme was first developed and
34
35 implemented. What we have shown, using the CFIR framework, is that a focus on the
36
37 core component of HealthPathways (web-portal and referral system) without adequate
38
39 consideration of the adaptable periphery (which is context dependent) when
40
41 implementing HealthPathways into a health system means implementation will likely fail.
42
43 Others have similarly shown the importance of the local context in determining whether
44
45 or not local implementation works or fails when rolling out a national quality
46
47 improvement programme in secondary care.²⁴ We therefore consider that the
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

1
2
3 implication of our work for future implementers of HealthPathways and similar complex
4
5 interventions is always to consider the local context within which they are to be
6
7 implemented and to tailor the implementation approach to address these.
8
9

10
11 *Word count: 4668*
12

13 14 *Acknowledgements* 15

16
17 The authors would like to thank the participants for their time and the Southern DHB
18
19 HealthPathways Steering Committee for their sharing of information.
20
21
22

23 24 *Contributors* 25

26
27 TS conceived and designed the study with input from RG and FDN. ET conducted the
28
29 interviews and led on the data analysis with input from TS. TS drafted the manuscript.
30
31 All authors read, provided critical review and approved the final manuscript.
32

33 34 *Competing interests* 35

36
37 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
38

39 40 *Authors' information* 41

42
43 RG was independent chair of Alliance South at the time the study was conducted. ET
44
45 was an Assistant Research Fellow in the Department of General Practice and Rural
46
47 Health, Dunedin School of Medicine at the time of conducting the research.
48
49

50 51 *Funding* 52 53 54 55

1
2
3 University of Otago Research Grant (UORG) and the Dean's Bequest Fund, Dunedin
4
5 School of Medicine. The funding body had no involvement in the design of the study
6
7 and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.
8
9

10 11 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

12
13
14 Ethical approval was obtained from the Otago University Human Ethics Committee
15
16 (16/024). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.
17

18 19 *Data sharing statement*

20
21 Full de-identified interview transcripts will not be shared. Informed consent, in line with
22
23 the approving ethics committee, only allows for the use of de-identified extracts within
24
25 research reporting and writing, in order to maintain the privacy of participants based in a
26
27 defined regional area and population, thus making their identification with full transcripts
28
29 more likely.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 CFIR Domains and associated constructs. Domains and constructs used in the study are in bold.

<p>1. Intervention Characteristics</p> <p><i>Interventions have core components (essential elements) and an adaptable periphery (adaptable elements, structures and systems related to the intervention and the organization into which it is being implemented)</i></p>	<p>3. Inner Setting</p> <p><i>The structural and cultural contexts through which the implementation process occurs</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Intervention source</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Structural characteristics</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Evidence strength and quality</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Networks and communication</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Relative advantage</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Culture
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation climate
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Trialability</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readiness for implementation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Complexity</i> 	<p>4. Characteristics of Individuals</p> <p><i>The individuals involved with the intervention and/or implementation process</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Design quality and packaging</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and beliefs about the intervention
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cost</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-efficacy
<p>2. Outer Setting</p> <p><i>The economic, political and social context within which an organisation resides</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual stage of change
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Patient needs and resources</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other personal attributes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cosmopolitanism</i> 	<p>5. Implementation Process</p> <p><i>An active change process is usually required to deliver individual and organizational use of the intervention as designed</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Peer pressure</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>External policy and incentives</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Executing
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflecting and Evaluating

REFERENCES

1. Armitage GD, Suter E, Oelke ND, et al. Health systems integration: state of the evidence. *International journal of integrated care* 2009;9:e82. [published Online First: 2009/07/11]
2. Kinsman L, Rotter T, James E, et al. What is a clinical pathway? Development of a definition to inform the debate. *BMC medicine* 2010;8:31. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-8-31 [published Online First: 2010/05/29]
3. McGeoch G, Anderson I, Gibson J, et al. Consensus pathways: evidence into practice. *The New Zealand medical journal* 2015;128(1408):86-96. [published Online First: 2015/02/11]
4. Robinson S, Varhol R, Bell C, et al. HealthPathways: creating a pathway for health systems reform. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2014 doi: 10.1071/ah14155 [published Online First: 2014/12/01]
5. Gray JS, Swan JR, Lynch MA, et al. Hunter and New England HealthPathways: a 4-year journey of integrated care. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2018;42(1):66-71. doi: 10.1071/ah16197 [published Online First: 2017/02/20]
6. Gill SD, Mansfield S, McLeod M, et al. HealthPathways improving access to care. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2018;early online publication doi: 10.1071/ah17090 [published Online First: 2018/02/09]
7. Reyneke A, Jaye C, Stokes T. Local clinical pathways: from 'good ideas' to 'practicality' for general practitioners. *Journal of Primary Health Care* 2018 doi: 10.1071/HC18023 [published Online First: 2018/09/05]
8. Timmins N, Ham C. The quest for integrated health and social care. A case study in Canterbury, New Zealand. London, 2013.
9. McGeoch G, McGeoch P, Shand B. Is HealthPathways effective? An online survey of hospital clinicians, general practitioners and practice nurses. *The New Zealand medical journal* 2015;128(1408):36-46. [published Online First: 2015/02/11]
10. Ministry of Health. Better, Sooner, More Convenient Health Care in the Community. Wellington: Ministry of Health, 2011.
11. Mansfield SJ, Quirk F, von Treuer K, et al. On the right path? Exploring the experiences and opinions of clinicians involved in developing and implementing HealthPathways Barwon. *Australian health review : a publication of the Australian Hospital Association* 2016;40(2):129-35. doi: 10.1071/ah15009 [published Online First: 2015/12/23]
12. Gauld R. What should governance for integrated care look like? New Zealand's alliances provide some pointers. *The Medical journal of Australia* 2014;201(3 Suppl):S67-8. [published Online First: 2014/07/23]
13. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, et al. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ* 2008;337:a1655.
14. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, et al. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing

- 1
2
3 implementation science. *Implementation science : IS* 2009;4:50. doi:
4 10.1186/1748-5908-4-50 [published Online First: 2009/08/12]
5
6 15. Kirk MA, Kelley C, Yankey N, et al. A systematic review of the use of the
7 Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research. *Implementation science :*
8 *IS* 2016;11:72. doi: 10.1186/s13012-016-0437-z [published Online First:
9 2016/05/18]
10
11 16. Davidoff F, Dixon-Woods M, Leviton L, et al. Demystifying theory and its use in
12 improvement. *BMJ quality & safety* 2015;24(3):228-38. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2014-
13 003627 [published Online First: 2015/01/27]
14
15 17. The Improved Clinical Effectiveness through Behavioural Research Group.
16 Designing theoretically-informed implementation interventions. *Implementation*
17 *Science* 2006;1(1):4. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-1-4
18
19 18. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, et al. Using the framework method for the analysis
20 of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Med Res Methodol*
21 2013;13(1):117. doi: 1471-2288-13-117 [pii];10.1186/1471-2288-13-117 [doi]
22
23 19. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
24 (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International*
25 *journal for quality in health care : journal of the International Society for Quality in*
26 *Health Care* 2007;19(6):349-57. doi: 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042 [published Online
27 First: 2007/09/18]
28
29 20. Soper B, Yaqub O, Hinrichs S, et al. CLAHRCs in practice: combined knowledge
30 transfer and exchange strategies, cultural change, and experimentation. *Journal*
31 *of health services research & policy* 2013;18(3 Suppl):53-64. doi:
32 10.1177/1355819613499903 [published Online First: 2013/10/09]
33
34 21. Kenealy TW, Sheridan NF, Connolly MJ. HealthPathways website: making the right
35 thing the easy thing to do? *The New Zealand medical journal* 2015;128(1408):6-
36 9. [published Online First: 2015/02/11]
37
38 22. Warner G, Lawson B, Sampalli T, et al. Applying the consolidated framework for
39 implementation research to identify barriers affecting implementation of an online
40 frailty tool into primary health care: a qualitative study. *BMC Health Serv Res*
41 2018;18(1):395. doi: 10.1186/s12913-018-3163-1 [published Online First:
42 2018/06/02]
43
44 23. Kringos DS, Sunol R, Wagner C, et al. The influence of context on the effectiveness
45 of hospital quality improvement strategies: a review of systematic reviews. *BMC*
46 *Health Serv Res* 2015;15:277. doi: 10.1186/s12913-015-0906-0 [published
47 Online First: 2015/07/23]
48
49 24. Dixon-Woods M, Leslie M, Tarrant C, et al. Explaining Matching Michigan: an
50 ethnographic study of a patient safety program. *Implementation science : IS*
51 2013;8:70. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-8-70 [published Online First: 2013/06/22]
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplementary file 1: INTERVIEW TOPIC GUIDE

So following on from the information sheet, just to reiterate, we're hoping to explore your views and experiences of the HealthPathways initiative in the Southern Region, including what has been challenging or beneficial in relation to their implementation."

"CONSENT PROCESS"

Before we begin, do you have any further questions?

The following questions are examples rather than a set of specific questions.

Question
<p>When did you first hear about HealthPathways in the Southern Region? What do you understand them to be? What were your initial thoughts? Did you feel they met a need?</p>
<p>What do you know about how HealthPathways in the Southern Region came about and how they created? Who was involved? What did you think of the process?</p>
<p>How useful do you think the HealthPathways initiative in the Southern Region is? How were you introduced to them? What were your initial thoughts? Did you feel they met a need? What gap does it fill? What problem does it solve? If not, why not? What is not being addressed? Is this a fix to a problem you don't perceive? Is there a problem about communication/process, etc. rather than concept/content?</p>
<p>What has been your experience of using a pathway? Did they fit well with normal practice? Have you used a healthpathway; if yes which one? How was that for you? What was better than before/what wasn't so good?</p>
<p>What has worked well in Southern Region initiative to implement HealthPathways in your opinion? Why? Communication; resourcing; support; clinical leadership; IT; patient information; effective governance of the work etc.</p>
<p>What has not worked so well in Southern Region initiative to implement HealthPathways in your opinion? Why? Communication; resourcing; support; clinical leadership; IT; patient information; effective governance of the work etc.</p>
<p>If you were asked to make a recommendation about the continuation of HealthPathways, what recommendation would you make? Why?</p>
<p>If you were asked to suggest further conditions for HealthPathways what would you suggest? Why? Are these conditions, particular prevalent or is the care (care coordination) for these conditions particularly fractured/complicated?</p>
<p>Is there anything else you would like to make comment on in regard to HealthPathways in general or the HealthPathways initiative in the Southern Region?</p>

Supplementary File 2

COREQ (COnsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) 32 item Checklist

Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. International Journal for Quality in Health Care. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

Domain	Item Number	Comment	Reported on page number or not applicable (N/A)
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
<i>Personal characteristics</i>			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	The Assistant Research Fellow (Dr Emma Tumilty) conducted the interviews	8
Credentials	2	All four research team members have extensive experience of conducting qualitative health research	N/A
Occupation	3	ET was an Assistant Research Fellow at the University of Otago at the time of conducting the research	1
Gender	4	Two male-identifying and two female identifying researchers (interviewer, female-identifying)	
Experience and training	5	All four research team members have extensive experience of conducting qualitative health research	N/A
<i>Relationship with participants</i>			
Relationship established	6	The assistant research fellow had no relationships with participants prior to the study, while the broader research team had varying relationships with the health community at large. It was felt the interviewer should be seen as an unbiased enquirer rather than a person with a particular stance or opinion about the topic.	8, 24
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	The interviewer introduced herself to participants stating she was not a medical professional, etc. as well as describing the research team, its funding, the purpose of the project and answering any questions participants may have had about the project and those involved in it.	N/A

Interviewer characteristics	8	The interviewer was not a medical professional, but aware of the medical system in New Zealand and had read the literature on care pathways prior to beginning the project.	N/A
Domain 2: Study design			
<i>Theoretical framework</i>			
Methodological orientation and theory	9	Deductive thematic analysis using the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research	9
<i>Participant selection</i>			
Sampling	10	Purposive sampling was used	8
Method of approach	11	Various methods of approach were used, group emails were sent via a third party, invitations were added to newsletters, emails were sent to practices, and those taking part or responding were also asked to pass on information to others (snowball sampling).	N/A
Sample size	12	Ten	10
Non-participation	13	A number of key informants did not respond to the invitation to participate, however no person responded directly to decline taking part, nor did anyone drop out once agreeing to take part.	N/A
<i>Setting</i>			
Setting of data collection	14	Participants could determine whether the interview took place in their place of work or in a private meeting room arranged by the interviewer on the university campus.	N/A
Presence of nonparticipants	15	None	N/A
Description of sample	16	Fully presented in results section	10
<i>Data collection</i>			
Interview guide	17	The interview guide was open, but listed a number of key questions and potential prompts. Interviews generally followed a similar approach although questions themselves varied depending on the participant.	Supplemental file
Repeat interviews	18	No	N/A
Audio/visual recording	19	All interviews were audio-recorded and later transcribed.	9
Field notes	20	Yes, the interviewer wrote brief field notes after each interview regarding the nature of the interview and her perceptions of the participants responses, etc.	N/A

Duration	21	Interview times varied but were generally around 60mins	N/A
Data saturation	22	Not applicable as a deductive thematic analysis	N/A
Transcripts returned	23	No	N/A
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	The interviewer coded the data and described codes and these were discussed with all members of the interview team on a regular basis	9
Description of the coding tree	25	Codes had tags and description within the software except for where they were self-explanatory	9
Derivation of themes	26	The themes were those used in the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research	9
Software	27	nVivo 11 was used	9
Participant checking	28	No	N/A
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Yes quotations are presented and identified in a manner protecting participants confidentiality	10-18
Data and findings consistent	30	Consistency between the data and the findings exists	10-18
Clarity of major themes	31	Yes, major themes are clearly identified	
Clarity of minor themes	32	Yes, minor themes (CIFR constructs) are clearly identified and related to major themes.	10-18