Understanding the implementation strategy of a secondary care tobacco 1 addiction treatment pathway (The CURE Project) in England: A Strategic 2 **Behavioural Analysis** 3 4 Angela M Rodrigues (angela.rodrigues@northumbria.ac.uk)*1,2 Angela Wearn 5 (angela.wearn@newcastle.ac.uk)^{1, 2,3}, Anna Haste (a.haste@tees.ac.uk)^{2,4}, Verity 6 Mallion (verity.mallion@phe.gov.uk)⁵, Matthew Evison (m.evison@nhs.net)⁶, Freya 7 Howle (f.howle@nhs.net)⁶, Catherine Haighton (katie.haighton@northumbria.ac.uk)², 8 7 9 10 1 Department of Psychology, Northumbria University, Northumberland Building, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8ST, UK 11 2 Fuse: UKCRC Centre for Translational Research in Public Health, UK 12 3 Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 4AX 13 4 Department of Psychology, School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Law, Teesside University, Middlesbrough, TS1 3BX, 14 15 5 Public Health England, Wellington House, 133-155 Waterloo Road, London, SE1 8UG 16 6 The CURE Project Team, Greater Manchester Cancer, The Christie NHS Foundation Trust, Wilmslow Road, Manchester 17 7 Department of Social Work, Education and Community Wellbeing, Northumbria University, Coach Lane Campus West, 18 Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE7 7XA 19 20 21 *Corresponding author 22 Angela M. Rodrigues, PhD 23 Department of Psychology 24 Northumberland Building 25 Northumbria University 26 Newcastle upon Tyne 27 NE18ST 28 UK 29

Abstract

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

Objectives: The Conversation, Understand, Replace, Expert and evidence-based treatment (CURE) project implemented an evidence-based intervention that offers a combination of pharmacotherapy and behavioural support to tobacco-dependent inpatients. Understanding key characteristics of CURE's implementation strategy, and identifying areas for improvement, is important to support the roll-out of nationwide tobacco dependence services. This study aimed to 1) specify key characteristics of CURE's exiting implementation strategy, and 2) develop theoretical- and stakeholder-informed recommendations to optimise wider roll-out. Design and Methods: Data were collected via document review and secondary analysis of interviews with 10 healthcare professionals of a UK hospital. Intervention content was specified through Behaviour Change Techniques (BCTs) and intervention functions within the Behaviour Change Wheel. A logic model was developed to specify CURE's implementation strategy and its mechanisms of impact. We explored the extent to which BCTs and intervention functions addressed the key theoretical domains influencing implementation using prespecified matrices. The development of recommendations was conducted over a two-round Delphi exercise. Results: We identified six key theoretical domains of influences: 'environmental context and resources', 'goals', 'social professional role and identity', 'social influences', 'reinforcement', and 'skills'. The behavioural analysis identified 26 BCTs, five intervention functions and four policy categories present within the implementation strategy. The implementation strategy included half the relevant intervention functions and BCTs to target theoretical domains influencing CURE implementation, with many BCTs focusing on shaping knowledge. Recommendations to optimise content were developed following stakeholder engagement. **Conclusions:** CURE offers a strong foundation from which a tobacco dependence treatment model can be developed in England. The exiting strategy could be strengthened via the inclusion of more theoretically congruent BCTs, particularly relating to 'environmental

context and resources'. The recommendations provide routes to optimisation that are both theoretically grounded and stakeholder informed. Future research should assess the feasibility/acceptability of these recommendations in the wider secondary-care context.

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

57

58

59

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study is the first to qualitatively explore behavioural factors underpinning the implementation of the CURE project.
- The behavioural analysis, and subsequent stakeholder involvement, has resulted in tailored, practical recommendations for optimisation of future tobacco dependence services, which facilitate efficient translation of findings into policy and practice.
- Due to its early phase of roll-out, our recommendations have been developed from implementation within a single UK hospital implementing CURE, therefore generalisability of findings to other contexts may be limited.
- Feedback was not gathered from patients or members of the public, therefore the barriers and facilitators of implementation and the stakeholder-informed recommendations are limited to the views of those commissioning, delivering and implementing CURE.

74

75

76

- **Keywords**: Implementation intervention, intervention content, intervention function, behaviour change intervention, Strategic behavioural analysis, Theoretical Domains
- 77 Framework, Behaviour Change Technique, smoking, Health professional behaviour

78

79 **Word count: 5637**

Introduction

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

The government NHS Long Term Plan (1) has outlined a commitment to offer NHS-funded tobacco treatment services to all those admitted to hospital by 2023/24. However, the most recent National Smoking Cessation Audit Report from the British Thoracic Society (2) suggests that adherence to national smoking cessation standards remain poor. For example, despite the expected standard being 100%, only 77% of inpatients had their smoking status recorded. Of those who smoked, just 44% were asked if they would like to quit, and of those who were referred for smoking cessation support, just 16% were referred to hospital-based services (with a further 8% referred to community-based services). In addition, only 31% of smokers were offered nicotine replacement therapy (NRT). As a result, the report set national improvement objectives to support and offer NRT to all inpatient smokers, and to provide further support and training to hospital staff to ensure they are able to implement tobacco dependence treatment into their everyday practice. Hospitalisation provides a unique opportunity to identify and engage smokers, initiate cessation treatments, and facilitate appropriate follow-up and support (3,4). Intensive smoking cessation interventions that begin in hospital and include pharmacotherapy, counselling, and post-discharge support for ≥ 1 month, increase the likelihood of smoking abstinence (risk ratio 1.37, 95% confidence interval [CI] 1.27-1.48; 25 studies) compared to hospital only interventions with no follow-up (4). The Ottawa model for smoking cessation (OMSC), initially implemented in Canada, aims to increase the rate at which smoking cessation support is offered to all smokers within secondary care (i.e. hospital settings) (5,6). The OMSC provides a systematic approach to screening all inpatients for smoking status, with those who smoke offered a combination of pharmacotherapy and behavioural support. Patients are then attached to ongoing community stop-smoking support post-discharge (7). The OMSC model was found to have positive outcomes in increased smoking abstinence at 6 months, reduced all-cause readmissions at 30 days and 1 year, and reduced mortality at 1 year when compared to a control group receiving usual care (7).

The positive outcomes observed in Canada led to the development of the Conversation,

Understand, Replace, Experts and evidence-based treatments (CURE) and has recently been piloted within an NHS trust in the North West of England (8). Importantly, CURE aims to increase awareness about the medicalisation of tobacco dependence and encourage clinicians in offering smoking cessation care to all inpatient smokers. Similar to the OMSC, the CURE project aims to improve smoking outcomes by providing combination of pharmacotherapy (e.g. NRT, varenicline) and behavioural support to patients, as well as post-discharge care at 2, 4- and 12-weeks. The CURE implementation intervention includes various strategies designed to change behaviours at organisational, practitioner or patient levels and to enhance the adoption of a clinical innovation (9). Examples of implementation strategies include outreach activities, in-house training, audit and feedback, and computer prompts.

Evaluation of the CURE pilot (October 2018-March 2019) showed that 92% of all adult admissions (total admissions:14,690) were screened for smoking status (10) with a cost per quit of £475 (11). More importantly, the evaluation demonstrated a positive patient impact; out of 2,293 patients identified as current smokers, 96% were provided with brief advice, 61% accepted and completed specialist behavioural support, 66% were prescribed pharmacotherapy (e.g. NRT, varenicline) to support quit attempts, and 22% were abstinent at 3 months post-discharge (10). These findings suggest that the model may be useful in assisting clinicians' behaviour change when compared to national audit data. It would therefore be valuable to determine how the CURE project was delivered in practice. This knowledge would support recommendations for a national specification model, based on the OMSC and CURE, for further testing and piloting (1).

To maximise the potential benefits of CURE, there is a need to understand the implementation process of this evidence-based smoking cessation intervention in routine

secondary care. Several theoretical approaches (i.e. theories, models, frameworks) can be used to provide a better understanding and explanation of how and why implementation succeeds or fails (12,13). For instance, the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) represents an approach to understand what determinants are hypothesized to influence implementation outcomes, (e.g. healthcare practitioners' adoption of an evidence-based patient intervention) (13,14). The TDF summarises 14 broad domains relevant to changing behaviour, 'knowledge', 'beliefs about consequences', 'beliefs about capabilities', 'skills', 'environmental context & resources', 'social influences', 'memory, attention & decision processes', 'behavioural regulation', 'emotion', 'social or professional role/identity', 'optimism', 'intentions', 'goals' and 'reinforcement' (15,16). Another theoretical approach to explain the causal mechanisms of implementation is the COM-B (Capability, Opportunity, Motivation and Behaviour) model, which suggests behaviour is a function of physical and psychological capability, physical and social opportunity and automatic and reflective motivation. The COM-B model sits at the hub of the Behaviour Change Wheel (BCW) (see Figure 1) (14,17), a well-established guide, applied to health services research, to provide a systematic approach to identifying intervention content and specifying mechanisms of action (i.e. how interventions elicit behaviour change) (14). The wheel comprises three main 'layers' 1) sources of behaviour (i.e. the COM-B model), 2) nine intervention functions (i.e. means by which behaviour can be changed) and 3) policy categories (i.e. that may support delivery of intervention functions) (p.17).

[Insert Figure 1 here]

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

Figure 1: Visual representation of the Behaviour Change Wheel (14)

When aiming to understand how behaviour may be changed and/or specify implementation content, the intervention functions within the BCW can be linked to specific BCTs, which are defined as "an active component of an intervention designed to change behaviour". BCTs

- have been associated with many types of behaviour which have been brought together to form an international BCT Taxonomy v1 with 93 BCTs (18).
- Theoretical approaches such as BCW, the COM-B model (Fig. 1), the TDF, and the BCT
 Taxonomy (BCTTv1), may be applied in conjunction with one another to understand the
 implementation process, identify implementation strategy content, and to explore barriers to
 and facilitators of behaviour. Prior research has successfully integrated these theoretical
 approaches to explore determinants influencing the implementation process of evidencebased practice in healthcare (16,19).
- When planning implementation, developing a logic model of links between implementation strategies, mechanisms and outcomes is crucial (20). The BCW facilitates the specification of outcomes, determinants, change objectives and intervention, and it thereby enables intervention developers to map specific BCTs to behavioural determinants (17).
- 171 Informed by the BCW (14), the present study aimed to describe the core elements of the
 172 CURE implementation strategy in the pilot site, particularly the activities directed at
 173 promoting behaviour change in healthcare practitioners and wider organisational
 174 implementation strategies (organisational/professional level).
- 175 The specific objectives of this study were to:

176

177

178

179

180

181

- Describe the content of CURE's implementation strategy, using BCW functions, policy categories, and the BCT Taxonomy (v1)(21);
 - 2. Characterise the intervention in a logic model to clarify causal assumptions and mechanism of impact using the Medical Research Council (MRC) guidance (21);
 - Explore to what extent the barriers and facilitators of CURE implementation are addressed by existing implementation strategy components;
- 4. Develop recommendations to optimise the future implementation.
- This work is a first step in designing a successful theoretical-informed implementation strategy for wider, national roll-out. This work was conducted alongside a TDF-based,

qualitative study which explored the barriers and facilitators of CURE implementation and delivery, from the perspective of healthcare professionals engaged in the project pilot (22).

Methods

We undertook a systematic, theoretically guided approach to specify the content and possible mechanisms of action and impact of the implementation strategy of CURE. This process has previously been coined as 'strategic behavioural analysis' (19). We have employed the use of the StaRI (Standards for Reporting Implementation Studies) as our reporting standard (23). Ethical approval for this study was granted from Northumbria University Faculty of Health and Life Sciences (Ref: 21358).

Setting and participants

The pilot site is a major acute teaching hospital with approximately 900 beds and 27,500 inpatient admissions per year (excluding maternity, paediatrics, and AE/ICU admissions), providing both district general hospital services and specialist tertiary services. Tertiary services include cardiology, cardiothoracic surgery, heart and lung transplantation, respiratory conditions, burns and plastics, cancer, and breast care services. The smoking prevalence included in the pilot site was modelled based on 20% of inpatient admissions (approximately 5,500 smokers per year).

At admission, the admitting clinicians (doctor or nurse) were responsible for recording smoking status, assessing level of addiction, and offering initial rapid treatment. A CURE specialist team would then perform a visit, review all smokers admitted (opt-out service), and complete specialist assessment, update treatment plan and plan for discharge (e.g. refer to community service). For the pilot study, the implementation plan modelled the need for five specialist CURE nurses to deliver the specialist assessment, treatment planning and follow up for all smokers admitted as inpatients.

Patient and public involvement

As this study focussed on healthcare professionals' behaviour change, no patients or members of the public were involved.

Procedure and sources of data

To collect data on the implementation strategy content, we used two different methods:

- 1. Document analysis. Researchers read and re-read training materials (i.e. training manual, training poster, teaching slides, level 1 and 2 eLearning modules, Steering Group Terms of Reference) and the CURE project webpage (available from https://thecureproject.co.uk/) describing implementation strategy content, including the training materials, practice tools, promotional/educational materials and smoke free policy. We (AR, AH, AW; health psychology specialists) reviewed and appraised documentation by systematically mapping information against the Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) (24) and the BCW components, including BCTs, intervention functions and policy categories (14). This information was also used to develop an initial logic model.
- 2. Semi-structured interviews. We conducted secondary analysis of semi-structured interview data with 10 purposively sampled healthcare professionals, who were involved in the implementation and delivery of the CURE evidence-based intervention (reported in full elsewhere; 22). Participants spanned core CURE management (n=2) and specialist nursing staff (n=3), pharmacy (n=1), primary care (n=1) and public health (n=3). Interview topic guides were informed by TDF domains and asked participants to discuss barriers and facilitators to implementing the CURE project pilot and detail implementation strategy content (i.e. describing the what was delivered, with what aim, how much, to whom, and by whom). All interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed verbatim and analysed using the Framework Method (25). Data from interviews were also used to revise the logic model.

Data analysis

Step 1 - Implementation strategy content analysis

Using the TIDieR framework (24), we created a broad outline of the implementation strategy that included the content delivered, to whom and by whom, why, by what mode of delivery, how often, where, when and how much, tailoring, modifications, and fidelity. Data from all data sources were used. Data collected from both the document analysis and interviews were coded for implementation strategy content (AR, AH and AW) using existing coding frameworks provided by the BCW guide (14); Appendix 4 (p.259 of the guide) for BCTs, Table 2.1 (p.111 of the guide) to code intervention functions, and Table 2.7 (p.135 of the guide) to code policy categories. Any discrepancies in coding were resolved via consensus discussion.

Step 2 – Mechanisms of impact (Logic model)

Following the guidance on developing logic models in process evaluations of complex interventions, issued by the Medical Research Council (21), we developed a logic model by reviewing the CURE documentation and service specification (https://thecureproject.co.uk/), current evidence (7,8,26), and theoretical understandings of both the evidence-based intervention and the implementation strategy as suggested in the TiDIER guidelines. Public Health England liaised with the CURE project team (via email) who provided additional documentation (pathway mapping workshop slides, early evaluation options, inpatient numbers and time commitments for specialist nurses, communications plan, Tobacco Addiction Service data) to further inform the logic model. An initial logic model was reviewed and updated based on findings from the qualitative interviews and behavioural analysis demonstrating the intended mechanisms of impact (initial model) vs. actual mechanisms of impact i.e. what was delivered in practice (revised model).

Step 3 – Identifying opportunities for optimisation

In line with previous research (19,27), the following mapping exercise was conducted in order to explore the extent to which barriers and facilitators of CURE implementation (22) were addressed by existing implementation strategy components, and to identify any missed opportunities for further design:

- 1. A concurrent qualitative study (22) reported eight key TDF domains that influenced CURE implementation (see additional file 1 for a summary of these findings). To identify key domains influencing the implementation of CURE, we ranked these previously reported TDF/COM-B domains using established criteria: frequency (number of transcripts in which a domain occurred), elaboration (number of themes within a domain) and evidence of conflicting statements within domains (e.g. if some participants report lack of specific skills whereas others report having the relevant skills) (28–30). All of these factors were considered concurrently in establishing domain relevance. This process was facilitated through consensus discussion between the two researchers (AR, AW) and supported by a third researcher to resolve any discrepancies (AH).
- 2. The outputs of the key domains and content analysis stages were combined by mapping the identified influences to the identified BCT and intervention functions of the CURE implementation strategy. This was achieved by combining two available matrices that map the TDF to the BCT Taxonomy v1 (31,32) and the Theory & Techniques Tool (https://theoryandtechniquetool.humanbehaviourchange.org/) as was developed for previous research (19). This analysis investigated the level of theoretical congruence between implementation strategy components of CURE and the qualitative data on barriers and facilitators influencing its implementation.
- 3. The level of theoretical congruence between influences on behaviour (TDF domains) and implementation strategy content to change behaviour (BCTs) was achieved by analysing the extent to which the BCTs identified in the CURE implementation strategy targeted the key TDF domains (identified in the qualitative data). Each BCT identified was coded as either low congruence (did not target any key domain).

medium congruence (targeted at least one key domain) or high congruence (targeted 2+ key domains) (19).

- 4. The mapping exercise was repeated for intervention functions and policy categories, by consulting the matrices mapping BCW against COM-B/TDF (14) to identify the extent to which functions (matrix on p. 116) and policy categories (matrix on p. 138) in the CURE implementation strategy targeted key factors influencing the implementation process, and what additional intervention functions and policies may address barriers/facilitators within the key domains. The following definitions were applied:
 - a. Opportunity seized instances where a theoretically congruent intervention function/policy category (according to the matrices) was identified in the existing CURE implementation strategy at least once.
 - b. Missed opportunity instances where the theoretically congruent intervention function/policy category was not identified in existing implementation strategy.

Step 4 – Development of recommendations to support future implementation.

Following steps 1-3, the research team used the findings from the qualitative interviews and strategic behavioural analysis to draft a list of practical recommendations to strengthen implementation strategy content (i.e. content likely to encourage healthcare professional behaviour change and support implementation of a secondary care-based tobacco dependence treatment model). These recommendations included example strategies to deliver BCTs relevant to the key TDF domains. To enhance the suitability and acceptability of these recommendations, a Delphi study was conducted by collecting data from a panel of six experts until consensus was reached (33). Experts included the CURE management team, PHE Programme Managers (e.g. Tobacco Control and NHS Long Plan), and NHS England representatives. The six experts independently rated whether each recommendation was affordable, practical, effective, acceptable, safe and equitable (the APEASE criteria) (14), on a dichotomous scale of yes (1), no/uncertain (0) for each criteria.

This gave a total possible score of 36 for each recommendation. These ratings were then used to structure and encourage discussion surrounding uncertainties and potential modifications during a collaborative, stakeholder workshop. A total of 11 stakeholders participated in the stakeholder workshop. Participants included 2 members of the research team (1 workshop facilitator and 1 scribe), 2 members of the CURE management team, 4 PHE Programme Managers (e.g. Tobacco Control and NHS Long Plan), 1 representative from NHS England, and 2 consultants. Workshop feedback was incorporated into a refined recommendations table, which was then circulated via email for further stakeholder comment and review. This process resulted in the final list of recommendations.

Results

Step 1 - Implementation strategy content

Table 1 summarises the content of the implementation strategy, using the TIDieR framework. The following broad components of CURE implementation strategy were identified: staff training, practice tools, reminder systems, educational outreach visits, audit and feedback, primary care incentives, use of a steering group, branding materials, clinician implementation team meetings to promote reflective discussion, provision of local technical assistance (e.g. admin support), promotion of network weaving (e.g. information sharing), physical environment changes (e.g. consultation facilities), and a triage system.

Through content coding we identified 26 BCTs (i.e. 'active components'), five intervention functions and four policy categories. Further details of these activities, BCTs, intervention functions and policy categories can be found in Table 2.

Step 2 -Mechanisms of impact (Logic model)

The initial model is presented in Figure 2. The original logic model, based on the CURE implementation strategy, shows all patients who are admitted to hospital should be asked whether they smoke, and their response should be recorded in the hospitals' electronic patients records. All smokers should be offered immediate Nicotine Replacement Therapy

and specialist support through motivational interviewing and behavioural change support as well as access to additional evidence-based pharmacotherapy treatments for tobacco addiction. All smokers should be offered further appointments with a specialist team after discharge from hospital to continue their support.

345

346

347

341

342

343

344

[Insert Figure 2 here]

Figure 2. CURE stop smoking project: Initial logic model

348

349

350

351

352

353

354

355

356

357

358

359

360

361

362

363

The logic model was reviewed and updated iteratively based on findings from the qualitative interviews and behavioural analysis. The final model is presented in Figure 3. The final logic model contains further facilitators identified as important by key stakeholders (e.g. funding, tobacco policy, nurse champion) as well as clarification of the meaning of an adequately resourced and staffed implementation strategy (e.g. office space, clerical support, phone/computer access). Other local stakeholders essential to the smooth implementation and delivery of CURE were also added to the revised model (e.g. Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG); Local Medical Committee (LMC); local GPs) as well as barriers to successful implementation and delivery (e.g. staff turnover, staff confidence, paperwork). While a structured protocol and treatment pathway was an important facilitator, the final model includes more detail regarding the potential variety of patient journeys and the role of hospital pharmacy. The importance of patient choice was added to the final model, because it was highlighted as important to both choices of Nicotine Replacement Therapy (NRT) and of the discharge pathways. However, there were many challenges to implementing many of the pathways as intended. This tension between primary and secondary care was highlighted in the final model.

365

366

367

368

364

[Insert Figure 3 here]

Figure 3. CURE stop smoking model: Final logic model following stakeholder consultations and behavioural analysis

369

370 Previously identified TDF/COM-B domains influencing implementation are summarised in 371 additional file 1. Considering the frequency, elaboration of the domains and evidence of 372 conflict, the following six domains were considered the key domains of influence relating to 373 the implementation strategy; (i) Environmental Context and Resources (Physical 374 Opportunity; e.g. integration with the wider healthcare context, staffing resources, hospital 375 delivery environment, availability of CURE related knowledge and training, CURE branding 376 and flexibility of the service specification), (ii) Goals (Reflective Motivation; e.g. promoting 377 CURE, adhering to a CURE service specification, identifying and evaluating outcomes), (iii) 378 Social Influences (Social Opportunity; e.g. peer support, CURE champions, organisational 379 culture change), (iv) Reinforcement (Automatic Motivation; e.g. reflection on intrinsic rewards 380 related to CURE involvement and delivery), (v) Social Professional Role and Identity 381 (Reflective Motivation; e.g. commitment to patient choice, acceptance of responsibility for 382 delivering tobacco dependence treatment.), and (vi) Skills (Psychological Capability & 383 Physical Capability; e.g. previous experience and skills supporting smoking cessation and 384 using hospital-based IT systems). These domains acted as both barriers and facilitators to 385 implementation. Based on the criteria, we suggest these six key domains are prioritised for 386 change (see Table 3). 387 Of the 26 BCTs identified in the current implementation strategy content, six had high 388 theoretical congruence with the key domains identified above, nine had medium congruence 389 and eleven BCTs had low theoretical congruence (see Table 4). The BCTs observed to have 390 high theoretical congruence were (i) Social support (practical), (ii) Social support (emotional), 391 (iii) Social support (unspecified), (iv) Reward (outcome), (v) Restructuring the social 392 environment, and (vi) Demonstration of the behaviour. These BCTs were paired with 393 domains rated as important in influencing CURE implementation. For instance, the domain 394 Social influences (e.g. peer support, visibility of CURE champions) was appropriately 395 targeted via the BCT Social support (practical), delivered through the implementation

strategy component educational outreach visits (whereby nurse leads, clinical leads and/or CURE nurses visit colleagues, providing information and advice to support their ability to engage with CURE). Table 5 shows whether intervention functions identified in the CURE implementation strategy appropriately targeted the six most important TDF/COM-B components. The potential missed opportunities (e.g. as highlighted by the analysis) were related to the intervention functions Coercion and Restriction, which were not identified in the CURE implementation strategy. The Coercion intervention function may have been useful in targeting the domains linked to Reflective Motivation addressing themes under the TDF domain 'Goals' such as Managing competing goals and priorities and Promoting CURE. Nevertheless, other intervention functions were used to target this component: Education, Incentivisation and Persuasion. The Restriction intervention function may have been useful in targeting Environmental Context and Resources (Physical Opportunity) and Social Influences (Social Opportunity). Other intervention functions were used to target these TDF/COM-B components: Enablement, Environmental restructuring, Training, and Modelling. Table 6 shows whether intervention functions identified in the CURE implementation strategy were delivered through policy categories suggested by the BCW intervention function/policy category matrix. All intervention functions were delivered through at least one policy category suggested by the matrix. There were missed opportunities to deliver functions identified in implementation strategy through the policy category of fiscal measures, regulation and legislation. This was particularly important for the Training (1 out 4 opportunities were 'seized') and Environmental restructuring (2 out of 5 opportunities were 'seized') intervention functions, as they could have been better supported by including these policy categories.

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

Step 4 - Development of recommendations to support future implementation.

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

Following stakeholder involvement, the final list includes 29 recommendations. Table 7 presents the final overview of recommendations, with a brief indication of stakeholder APEASE evaluations. Initially, 26 recommendations were developed to address the themes identified within the six most important TDF domains. Recommendation ratings from the Delphi survey ranged from 3 to 36 (maximum score) with a median of 28.5 (IQR, 25.25 - 31). Survey responses are available in additional file 2. These ratings were used to structure discussion within the subsequent stakeholder workshop. The workshop focused predominately on recommendations which had greatest levels of uncertainty, further contextualised these recommendations considering the existing healthcare system and specified the feasibility of implementing recommendations in practice. This included the removal of a recommendation related to financial incentives for GPs (i.e., Provide financial incentive on performance (e.g., when prescribing NRT) for primary care staff supporting service outpatients in the community). This was the lowest rated recommendation within the Delphi survey, with further stakeholder discussion suggesting financial incentives were not deemed acceptable nor considered effective within the pilot phase. Another recommendation relating to the delivery environment (i.e., Ensure adequate facilities are available to support delivery, including physical spaces for one-to-one sessions, hospital accessibility for patients (i.e., through parking, public transport) and vaping facilities) was thought to cover a lot of separate components and thus was separated into three recommendations covering the need to provide 1) adequate office space for delivery staff 2) physical space to deliver one-to-one support to patients and 3) on-site vaping facilities. Access to IT equipment (e.g., laptops), was also added as a recommendation in light of increased need to self-isolate due to the COVID-19 pandemic. A highly rated recommendation relating to deliverers' skill development (i.e., Provide additional training on how to use tools associated with intervention delivery, so staff practice and observe use of these tools to facilitate day to day

delivery) was expanded to support deliverers capacity to provide behavioural support to patients. As such, an additional recommendation (to allow deliverers to shadow experienced staff members) was added, as this was identified as a facilitator of delivery during the pilot phase.

Discussion

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

Summary of findings

This study aimed to specify the content of CURE's implementation strategy and to develop theory-based recommendations to optimise future implementation of secondary-care /hospital-based tobacco dependence services. The existing implementation strategy incorporated half the potentially relevant content to target key identified barriers and facilitators for the CURE project. However, there were missed opportunities to further facilitate implementation as a large proportion of the BCTs within the current implementation strategy focused on the TDF domain 'knowledge'. These findings highlight that some of the implementation strategy features were primarily educational, though many of the barriers related to the social and environmental context. More theoretically congruent BCTs should be included in the implementation strategy, particularly for the TDF domains 'environmental context and resources,' 'social professional role and identity', and 'social influences'. The recommendations presented within Table 7 highlight potentially feasible ways in which these BCTs could be operationalised. The study used a systematic, theoretically guided approach to specify the content and possible mechanisms of action of an implementation strategy using behavioural science methodology and triangulation from different data sources (i.e. semi-structured interviews, document analysis, Delphi survey, stakeholder engagement). We have also illustrated how theory can be used to optimise the implementation strategy of the CURE project. From interviews with healthcare professionals, six themes were identified as influences for the implementation of CURE (22). These were used to identify gaps in the existing

implementation strategy and informed recommendations for refinement. The implementation strategy consisted of 26 BCTs (i.e. 'active components'), seven intervention functions, and four policy categories that could stimulate behaviour change through several mechanisms of action, especially 'beliefs about consequences' (Reflective Motivation) and 'knowledge' (Psychological Capability). Similarly, previous systematic reviews have shown that educational strategies were the most commonly used strategies in multi-strategy interventions (34,35). Current evidence suggests that organisational-level interventions in the healthcare context can influence clinical outcomes and efficiency (36). When used as part of multi-strategy interventions, group education and organisational strategies (e.g. creation of an implementation team) corresponded with positive significant changes in outcomes (34). Incorporating theory (12) in the design of implementation strategies would enhance the field's understanding of the causal mechanisms by which the strategies lead, or do not lead, to changes in outcomes at all levels. The logic model specifies the theory of change related to mechanisms, assumptions and outcomes of the CURE model. The initial version of the model (as presented in Figure 2. CURE stop smoking project: Initial logic model) presents the intended process of change, as informed by the document review. The final iteration of the model (as presented in Figure 3) demonstrates a more accurate overview of what ultimately was delivered in the programme, and documents the actual process of change, as informed by document review, stakeholder views and behavioural analysis. Several challenges to adoption and implementation of the Ottawa model have been identified previously (Reid et al 2010). Likewise, these challenges typically included staff regarding smoking as a 'lifestyle choice' and a lack of support from key opinion leaders and clinical managers. Leadership and performance feedback form managers, training about tobacco-dependence treatment, and smoke-free hospital policies were the key recommendations to improve adoption and implementation (Reid et al 2010). This evidence

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

490

491

492

493

494

495

496

497

base has been used to underpin the delivery of smoking cessation in secondary care settings, and to inform future implementation strategies (37). Other studies have successfully integrated similar theoretical approaches (i.e. BCW, TDF) and methodologies (e.g. qualitative interviews, Delphi, stakeholder involvement) to characterise the content and theoretical mechanisms of action of an existing implementation strategy, and to optimise an existing implementation strategy (38,39). The findings from this strategic behavioural analysis are similar to those of other studies, particularly that only a small percentage of BCTs used in interventions (21% to 37.5%) are theoretically relevant for targeting identified barriers to deliver or implement behaviour change interventions (18, 29). Likewise, missed opportunities in the implementation strategy content are similar across other behavioural analyses that highlighted that most focus on shaping knowledge rather than addressing motivational, social and environmental influences (18, 29). This study provides relevant evidence to further guide the implementation process and selection of strategies; ensuring that enough attention is paid to planning implementation; and a flexible approach that allows response to emerging barriers, particularly at the organisational level. According to Li et al. (40) organisational contextual features (e.g. organisational culture; leadership; networks and communication; resources; evaluation, monitoring and feedback; and champions) were most commonly reported to influence implementation outcomes across a wide range of healthcare settings.

Strengths and limitations

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

This study is the first to qualitatively explore behavioural factors underpinning the implementation of the CURE project. Considering barriers and facilitators to implementation through the lens of the TDF allows for the identification of both internal and external factors which are known to influence behaviour change and evidence-based intervention implementation. The behavioural analysis links these barriers and facilitators to specific components underpinning the CURE implementation strategy. This therefore provides novel insight into key factors which can facilitate implementation of such an intervention in a hospital setting. The NHS long-term plan aims to roll-out adaptations of the CURE and

Ottawa models across acute, maternity and mental health settings (1). As such, this study is further informing and supporting implementation of NHS-funded tobacco dependence services in England (41). Given the time and financial constraints of this study (conducted during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic), and the focus on facilitating healthcare professionals' implementation behaviour, stakeholder consultation was limited to healthcare professionals. As such, patients or the public were not involved in the development of this research. The inclusion pf patient perspectives should therefore be prioritised in future work. Due to its early phase of roll-out, our recommendations were developed from data relating to a single UK hospital implementing CURE. As such, generalisability of findings to other contexts may be limited. From these findings, relevant decision makers can make a strategic, informed decision using evidence-based recommendations to optimise the implementation and delivery of future NHS-funded tobacco dependence treatment and target mechanisms of healthcare professional's behaviour change. This approach also provides further insight into potentially overlooked, yet relevant, intervention functions (i.e. missed opportunities) which may be considered by decision makers to optimise the implementation of secondary care-based tobacco dependence services. Overall, the systematic approach taken throughout the present research, and use of established theoretical frameworks, results in evidence which, importantly, facilitates efficient translation to policy and practice (14).

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

Implications for practitioners, policymakers, and future research

Based on the appraisal of the CURE implementation strategy content, the current package shows good practice for implementation including relevant BCTs, intervention functions and policy categories. However, the additional recommendations provided may optimise and inform future implementation. This is a set of practical recommendations co-developed with stakeholders and informed by robust behaviour change theoretical approaches.

The BCTs currently in use are linked to multiple intervention functions, including the most relevant intervention functions to tackle the key domains. The introduction of strategies using the intervention function of Coercion (not currently in use) might not be considered acceptable/appropriate in the hospital context and future research could explore the practicalities of introducing this intervention function in secondary care settings (e.g. having behavioural/letter commitments for staff involved in CURE) (42). This strategy was successful in avoiding inappropriate antibiotic prescribing by having poster-sized commitment letters featuring clinician photographs and signatures stating a commitment in wards (43). The inclusion of fiscal measures (i.e., using the tax system to reduce or increase the financial cost), and legislation (i.e., making or changing laws) was considered less practicable in the hospital context. For the policy category of regulation, further strategies could be introduced, e.g., establishing rules or principles for vaping within the hospital premises, and further evaluated through research. The findings presented in this paper are related to the CURE pilot implementation strategy within an acute care setting. Given the long term plan aims to roll out similar tobacco

The findings presented in this paper are related to the CURE pilot implementation strategy within an acute care setting. Given the long term plan aims to roll out similar tobacco dependence services within acute, maternity and mental health settings (1), it will be important to conduct qualitative work and strategic behavioural analysis in other contexts where the delivery and/or barriers/facilitators might be different. In addition, suggested future research should also try to understand how these findings differ in different geographical locations given different structures and systems within hospitals. Implementation fidelity across different pilot sites should be evaluated and compared with adherence to protocols. For example, implementation fidelity could be assessed by measuring the completeness of smoking cessation consultation forms and the proportion of patients for whom cessation medications were ordered in hospital.

Conclusion

Despite treating tobacco dependence being one of the most cost-effective health interventions any healthcare system can provide, adherence to smoking cessation standards within hospitals settings remains poor in England. This strategic behavioural analysis study demonstrates how the use of a variety of behaviour change tools can be used to specify the content and possible mechanisms of action of an existing implementation strategy which has achieved some level of success in clinical practice but requires further improvement and evaluation. The CURE implementation strategy may be further optimised by using additional theoretically congruent BCTs to target the less commonly addressed influences related to the social and environmental context (e.g. 'restructuring the physical environment' by creating a steering group to consider options for discharge pathways).

This study provides comprehensive evidence about current practice in the pilot site that can further inform implementation strategy improvement and the implementation of an NHS-funded tobacco dependence treatment and policy in secondary care in England.

List of abbreviations

- 594 CURE: Conversation, Understand, Replace, Expert and Evidence based Treatments.
- 595 OMSC: Ottawa Model for Smoking Cessation
- 596 TDF: Theoretical Domains Framework
- 597 BCT: Behaviour Change Technique
- 598 BCW: Behaviour Change Wheel
- 599 MRC: Medical Research Council
- 600 APEASE: Affordability, Practicality, Efficacy, Acceptability, Safety and Equity/Side Effects

Declarations

602

603 Availability of data and material: The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study 604 are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. 605 Competing interests: VM is employed by project funders, Public Health England, ME and FH 606 led the pilot evaluation of the CURE project in Greater Manchester. 607 Funding: This research was commissioned and funded by Public Health England 608 (award/grant number: not applicable). 609 Authors' contributions: AR, AH and CH developed the initial study design and secured 610 funding for the study. AW conducted preparation of study materials, data collection and 611 analysis for the qualitative interviews and drafted summary reports. AR conducted the 612 behavioural analysis. CH developed the logic models. AR and AW drafted the manuscript. 613 CH, AH, VM, FH and ME contributed and provided comments on data analysis and 614 interpretation, and report drafts. All co-authors have reviewed and agreed the final draft of 615 the paper submitted for publication. 616 Acknowledgements: We thank all of the healthcare professionals who took the time to 617 participate in this research, the CURE team, and PHE Behavioural Insights and Tobacco 618 Control teams for their helpful comments and insight, particularly Martyn Willmore, 619 Aleksandra Herbec, Anna Sallis and Michelle Havill. 620 Patient and Public Involvement: As this study focussed on healthcare professionals' behaviour change, no patients or members of the public were involved. 621 622 Ethics statement: Ethical Approval was granted from Northumbria University Faculty of 623 Health and Life Sciences Ethics Committee (Ref 21358). Informed consent was obtained 624 from all study participants. All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant 625 guidelines and regulations.

627 References

- 1. National Health Service, NHS England. The NHS long term plan [Internet]. 2019 [cited
- 629 2020 Apr 6]. Available from: www.longtermplan.nhs.uk
- 630 2. Mangera Z, Devani N. National Smoking Cessation Audit Report 2019 National
- Improvement Objectives: Key Findings. London, UK; 2020.
- 632 3. Rigotti NA, Munafò MR, Stead LF. Interventions for smoking cessation in hospitalised
- patients. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2007;
- 634 4. Rigotti NA, Clair C, Munafò MR, Stead LF. Interventions for smoking cessation in
- hospitalised patients. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012 May 16;2017(12).
- 5. Papadakis S, Cole AG, Reid RD, Coja M, Aitken D, Mullen KA, et al. Increasing rates
- of tobacco treatment delivery in primary care practice: Evaluation of the Ottawa model
- for smoking cessation. Ann Fam Med. 2016;14(3):235–43.
- 639 6. Reid RD, Mullen KA, D'Angelo MES, Aitken DA, Papadakis S, Hale PM, et al.
- Smoking cessation for hospitalized smokers: An evaluation of the "Ottawa Model."
- 641 Nicotine Tob Res. 2009;12(1):11–8.
- 7. Mullen KA, Manuel DG, Hawken SJ, Pipe AL, Coyle D, Hobler LA, et al. Effectiveness
- of a hospital-initiated smoking cessation programme: 2-year health and healthcare
- outcomes. Tob Control. 2017;26(3):293–9.
- 645 8. Evison M, Agrawal S, Conroy M, Bendel N, Sewak N, Fitzgibbon A, et al. Building the
- case for comprehensive hospital-based tobacco addiction services: Applying the
- Ottawa Model to the City of Manchester. Lung Cancer. 2018;121:99–100.
- 648 9. Powell BJ, Waltz TJ, Chinman MJ, Damschroder LJ, Smith JL, Matthieu MM, et al. A
- refined compilation of implementation strategies: Results from the Expert
- Recommendations for Implementing Change (ERIC) project. Implement Sci [Internet].
- 651 2015 Feb 12 [cited 2021 Apr 9];10(1):21. Available from:

| http://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13012-015 | 5-0209-1 | 1 |
|--|----------|---|
|--|----------|---|

- 653 10. Evison M, Pearse C, Howle F, Baugh M, Huddart H, Ashton E, et al. Feasibility,
- uptake and impact of a hospital-wide tobacco addiction treatment pathway: Results
- from the CURE project pilot. Clin Med (Northfield II). 2020;20(2):196–202.
- 656 11. Evison M, Cox J, Howle F, Groom K, Moore R, Clegg H, et al. Health economic
- analysis for the CURE Project' pilot: A hospital-based tobacco dependency treatment
- service in Greater Manchester. BMJ Open Respir Res [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2022 Apr
- 8];8(1):e001105. Available from:
- https://bmjopenrespres.bmj.com/content/8/1/e001105
- 661 12. Birken SA, Powell BJ, Shea CM, Haines ER, Alexis Kirk M, Leeman J, et al. Criteria
- for selecting implementation science theories and frameworks: Results from an
- international survey. Implement Sci [Internet]. 2017 Oct 30 [cited 2021 Apr 9];12(1):1–
- 9. Available from: https://link.springer.com/articles/10.1186/s13012-017-0656-y
- 665 13. Nilsen P. Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks.
- lmplement Sci [Internet]. 2015 Apr 21 [cited 2021 Apr 9];10(1):53. Available from:
- http://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13012-015-0242-0
- 668 14. Michie S, Atkins L, West R. The Behaviour Change Wheel: A Guide to Designing
- Interventions. Great Britain: Silverback Publishing; 2014.
- 670 15. Michie S, Johnston M, Abraham C, Lawton R, Parker D, Walker A. Making
- psychological theory useful for implementing evidence based practice: A consensus
- approach. Qual Saf Heal Care. 2005;14(1):26–33.
- 673 16. Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S. Validation of the theoretical domains framework for
- use in behaviour change and implementation research. Implement Sci. 2012;7(1):1–
- 675 17.
- 676 17. Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: A new method for

- characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. Implement Sci.
- 678 2011;6(1):42.
- 679 18. Michie S, Richardson MS, Johnston M, Abraham C, Francis J, Hardeman W, et al.
- The Behavior Change Technique Taxonomy (v1) of 93 Hierarchically Clustered
- Techniques: Building an International Consensus for the Reporting of Behavior
- Change Interventions. Ann Behav Med. 2013;46(1):81–95.
- 683 19. Atkins L, Sallis A, Chadborn T, Shaw K, Schneider A, Hopkins S, et al. Reducing
- 684 catheter-associated urinary tract infections: a systematic review of barriers and
- facilitators and strategic behavioural analysis of interventions. Implement Sci.
- 686 2020;15(1):44.
- 687 20. Araújo-Soares V, Hankonen N, Presseau J, Rodrigues A, Sniehotta FF. Developing
- Behavior Change Interventions for Self-Management in Chronic Illness: An Integrative
- 689 Overview. Eur Psychol. 2019;24(1):7–25.
- 690 21. Moore G, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, et al. Process
- 691 Evaluation of Complex Interventions: UK Medical Research (MRC) Guideline. Br Med
- 692 J [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2018 Sep 30];350. Available from:
- 693 https://mrc.ukri.org/documents/pdf/mrc-phsrn-process-evaluation-guidance-final/
- 694 22. Wearn A, Haste A, Haighton C, Mallion V, Rodrigues AM. Barriers and facilitators to
- 695 implementing the CURE stop smoking project: a qualitative study. BMC Health Serv
- 696 Res. 2021;21(1):481.
- 697 23. Pinnock H, Barwick M, Carpenter CR, Eldridge S, Grandes G, Griffiths CJ, et al.
- Standards for Reporting Implementation Studies (StaRI) Statement. BMJ [Internet].
- 699 2017 Mar 6 [cited 2021 Apr 9];356. Available from:
- 700 http://www.bmj.com/permissionsSubscribe:http://www.bmj.com/subscribeBMJ2017;35
- 701 6:i6795doi:10.1136/bmj.i6795

- 702 24. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, et al. Better 703 reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication 704 (TIDieR) checklist and guide. Br Med J. 2014 Mar 7;348.
- Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method
 for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. BMC Med Res
 Methodol. 2013 Dec 18;13(1):117.
- Cartmell KB, Dismuke CE, Dooley M, Mueller M, Nahhas GJ, Warren GW, et al.
 Effect of an evidence-based inpatient tobacco dependence treatment service on 1 year postdischarge health care costs. Med Care. 2018;56(10):883–9.
- Riordan F, Racine E, Phillip ET, Bradley C, Lorencatto F, Murphy M, et al.
 Development of an intervention to facilitate implementation and uptake of diabetic
 retinopathy screening. Implement Sci. 2020;15(1):1–17.
- 714 28. Atkins L, Francis J, Islam R, O'Connor D, Patey A, Ivers N, et al. A guide to using the 715 Theoretical Domains Framework of behaviour change to investigate implementation 716 problems. Implement Sci. 2017;12(1):77.
- Patey AM, Islam R, Francis J, Bryson GL, Grimshaw JM, Driedger M, et al.
 Anesthesiologists' and surgeons' perceptions about routine pre-operative testing in
 low-risk patients: Application of the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) to identify
 factors that influence physicians' decisions to order pre-operative tests. Implement
 Sci. 2012;7(1):52.
- 30. Haighton C, Newbury-Birch D, Durlik C, Sallis A, Chadborn T, Porter L, et al.
 Optimising Making Every Contact Count (MECC) interventions: A strategic
 behavioural analysis.
- 725 31. Cane J, Richardson M, Johnston M, Ladha R, Michie S. From lists of behaviour 726 change techniques (BCTs) to structured hierarchies: Comparison of two methods of

- developing a hierarchy of BCTs. Br J Health Psychol. 2015;20(1):130–50.
- 728 32. Michie S, Johnston M, Hardeman W, Eccles M. From Theory to Intervention: Mapping
- 729 Theoretically Derived Behavioural Determinants to Behaviour Change Techniques.
- 730 Appl Psychol. 2008;57(4):660–80.
- 731 33. de Meyrick J. The Delphi method and health research. Health Educ. 2003 Feb
- 732 1;103(1):7–16.
- 733 34. Tomasone JR, Kauffeldt KD, Chaudhary R, Brouwers MC. Effectiveness of guideline
- dissemination and implementation strategies on health care professionals' behaviour
- and patient outcomes in the cancer care context: A systematic review [Internet]. Vol.
- 15, Implementation Science. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2020 [cited 2021 Apr 9]. p. 41.
- 737 Available from:
- 738 https://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13012-020-0971-
- 739 6
- 740 35. Grimshaw JM, Thomas RE, MacLennan G, Fraser C, Ramsay CR, Vale L, et al.
- 741 Effectiveness and efficiency of guideline dissemination and implementation strategies.
- 742 Health Technol Assess (Rocky) [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2021 Apr 9];8(6). Available
- 743 from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14960256/
- 36. Straus SE, Tetroe J, Graham ID. Knowledge Translation in Health Care: Moving from
- 745 Evidence to Practice [Internet]. Straus S, Tetroe J, Graham I., editors. Knowledge
- 746 Translation in Health Care: Moving from Evidence to Practice. John Wiley & Sons;
- 747 2009 [cited 2021 Apr 9]. 1–318 p. Available from: https://cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/40618.html
- 748 37. Jones S, Hamilton S. Smoking cessation: Implementing hospital-based services. Br J
- 749 Nurs [Internet]. 2011 Oct 13 [cited 2021 Apr 9];20(18):1210–5. Available from:
- 750 https://www.magonlinelibrary.com/doi/abs/10.12968/bjon.2011.20.18.1210
- 751 38. Steinmo S, Fuller C, Stone SP, Michie S. Characterising an implementation

- intervention in terms of behaviour change techniques and theory: The "Sepsis Six"
- 753 clinical care bundle. Implement Sci [Internet]. 2015 Aug 8 [cited 2020 Jul
- 754 16];10(1):111. Available from:
- 755 http://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13012-015-0300-7
- 756 39. Steinmo S, Michie S, Fuller C, Stanley S, Stapleton C, Stone SP. Bridging the gap
- between pragmatic intervention design and theory: Using behavioural science tools to
- 758 modify an existing quality improvement programme to implement "Sepsis Six."
- 759 Implement Sci [Internet]. 2016;11(1):1–12. Available from:
- 760 http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13012-016-0376-8
- 761 40. Li SA, Jeffs L, Barwick M, Stevens B. Organizational contextual features that
- influence the implementation of evidence-based practices across healthcare settings:
- A systematic integrative review. Syst Rev [Internet]. 2018 May 5 [cited 2021 Apr
- 764 9];7(1):72. Available from:
- 765 https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-018-
- 766 0734-5
- 767 41. Kaner EFS, Ramsay SE, Aquino MRJV, Wearn A, Fong M, Todd A, et al. Supporting
- 768 the NHS Long Term Plan: An evaluation of the implementation and impact of NHS-
- funded tobacco dependence services. NIHR Applied Research Collaboration National
- 770 Priority Areas: Prevention, including behavioural risk factors.; 2021.
- 771 42. Perry C, Chhatralia K, Damesick D, Hobden S, Volpe L. Behavioural insights in health
- care | The Health Foundation [Internet]. The Health Foundation. 2015 [cited 2021 Apr
- 773 23]. Available from: https://www.health.org.uk/publications/behavioural-insights-in-
- 774 health-care
- 775 43. Meeker D, Knight TK, Friedberg MW, Linder JA, Goldstein NJ, Fox CR, et al. Nudging
- 776 guideline-concordant antibiotic prescribing: A randomized clinical trial. JAMA Intern
- 777 Med [Internet]. 2014 Mar 1 [cited 2021 Apr 9];174(3):425–31. Available from:

| 778 | | https://jamanetwork.com/ |
|-----|-----|---|
| 779 | 44. | Human Behaviour Change Project. The Theory and Techniques Tool [Internet]. [cited |
| 780 | | 2020 Apr 20]. Available from: |
| 781 | | https://theoryandtechniquetool.humanbehaviourchange.org/tool |
| 782 | | |
| 783 | | |
| 784 | | |
| 785 | | |
| 786 | | |
| 787 | | |
| 788 | | |
| 789 | | |
| 790 | | |
| 791 | | |
| 792 | | |
| 793 | | |
| 794 | | |
| 795 | | |
| 796 | | |
| 797 | | |
| 798 | | |
| 799 | | |

Table 1: TIDieR table for the CURE project implementation strategy in the pilot site.

| TIDieR | CURE project implementation intervention | | | |
|------------------|---|--|--|--|
| checklist item | | | | |
| What | The primary focus of the CURE project implementation strategy is to: Implement systematic screening of all hospital admissions for smoking status Implement an automated opt-out referral process to a specialist tobacco addiction treatment team for active smokers Train the medical workforce to have the competence and confidence to discuss and initiate the treatment for tobacco addiction with smokers; Provide a standardised assessment and treatment pathway for smokers admitted to secondary care; Provide an appropriately resourced Specialist Nurse team to see all smokers admitted to secondary care and design individualised treatment plans including beyond discharge; Promote standardised and robust handover of treatment plan to primary care upon discharge; Promote culture change within secondary care to embed the treatment of tobacco addiction into all medical teams' day-to-day practice; Provide IT systems to support the delivery of this programme. | | | |
| Who delivered | Two eLearning modules developed by the CURE Project Team and Dynamic to fit the needs of the gaps in knowledge for staff in the hospital as well as the new treatment pathway. Bespoke face to face teaching sessions delivered by Clinical Lead, Nurse Lead and Project Manager (induction, departmental teaching, grand rounds, ward walk-arounds, educational resources) | | | |
| How | Two eLearning modules developed and promoted by internal communications/education teams prior to formal launch of CURE Project. Specialist Nurse Training manual developed to support the CURE Nursing Team in their role. Posters, screensavers, flyers, ID badge foldout prescribing protocol created to promote project and key elements of the pathway. Bespoke teaching sessions (induction, departmental teaching, grand rounds, ward walk-arounds, educational resources) | | | |
| Where | Online training Face to face training sessions Slots on existing educational training sessions for doctors and nurses Hospital setting | | | |
| When and | ELearning module launched September 2018 – one month prior to | | | |
| How much | launch to give time to embed Face to face training/updates given over 3-4 months before and after launch of the CURE Project in October 2018 | | | |
| Tailoring | No tailoring | | | |
| Fidelity | No fidelity checks | | | |

Table 2. BCTs, intervention functions and policy categories identified in CURE.

| Activities and intervention strategies | Source of information | Behaviour Change Techniques | Intervention functions | Policy Categories |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| HCP Training (i.e. training manual, training manual, training poster, teaching slides, Level 1 and Level 2 eLearning modules) | Document analysis | Action Planning; Monitoring of behaviour by others without feedback; Monitoring outcome(s) of behaviour by others without feedback; Instruction on how to perform the behaviour; Information about Antecedents; Information about health consequences; Salience of consequences; Information about social and environmental consequences; Information about emotional consequences; Demonstration of the behaviour; Credible source; Verbal persuasion about capability. | Education Training Modelling Enablement Persuasion | Service provision Guidelines Communication/marketing Environmental/social planning |
| Other features of HCP training (i.e. shadowing, observation of new staff, repetition of training, lunchtime training sessions, certificate upon completion of training) | Interviews only | Monitoring of behaviour by others without feedback; Social support (practical); Social support (emotional); Demonstration of the behaviour; Behavioural practice/rehearsal; Credible source; Reward (outcome). | Education Training Modelling Enablement Persuasion | |
| Practice tools (e.g. assessment forms, prescribing protocols, NRT products for demonstration) Reminder systems (e.g. lanyard card, | Document analysis; interviews Document analysis; | Goal setting (behaviour); Action planning; Instruction on how to perform the behaviour; Adding objects to the environment Prompts/ cues; Adding objects to the | Education Enablement Training Environmental restructuring Education Environmental | |
| IT systems) | interviews | environment | restructuring | |
| Educational outreach visits (inclusive of both senior management and the wider healthcare team/staff) | Interviews only | Social support (practical); Instruction on how to perform the behaviour; Information about health consequences; Information about social and environmental consequences; Demonstration of the behaviour; Credible source; | Education Enablement Modelling Persuasion | |
| Ongoing audit and feedback | Interviews only | Review outcome goal(s); Feedback on behaviour; Feedback on outcome(s) of behaviour; Social support (unspecified) | Education Enablement Persuasion Incentivisation Training | |

| Activities and intervention strategies | Source of information | Behaviour Change Techniques | Intervention functions | Policy Categories |
|---|---|---|---|-------------------|
| | | | | |
| GP financial incentives (i.e. discharge pathway in primary care) | Interviews only | Cue signalling reward; Material incentive (behaviour) | Incentivisation Environmental restructuring | |
| Steering groups meetings | Document analysis; Interviews only | Monitoring of behaviour by others without feedback; Monitoring outcome(s) of behaviour by others without feedback; Restructuring the social environment | Education Enablement Environmental restructuring | |
| Branding and educational tools (e.g. posters, website, e-learning modules, pens, media campaign) | Document analysis; interviews | Prompts/ cues; Adding objects to the environment | Environmental restructuring | |
| Reflective discussions | Interviews only | Social support (unspecified); Restructuring the social environment | Enablement Environmental restructuring | |
| Information sharing | Interviews only | Social support (practical); Information about social and environmental consequences; Restructuring the Physical environment | Education Persuasion Enablement Environmental restructuring | |
| Admin Support | Interviews only | Restructuring the social environment | Enablement Environmental restructuring | |
| Consultation facilities | Interviews only | Restructuring the Physical environment | Environmental restructuring | |
| Triaging system | Interviews only | Restructuring the Physical environment | Environmental restructuring | |

Table 3. Prioritisation of TDF domains for the implementation of the CURE model by frequency, thematic elaboration, and evidence of conflicting beliefs.

| Ranking | TDF Domain (COM-B) | Frequency (No. of transcripts identified in; max n=10) | Elaboration (Number of themes [barriers/facilitators]) | Evidence of conflicting beliefs within domains (Yes/No) |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | Environmental Context and Resources (physical opportunity) | 10 | 13 | Yes |
| 2 | Goals (reflective motivation) | 7 | 4 | Yes |
| 3 | Social Influences (social opportunity) | 9 | 3 | Yes |
| 4 | Reinforcement (automatic motivation) | 8 | 2 | Yes |
| 5 | Social Professional Role and Identity (reflective motivation) | 7 | 2 | Yes |
| 6 | Skills (psychological capability & Physical Capability combined) | 7 | 1 | Yes |
| 7 | Beliefs about consequences (reflective motivation) | 7 | 2 | No |
| 8 | Knowledge (psychological capability) | 3 | 1 | No |
| Joint 9 th – 14 th | Beliefs about capabilities (reflective motivation) | 0 | 0 | - |
| | Intentions (reflective motivation) | 0 | 0 | - |
| | Memory, Attention, and Decision Making (psychological capability) | 0 | 0 | - |
| | Behavioural Regulation (psychological capability) | 0 | 0 | - |
| | Emotions (automatic motivation) | 0 | 0 | - |
| | Optimism (reflective motivation) | 0 | 0 | - |

Table 4. Theoretical congruence between the BCTs identified in CURE implementation strategy content and the key TDF domains influencing implementation of CURE within the pilot site

| ВСТ | Linked TDF domains according to integrated mapping matrix* | Domain importance ranking** | Theoretical congruence between BCT and domain*** |
|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Social support (practical) | Environmental Context and Resources | 1 | HIGH |
| | Goals | 2 | |
| | Social professional role/ identity | 3 | |
| | Social influences | 3 | |
| | Beliefs about capabilities | | |
| | | 9-14 | |
| Social support (emotional) | Goals | 2 | HIGH |
| | Social professional role/ identity Social influences | 3 3 | |
| | Beliefs about capabilities | 9-14 | |
| | Emotions | 9-14 | |
| Social support (unspecified) | Goals | 2 | HIGH |
| | Social professional role/ identity | 3 | |
| | Social influences | 3 | |
| | Beliefs about capabilities | 9-14 | |
| Reward (outcome) | Goals | 2 | HIGH |
| | Reinforcement | 5 | |
| | Skills | 6 | |
| | Beliefs about consequences | 9-14 | |
| Restructuring the social environment | Environmental Context and Resources | 1 | HIGH |
| | Social influences | 3 | |
| Demonstration of the | Social influences | 3 | HIGH |
| behaviour | Skills | 6 | |
| | Beliefs about capabilities | 9-14 | |
| Prompts/cues | Environmental Context and Resources | 1 | MED |
| | Memory, Attention, Decision Making | 9-14 | |
| | Behavioural Regulation | 9-14 | |
| Restructuring the Physical | Environmental Context and | 1 | MED |
| environment | Resources | | |
| Adding objects to the | Environmental Context and | 1 | MED |
| environment | Resources | | |
| Action Planning | Goals | 2 | MED |
| | Behavioural Regulation Memory, Attention, Decision | 9-14 9-14 | |
| | Making | 3-14 | |
| Verbal persuasion about | Goals | 2 | MED |
| capability | Beliefs about capabilities | 9-14 | W.E.D |
| | Optimism | 9-14 | |
| Review outcome goal(s) | Goals | 2 | MED |
| Material incentive | Reinforcement | 5 | MED |
| (behaviour) | Beliefs about consequences | 9-14 | |
| Instruction on how to | Skills | 6 | MED |
| perform the behaviour | Knowledge | 8 | |
| Dahaviavual | Beliefs about capabilities | 9-14 | MED |
| Behavioural | Skills Reliefs about capabilities | 6 | MED |
| practice/rehearsal Credible source | Beliefs about capabilities Beliefs about consequences | 9-14 9-14 | LOW |
| Feedback on outcome(s) of | Beliefs about consequences | 9-14 | LOW |
| behaviour | Denois about consequences | <i>3</i> -1 4 | LOW |
| Feedback on behaviour | Knowledge | 8 | LOW |
| | Beliefs about consequences | 9-14 | |

| Vnaudadaa | | BCT and domain*** |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| Knowledge | 8 | LOW |
| Behavioural regulation | 9-14 | |
| Knowledge | 8 | LOW |
| Beliefs about consequences | 9-14 | |
| Intentions | 9-14 | |
| Knowledge | 8 | LOW |
| Beliefs about consequences | 9-14 | |
| Knowledge | 8 | LOW |
| Beliefs about consequences | 9-14 | |
| | | |
| Knowledge | 8 | LOW |
| Beliefs about consequences | 9-14 | |
| None | NA | LOW |
| None | NA | LOW |
| None | NA | LOW |
| | Knowledge Beliefs about consequences Intentions Knowledge Beliefs about consequences Knowledge Beliefs about consequences Knowledge Beliefs about consequences None None None | Knowledge 8 Beliefs about consequences 9-14 Intentions 9-14 Knowledge 8 Beliefs about consequences 9-14 Knowledge 8 Beliefs about consequences 9-14 Knowledge 8 Beliefs about consequences 9-14 Knowledge 8 Beliefs about consequences 9-14 None NA None NA |

identified as important in the thematic analysis; Medium: BCT is paired with at least one domain identified as important; High: BCT is paired with two or more domains identified as important.

| Table 5. Seized and missed opportunities: Intervention functions linked with CUR | ζĖ. |
|--|-----|
|--|-----|

| Intervention functions |
|------------------------|
| |

^{*} TDF x BCT mapping matrices (31,32) and The Theory and Techniques Tool (44).
Domain ranking based on thematic analysis of barrier/facilitators data from interviews (see **Error! Reference source not found.).

^{***}Classification of theoretical congruence: Low: BCT is not paired with any of the 6 key domains

| TDF domain | Educati | Enableme | Environmen | Incentivisati | Coerci | Modelli | Persuasi | Trainin | Restricti |
|-----------------|---------|----------|------------------|---------------|--------|-------------|----------|---------|-----------|
| (COM-B) | on | nt | tal | on | on | ng | on | g | on |
| | | | restructurin | | | | | | |
| | | | g | | | | | | |
| Skills | | | | | | | | | |
| Cixino | | | | | | | | | |
| (Physical | | | | | | | | | |
| capability) | | | | | | | | | |
| Skills | | | | | | | | | |
| (Psychologi | | | | | | | | | |
| cal | | | | | | | | | |
| capability) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Goals, | | | | | | | | | |
| Professional | | | | | | | | | |
| role, | | | | | | | | | |
| (Reflective | | | | | | | | | |
| motivation) | | | | | | | | | |
| Reinforcem | | | | | | | | | |
| ent | | | | | | | | | |
| (| | | | | | | | | |
| (Automatic | | | | | | | | | |
| motivation) | | | | | | | | | |
| Environmen | | | | | | | | | |
| tal context | | | | | | | | | |
| and | | | | | | | | | |
| resources | | | | | | | | | |
| (Physical | | | | | | | | | |
| opportunity) | | | | | | | | | |
| Social | | | | | | | | | |
| Influences | | | | | | | | | |
| mindences | | | | | | | | | |
| (Social | | | | | | | | | |
| opportunity) | | | | | | | | | |
| Table seven dis | | | nton continu fun | | | a CLIDE int | | | vention |

Table seven displays links between the intervention functions coded in the existing CURE intervention, and the intervention functions linked to the top TDF domains using the BCW matrix (p.116). Green indicate an opportunity seized, and red indicate

an opportunity missed. White is not paired. Note: the definition of Skills used for this exercise combines Physical Skills and Cognitive/Interpersonal Skills (see Table 1.5, p.88 of The Behaviour Change Wheel(Michie et al., 2014)). Furthermore, both types of Skill are linked to the same intervention functions and BCTs in the mapping matrices used throughout this paper.

Table 6. Seized and missed opportunities: Policy Categories linked with CURE.

| Intervention functions | Policy Categories | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|------------|-------------------|----------|
| Tariotions | | | | | | | |
| | Communication/marketi | Guideline | Fiscal | Regulatio | Legislatio | Environmental/Soc | Service |
| | ng | s | Measure | n | n | ial planning | provisio |
| | | | s | | | | n |
| Education | | | | | | | |
| Enablement | | | | | | | |
| Environment | | | | | | | |
| al | | | | | | | |
| restructuring | | | | | | | |
| Incentivisatio | | | | | | | |
| n | | | | | | | |
| Coercion | | | | | | | |
| Modelling | | | | | | | |
| Persuasion | | | | | | | |
| Training | | | | | | | |
| Restriction | | | | | | | |

Table eight shows whether intervention functions identified in the CURE interventions were delivered through policy categories suggested by the BCW intervention function × policy category matrix. Green indicates an opportunity seized, grey indicates an intervention function not identified in the intervention, and red indicate an opportunity missed. White is not paired..

Table 7. Recommendations to support the implementation of a nationwide, secondary care-based tobacco dependence treatment model, based upon the CURE project.

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| Environmental context and resource | es | | |
| Clearly define discharge | Restructuring the physical | Set up a steering group to consider options for | High, if flexible to local |
| | Trooti dotaining the physical | | |
| pathways, at the set-up of the | environment | discharge pathways, involving representation from | service availability. |
| implementation process, that | | secondary care, primary care, community | |
| support continuity of care/follow- | | services, community pharmacists. | |
| up for outpatients. | | | |
| | | | |
| Collaborative working and | Restructuring the physical | Arrange educational outreach workshops and/or | Uncertain, dependent |
| discussion with external | environment | steering group meetings involving, for example, | on 'buy-in' from |
| stakeholders and organisations, | | Local Medical Committees, Local Care | stakeholder groups. |
| from the pre-planning stages. | | | |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| | | | |
| | | Organisations and Medicine Optimisation | |
| | | Services. | |
| Financial support for outpatient | Restructuring the physical | Project team to allocate specific funding for | Potentially high if |
| follow-up care within the | environment | discharge pathways, to enhance integration with | acceptable and |
| community. | | services external to secondary care. | practical locally. |
| Appropriate level of staffing | Restructuring the social | Model and implement staffing requirements | High |
| across groups (i.e. support staff, | environment | appropriate to the location, particularly in terms of | |
| delivery staff, project team and | | support staff (e.g. admin, IT support). | |
| community support). | | | |
| Designated hours for | | | |
| management to focus on the | | | |
| implementation of the | | | |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| intervention, particularly during | | | |
| the pre-launch phase. | | | |
| Ability to access space(s) and | Restructuring the physical | Provide adequate office space to specialist | Variable |
| equipment which enable delivery | environment | nursing staff/deliverers, to facilitate private | |
| of the intervention. | | telephone calls to patients and for use of IT. | |
| On-site smoking policy that aligns | | Ensure those involved in delivery and/or | |
| with intervention principles. | | implementation of the intervention can access and | Uncertain |
| | | use IT equipment (e.g. laptops) in light of the | |
| | | increasing need to work from home and self- | |
| | | isolate. | |
| | | Provide physical space for one-to-one support | |
| | | sessions, ensuring that these spaces are | Variable |

| echnique | | recommendation (in |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | 1000iiiiileiidatioii (iii |
| | | line with APEASE |
| | | criteria)ª |
| | accessible to both staff and outpatients from the | |
| | surrounding areas. | |
| | Provision of on-site vaping space/facilities. | Uncertain |
| estructuring the physical | Provide access to a range of NRT products within | Uncertain, as may be |
| nvironment | secondary care, ensuring stock/options on wards | unaffordable to offer a |
| | are reflective of what is available in the community | full range of NRT |
| | as much as practicable. | options. |
| | | |
| rompts/Cues | Prioritise the amendment of existing data storage | Moderate |
| dding objects to the | systems to allow recording and documenting of | |
| nvironment | patient information and journey through the | |
| ro d | ompts/Cues ding objects to the | surrounding areas. Provision of on-site vaping space/facilities. Structuring the physical Provide access to a range of NRT products within secondary care, ensuring stock/options on wards are reflective of what is available in the community as much as practicable. Prioritise the amendment of existing data storage systems to allow recording and documenting of patient information and journey through the |

| Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| Technique | | recommendation (in |
| | | line with APEASE |
| | | criteria) ^a |
| | intervention (e.g. computers programmed with pop | |
| | up requests for data). | |
| | | |
| Adding objects to the | Refer to (and/or provide if not already available) | High |
| environment | freely accessible e-learning modules/online | |
| | training resources. | |
| | | |
| Prompts/Cues | Provide marketing materials in a range of formats | High |
| Adding objects to the | i.e. posters, pens, and screensavers to promote | |
| environment | awareness of the service and prompt staff | |
| | engagement. | |
| | Adding objects to the environment Prompts/Cues Adding objects to the | intervention (e.g. computers programmed with pop up requests for data). Adding objects to the environment Refer to (and/or provide if not already available) freely accessible e-learning modules/online training resources. Prompts/Cues Provide marketing materials in a range of formats i.e. posters, pens, and screensavers to promote awareness of the service and prompt staff |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| Flexibility in the core service | Instruction on how to | Advise deliverers that shared decision-making is | High, depending on |
| specification, as much as | perform the behaviour | encouraged in relation to NRT options and post- | the availability of NRT |
| practicable, to facilitate shared | | discharge support (For example, choosing face to | options and physical |
| decision making. | | face or telephone support depending on local | space for one-to-one |
| | | restrictions). | sessions. |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Goals | | | |
| Ability to access a service | Goal setting (behaviour) | Communicate shared goals of the intervention | High |
| specification which clearly | | across management and deliverers, so required | |
| stipulates the core intervention | | behaviours can be agreed upon and planned. | |
| | Action planning | | |
| stipulates the core intervention | Action planning | behaviours can be agreed upon and planned. | |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| model, to ensure the intervention | | | |
| is delivered as intended. | | | |
| Motivate healthcare staff to | Goal setting (behaviour) | Arrange face-to-face or virtual discussions, | Moderate |
| promote the intervention to others | | training and the use of marketing materials to | |
| within their workplace. | | facilitate constant promotion of the intervention to | |
| | Review of outcome goal(s) | a wide range of healthcare professionals | |
| | | (including new junior doctors). | |
| | Review behaviour goals | | |
| | | | |
| | Verbal persuasion | | |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| Integration of the intervention with | Goal setting (behaviour) | Clearly communicate goals of the intervention, | Moderate |
| existing hospital goals and | | demonstrating how these align with existing | |
| priorities, to encourage 'buy-in' | | hospital priorities. | |
| from senior decision makers. | Review of outcome goal(s) | | |
| | Review behaviour goals | | |
| | Ç | | |
| | Action planning | | |
| Identification and monitoring of | Goal setting (outcome) | Advise project team to plan specific outcomes of | Moderate |
| outcomes that provide evidence | | interest from the earliest stages and engage in | |
| | Review of outcome goal(s) | | |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in | |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE | |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a | |
| of the success of the programme | | ongoing audit and feedback of these outcomes on | High | |
| and return on investment. | Feedback (outcome) | a regular basis. | 3 | |
| | | Share performance related feedback to delivery | | |
| | | teams and wider stakeholders (e.g. in primary | | |
| | Verbal persuasion | care) to encourage further 'buy-in'. | | |
| | | | | |
| Social/Professional Identity | Social/Professional Identity | | | |
| Those involved in | Social support | Educational outreach and training content to | High | |
| delivery/implementation to hold | (unspecified) | highlight that the intervention is aligned with a | | |
| the view that the intervention | | commitment to shared decision making. | | |
| allows for patient choice. | | | | |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| Clear project and peer leadership | Social support | Implement a full-time project manager and clinical | Moderate |
| within the locality. | (unspecified) | lead(s), ensuring they are able to provide | |
| | | troubleshooting and peer support in | |
| | | implementing/delivering the intervention. | |
| | Social support (practical) | | |
| | | | |
| | Social support (emotional) | | |
| Healthcare staff, across settings, | Social support | Educational outreach and training content to | Uncertain |
| to hold the view that delivery of | (unspecified) | highlight how the intervention aligns with | |
| the service aligns with their | | healthcare practice across settings and | |
| professional identity. | | stakeholder groups. | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| Social Influences | | | |
| Those involved in implementation | Social comparison | Encourage positive social comparison to share | High |
| and delivery to hold the view that | | good practice and facilitate a culture change of | |
| healthcare staff have a | | smoking cessation being everyone's responsibility | |
| responsibility to support patients | | by, for example, comparing no. of patients | |
| in smoking cessation. | | screened, no. referred to the service and/or no | |
| | | prescribed pharmacotherapy across | |
| | | wards/hospitals | |
| Strong teamwork and | Information about others' | Educational outreach and training content to | High |
| collaborative working within and | approval | highlight clear, visible senior leadership to ensure | |
| across stakeholder groups. | | staff are aware of others' support of the | |
| | | intervention. | |
| | | | |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| Strong and visible peer | Restructuring the social | Identify champions of the intervention within | High, depending on |
| leadership across stakeholder | environment | organisations, informing individuals that their own | affordability. |
| groups. | | behaviour may set a good example for others and | |
| | | have positive consequences. This may relate to: | |
| | Social support (unspecified) | Clinical/Nurse/Pharmacy champion | |
| | | Primary Care Champion | |
| | Credible source | in different Hospital wards/departments | |
| | | | High, depending on |
| | Verbal persuasion | As much as practicable, integrate opportunities for | practicality/ availability |
| | | staff to observe peers presenting/discussing the | of peer leads. |
| | | intervention. For example, within educational | |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| | | | |
| | Identification of self as a | outreach/information should be delivered by local | |
| | role model | clinical and nursing leads. | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Vicarious Consequences | | |
| Reinforcement | | | |
| | | | |
| Those involved in delivery and | Self-reward | Prompt self-praise or intrinsic rewards of | High |
| implementation to hold the view | | involvement, when performing intervention related | |
| that intervention involvement is | | tasks. For example, prompting staff to reflect on | |
| intrinsically rewarding. | | the likely health benefits for patients as a result of | |
| | | the treatment they are providing | |
| | | | |
| Engagement from those working | Cue signalling reward | Educational outreach workshops or online | Uncertain |
| within primary care to support | | information provision to advise GPs that funding is | |
| l. | | | |

| Summary of what needs to | Behaviour Change | Example delivery | Feasibility of |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|
| occur to support | Technique | | recommendation (in |
| implementation, by TDF | | | line with APEASE |
| domain. | | | criteria) ^a |
| ongoing treatment/prescribing | Material incentive | allocated for NRT prescriptions in the community | Provision of a material |
| within the community. | (behaviour) | and that this is a cost-effective approach. | (e.g. financial) |
| | | | incentive not deemed |
| | | | acceptable in the |
| | | | current context. |
| Skills | | | |
| Ensure deliverers have capability | Instruction on how to | Allow deliverers to shadow experienced staff | High |
| to provide behavioural support to | perform behaviour | providing support to patients. | |
| patients. | | Provide training on how to use tools associated | High |
| Ensure deliverers have capability | Demonstration of the | with intervention delivery (i.e. I.T systems). | |
| to use supporting IT systems. | behaviour | | |

| Summary of what needs to occur to support implementation, by TDF domain. | Behaviour Change Technique | Example delivery | Feasibility of recommendation (in line with APEASE criteria) ^a |
|--|----------------------------|------------------|---|
| | Behavioural practice | | |