



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

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

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

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

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

BMJ Open

Realist evaluation of the impact of the research translation process on health system sustainability: a study protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-045172
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Oct-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Mosedale, Abby; Curtin University, School of Public Health Hendrie, Delia; Curtin University, School of Public Health Geelhoed, Elizabeth; Telethon Kids Institute Zurynski, Yvonne; Macquarie University, Australian Institute of Health Innovation Robinson, Suzanne; Curtin University, Health Policy Management
Keywords:	Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

TITLE

Realist evaluation of the impact of the research translation process on health system sustainability: a study protocol

Corresponding author: *Ms Abby Mosedale*. School of Public Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia.

Email: abby.mosedale@curtin.edu.au

Address: Kent Street, Bentley, Perth

Western Australia, 6102

Tel: +61 8 9266 9266 Fax: +61 8 9266 2255

Co-authors:

Dr Delia Hendrie.

School of Public Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia.

Professor Elizabeth Geelhoed.

Telethon Kids Institute, Perth, Australia

Associate Professor Yvonne Zurynski

Australian Institute of Health and Innovation, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

Professor Suzanne Robinson.

School of Public Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia.

Funding statement: This work is supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council Partnership Centre for Health System Sustainability (ID: 9100002). In addition the Western Australian Department of Health provides financial support for the Research Translation Projects program.

Word count: 3874 words

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

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Sustainability at a system level relates to the capacity of the system to be able to service the ongoing health needs of the population. It is a multifaceted concept encompassing both the affordability and efficiency of a system and the system’s ability to adapt and change.

To address issues that currently threaten health system sustainability, health care leaders, policy makers, clinicians and researchers are searching for strategies that capitalise on new research and technologies while ensuring the delivery of safe, value-based care. Often these strategies are assessed in terms of the intervention being sustainable rather than contributions to the sustainability of the system as a whole. We present a realist evaluation of a research translation program to understand how the research translation process contributes to health system sustainability through the implementation of interventions funded to deliver service improvement and value-based health care.

Methods and analysis:

Underpinned by the realist evaluation framework, this research will be executed in three phases: (1) developing the Initial Program Theory (IPT) of the research translation process; (2) testing the program theory through case study analysis; and (3) theory refinement and consolidation. The evaluation uses a case example of a research translation program, chosen for its representation of a microcosm of the broader health system and the heterogeneity of service improvement activities taking place within it. Across the three phases, analysis of data from program documentation, interviews and focus groups will draw on the context (C), mechanism (M), outcome (O) formula that is core to realist evaluation. In addition, system dynamic methods will capture the feedback loops and complex relationships amongst IPT and CMO configurations.

Ethics and Dissemination: Curtin University Human Research Ethics Committee, Western Australia, approves this study. Results will be published in scientific journals, and communicated to respondents and relevant partners.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This is the first study to evaluate the impact of the research translation process on health system sustainability.
- Adopting a realist methodology will allow contextual factors and mechanisms to be identified that influence how the research translation process can contribute to health system sustainability.
- A novel feature of this study is the application of system dynamics modelling within the realist evaluation framework, capturing the complexity and feedback relationships between context, mechanism and outcome.
- Using a Delphi method to establish consensus on implementation and evaluation recommendations for a research translation program will facilitate perspectives to be gained from a broad group of stakeholders.
- Evaluation of one research translation program as a case study may affect generalisability of study findings to the research translation process more generally.

INTRODUCTION

Health systems around the world are facing challenges relating to rising healthcare expenditure and the effectiveness and efficiency of the system to deliver high value, safe healthcare. A number of complex interdependent factors are contributing to these challenges. An aging population, rising chronic disease, public expectations, and a lack of value-consciousness amongst healthcare consumers and providers are the major factors driving growing demand for healthcare^{1,2}. These issues are occurring against a cultural backdrop that is resistant to change, often driven by behaviours associated with vested interests, and incentives that do not promote value or transparency³. These challenges, pressures and behaviours raise questions about capacity of the system to deliver affordable, cost-effective outcomes to the population over time, which is often referred to as the sustainability of the system⁴. Research translation is an essential process for ensuring health systems have ongoing capacity to service the health needs of a population and address challenges through the integration of cost effective interventions based on new research and technology.

Western Australia (WA) is typical of other jurisdictions in Australia facing challenges that threaten the long-term sustainability of its health system. The demand for health services has grown substantially in recent years, along with health expenditure, yet outcomes in population health and acute care in WA have not improved at the same rate³. With major health issues such as increasing obesity, an aging population, chronic disease, mental health and inequalities in health outcomes

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

across the WA population, the sustainability of the WA health system is a growing concern for healthcare leaders and policy makers. The WA Department of Health, along with healthcare leaders, policy makers, clinicians and researchers around the globe, acknowledge the potential of research evidence to improve health outcomes and optimise resource use ^{3,5,6}. In 2007 the former State Health Research Advisory Council within the WA Department of Health, introduced the Research Translation Projects (RTP) program ⁷. The RTP program aims to cultivate and translate evidence for a sustainable health system through the support of industry driven, high-quality research projects that have the potential to deliver improved cost effectiveness and/or efficiencies to the health system while maintaining or improving patient outcomes. Internal evaluations of the RTP program have focused primarily on research outputs such as the number of publications, changes to practice guidelines and additional research funding obtained. Whilst assessment of research outputs is important, the RTP program’s contribution to sustainability is not well understood. Therefore, the project presented here, aims to explain how the RTP program contributes to health system sustainability through the implementation of research translation interventions funded to deliver service improvement and value-based health care. By adopting a realist evaluation framework, this project will in addition to the evaluation of the RTP program, aim to contribute to a more generalizable understanding of the relationships between the process of research translation, intervention sustainability and sustainability from a whole of system perspective.

BACKGROUND

Sustainability at a system level relates to the capacity of the system to be able to service the health needs of the population into the future⁴. It is a multifaceted concept that encompasses both the affordability and efficiency of a system, and the system’s ability to adapt and change ².

To address issues that currently threaten health system sustainability, healthcare leaders, policy makers, clinicians and researchers are searching for strategies that capitalise on new research and technologies while ensuring the delivery of safe, value-based care. Many of these strategies involve implementing new interventions and programs as research translation interventions ⁸.

Evaluating the impact of these interventions has become increasingly important as governments, research institutions and research funders are held to account for the funds they spend ⁵. One aspect of evaluation is the sustainability and spread of interventions, that is their sustained implementation, outcomes and scaling up ⁸. It follows that when interventions are evaluated in terms of sustainability, the focus is often in relation to the intervention itself, with a disconnect

between the intervention being sustained and its contribution to a sustainable health system. This limitation is evident in the measurement of sustainability, which is often undertaken in terms of continuity of program activities and outcomes, institutionalisation, adaptation of the intervention components, and sustained attention to the issue or problem⁹⁻¹². As a result, there are a growing number of theories, models and frameworks of sustainability that address individual programs and interventions^{8,13,14}. These theories, models and frameworks provide valuable guidance and insights into the facilitators and barriers that contribute to intervention sustainability. In addition they provide guidance around funding of interventions that are more likely to continue beyond the implementation period as well as guidance for planning and evaluation^{9,10,13-15}. While sustainability of effective programs and interventions at the end of the research translation pipeline is valuable, not all interventions need to be sustained in order to be useful or effective¹⁰. The process of research translation offers a number of other potential benefits to health system sustainability such as collaboration and capacity building, along with the impact that comes from sustained implementation.

A research gap therefore emerges, with the contribution of research translation interventions on sustainability at the macro level of the health system, not well described or understood¹⁶. This gap becomes particularly evident when the complex adaptive nature of health systems is acknowledged. As social systems, health systems can be viewed as complex adaptive systems characterised by dynamic, non-linear interactions amongst numerous components and across all levels of the system^{14,17}. The different levels of the system are defined here based on an adaptation of Caldwell and Mays¹⁸ and Pope, et al.¹⁹ conceptualisation of the micro, meso and macro levels of the public health care delivery system in the UK. Here we apply this conceptualisation to the Australian health system, defining the micro frame as the intervention, the meso as an intermediary frame (e.g. organisation within which the intervention is implemented) and the macro as the centralised policy-making level enacted by the department of health. This dynamic interaction across the levels of the system means that events at one level of the system influence action and events at another level in a feedback loop relationship²⁰. It follows that, in a similar fashion to Pope, et al.¹⁹, our interest is not solely with individual interventions but rather with the interconnections, interdependencies and feedback loops across a large complex system. In this context, sustainability is often considered only at the micro level¹⁵.

As previously mentioned, sustained research translation interventions are valuable to the macro system in terms of sustaining health outcomes, an intervention that is not sustained may also contribute to health system sustainability. The value of such interventions may not come through health outcomes, but other related outputs such as collaboration, skill development and capacity

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

building that maintain the health systems capacity to deliver health over time ^{10,21}. These, non-health related outputs are thought to be associated with the process of undertaking research translation, and may include, interprofessional collaboration, workforce capacity building and improved value consciousness amongst clinicians ^{2,10}

Whilst research regarding the key factors that influence the sustainability of research translation interventions is important, the next stage is to move beyond the intervention itself, and investigate how the process of research translation can trigger change within the wider health system ^{14,16,22}. This requires a shift away from linear cause and effect evaluation design to methods that are capable of dealing with complexity ²³. The process of research translation can be understood as a disruption to the system which is likely to trigger emergent, adaptive behaviours and nonlinear, feedback interactions across the system which will either reinforce or diminish overall system sustainability ²³. It follows that to understand sustainability at the macro level of the system, researchers need to shift their focus from *what* has been achieved, to *how* the process generates change in the system ²⁴. The concept of *how* and *why* change occurs within a system is core to the theory driven evaluation design, realist evaluation ²⁴⁻²⁷

Realist evaluation

Realist evaluation is a theory driven evaluation approach grounded in realism, a philosophy which asserts that both the material and social worlds are real ^{25,27}. It follows that the reality of the social and material world should be investigated to build a better understanding of what causes change within such systems. Realist evaluation shifts the basic inquiry of evaluation from “does this work?”, to “what works, in what context and how?” ²⁵. The realist evaluation approach can be said to be in contrast to traditional linear cause and effect approaches where complexity is controlled for or eliminated ²⁸. Instead, realist evaluation embraces complexity by acknowledging that context can influence the way an intervention achieves its outcomes through different change mechanisms that are triggered by context. Therefore, the realist approach aims to link intervention to outcome by identifying the various change mechanisms taking place in reality ²⁵. Within the realist evaluation framework, interventions are ‘theories incarnate’ embedded in a social reality that makes them prone to interpretation and modification ^{29,30}. Often these theories are not explicit and exist in the minds of those who designed a particular intervention ²⁵. It is therefore a central task of realist evaluation to make the theories explicit in the form of a program theory.

Program theories, in their simplest form, depict how a specific intervention is theorized to achieve change ³¹. The realist evaluation frameworks seek to develop program theories as Context-Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) configurations that explain how interventions trigger different change

mechanisms across different contexts to achieve (or not achieve) outcomes. The theory is then tested and refined through data collection and analysis that assesses patterns and regularities not only in the program outputs but also, the program context, the process of implementation, and the mechanisms that may be creating change^{25,26}. The outputs from the realist approach lead to a well-articulated program theory as well as a more generalizable theory, often termed a middle range theory, falling between program and grand theory that can be applied across different settings³¹. In the context of health system sustainability, the interest is in the process by which interventions trigger the change process across all levels of the system, from micro intervention level through to the macro policy level of the system. Many parallels can be drawn between the principles underlying realist evaluation and that of systems theory and complexity theory. When adding a system dynamics lens to the evaluation, it becomes clear that the CMO configurations that are central to realist evaluation involve complex, non-linear interactions often in the form of feedback loops. Within complex adaptive systems, the context, mechanism and outcomes are interconnected and, as such, the triggering of one mechanism can impact on the context of another³². Realist evaluation is said to be 'methods neutral' and thus provides a perspective and conceptual framework for evaluation rather than strict practical guidelines.²⁴ This study therefore aims to apply the realist evaluation framework, drawing on system dynamics methods and principles, to explain how research interventions funded to deliver service improvement and value-based health care, impact on sustainability across all levels of a complex adaptive system.

STUDY AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Aim:

Produce a program theory to explain how the research translation process contributes to health system sustainability through the implementation of interventions funded to deliver service improvement and value-based health care.

Objectives:

1. Identify the change mechanisms triggered by the implementation of research translation interventions that contribute to health system sustainability
2. Conduct case study analysis to explore the interconnected and feedback relationships between change mechanisms identified from objective 1, and
3. Refine the initial program theory of the impact of the research translation process on sustainability based on outcomes from objectives 1 and 2, through validation with key

stakeholders to inform a generalizable theory of mechanisms that influence sustainability at a health system level.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

A realist evaluation approach is applied to this study²⁷. The study draws on a number of theoretical frameworks including complexity science, complex adaptive systems theory and implementation science²³. It adopts a realist evaluation methodology to examine the pathways by which the RTP program as a research translation process contributes to health system sustainability. Realist evaluation is increasingly used in health services research to evaluate complex health system interventions^{28,33}. This approach has been chosen for its ability to cope with complexity and its focus on understanding how and why complex health interventions trigger change within complex systems. The RAMESES II reporting standards for realist evaluation will be used to structure the reporting of the study methods and analysis²⁸.

This study will be implemented in three phases:

1. Initial program theory development and evidence review: Development and refinement of an initial program theory for the research translation process and the impact on health system sustainability using peer reviewed literature, key informant interviews and program documentation.
2. Program theory testing: Test the initial program theory by applying it to selected case studies of interventions funded under the RTP program using document analysis, key stakeholder interviews and concept mapping workshops with key stakeholders.
3. Theory consolidation: Refine and validate the initial program theory based on the study findings and, peer-reviewed literature where relevant and focus group discussions with relevant stakeholders including program managers, existing and past investigators of funded projects, and members of the RTP selection panel.

The Research Translation Projects (RTP) Program

The RTP program, established in 2007 by the WA Department of Health, provides funding for short-term research projects that seek to improve healthcare practice and/or policy in the WA health system. Its aim is to improve or maintain patient outcomes through implementation of research translation projects that have the potential to deliver efficiencies to the WA health system. In an environment of rising healthcare burden and limited resources, the RTP program supports innovation with a focus on high-value care and needs-led research, funding work that might

otherwise not have been funded and also providing a focus on issues of importance as identified from the bottom up. It had been recognised that clinicians were generally uncompetitive for nationally funded grant programs due to lack of research training and research track-record. However, they were ideally placed to identify possible opportunities to implement new practices that promote efficiency while maintaining or improving patient outcomes. The RTP program was therefore implemented to provide an opportunity to deliver bottom up innovation and to build research capacity within the clinical environment through enablement and collaboration with those who have experience in research.

The program is innovative in terms of the requirement for inclusion of health resource appraisal, with a funding criterion that the proposed intervention would reduce or maintain costs to improve health outcomes (or reduce costs and maintain health outcomes). The combination of bottom up clinician led research translation, based on front line need and a key focus on health system efficiency, encourages clinicians from the WA health system to undertake research that has the potential to improve the quality and efficiency of their work. Through research translation into practice, innovation based on frontline need, development of research capacity within the clinical environment, collaboration amongst research and clinical workforce and the promotion of value-consciousness amongst clinicians, the RTP program also aims to contribute to the sustainability of the WA health system. Research translation projects sit along the research translation continuum and are made up of new research, pilot-studies or applications and evaluations of research that has been applied elsewhere.

Given the spread of projects funded by the RTP program, across multiple settings and addressing a variety of health and health service delivery issues, the program can be viewed as a microcosm of the broader health system, given a shared focus on making health services more effective and efficient. The RTP program therefore provides a unique opportunity to study how the process of research translation through clinician led research can trigger change mechanisms to produce effects that may contribute to sustainability from the micro to the macro levels of the system.

Phase 1: Initial program theory development and evidence review

A program theory describes how the intervention is expected to bring about changes. The initial program theory is essential to the realist evaluation logic of inquiry²⁷. Developing a program theory shifts the understanding of how an intervention is expected to work from the implicit ideas that often exist in the heads of policy makers, decision makers, clinicians and researchers, to the explicit. According to Luck (2017), a program theory consists of both a theory of action and a theory of change. Program theories in terms of the theory of action and expected outcomes can often be

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

identified in policy or program documents. However in the context of a realist evaluation further information about the theory of change, that is the mechanism by which the action will achieve the outcomes, is not so obvious and requires the researcher to conduct focused interviews with key stakeholders to elicit the theory of change ³⁴.

Data sources: The development of the program theory will be informed by three main sources: input from the key stakeholders of the RTP program, analysis of documentation and a rapid review of the literature ³⁵. Program stakeholders such as program managers, existing and past investigators of funded projects, and members of the RTP selection panel will be interviewed to elicit the hypothesised change mechanisms that explain how the research translation process is thought to influence health system sustainability. In addition, program documents, including RTP research applications, progress reports and final reports of funded projects as well as past evaluations of the program will be accessed. Finally a rapid review of the literature will be undertaken to identify published theories of change (e.g. theories focusing on change within the individual professionals, within the organisation, the social setting or economic context) that provide insight into effective implementation of change through the research translation process ³⁶.

Data analysis: The CMO framework will underpin an iterative process of reflection and adaptation, which will take place to analyse data and identify relations between contexts, mechanisms of change and outcomes. The emergent behaviour of complex adaptive systems such as the health system would suggest that feedback loops would exist between CMO; therefore, the IPT will be depicted using a causal loop diagram (CLD) in order to capture any feedback interactions between CMOs. While logic models are commonly used to depict a program theory, the complexity of both the intervention and the system in which it is being implemented lends itself to system dynamics methods to depict the program theory.

Phase 2: Program theory testing

We will test the program theory of the research translation process developed in phase one by analysing in detail a series of RTP program case studies. Realist evaluation aims to test program theories for the purpose of refining them as well as informing implementation of the program. As such the core questions asked of the program are; what works (and does not work) for whom, in what circumstances and how? Mechanisms that produce positive outcomes in one context may not produce the same outcomes in an alternative context. This notion that the success (or failure) of an intervention is context dependant is one shared in the current literature that explores implementation science and complex interventions (Braithwaite, Churruarín, Long, Ellis, & Herkes, 2018). Anderson and Hardwick (2016) outline this concept succinctly:

“Recognising that no one policy, programme or intervention will always work, all the time, for everyone, realist approaches seek to explain this pattern of outcomes through building programme theories about how an intervention (policy or programme) is meant to work (often according to programme architects, or policymakers, or participants), and then ‘test’ whether and how this programme theory plays out in the real world using empirical data.” (Anderson & Hardwick, 2016, p. 325)

Selection criteria: Given the variety of implemented research projects funded by the RTP program, a descriptive analysis of past RTP projects will be undertaken prior to a case study selection to enable a selection of cases that captures the variety of activity undertaken within the RTP program. Projects will be classified based on characteristics such as context of implementation (e.g. ,metro hospital, rural hospital, primary care, community health) and type of research translation intervention (e.g. new practice guideline, new service, new test, role substitution) ⁸. In the first instance, case study selection will be purposive in nature to ensure a breadth of projects across the above criteria is captured. However, given the retrospective nature of this study, case study selection may be limited by access to project investigators and other stakeholders for interview.

Data sources: Case study analysis will be undertaken using three data collection techniques: key informant interviews, document review and analysis of individual RTP reports and other key documents, and secondary data analysis of project data such as cost and outcome data where necessary.

Data analysis: Thematic analysis will involve a process of organising data in relation to the initial programme theory (phase 1), whereby the data is mapped against the CLD developed in phase 1. Additionally, data will be coded and themed according to patterns of context, mechanism and outcomes. This thematic analysis will be informed by the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR), a widely used implementation science framework providing a typology to promote implementation theory development about what works, where and why across multiple settings ³⁷. The aim of this phase in the realist approach is to identify emerging patterns across the case studies to validate and refine the initial program theory to be consolidated in phase three. In addition, the interactions and relationships between change mechanisms will be refined.

Phase 3: Theory consolidation

The final phase of research will involve refining the initial program theory to produce a final iteration of the research translation process to be presented in the form of a mid-range program theory of its impact on sustainability across the micro, meso and macro levels of the system. The final model will

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

articulate a robust and empirically tested model of complex relationships among program and health service unit, organisation and policy level outcomes for sustainability. Similar to the process undertaken in phase one, the theory consolidation will be informed through the input of key stakeholders of the RTP program and a rapid review of the literature to update the initial rapid review to include relationships and interconnections between change mechanisms. Input from key stakeholders will be elicited through concept mapping workshops and interviews where the theory will be presented to key stakeholders for validation.

Implementation and evaluation recommendations for RTP program: In addition to the refined RTP theory, a Delphi Survey of experts will be undertaken to determine implementation and evaluation recommendations for the RTP program in the future. The survey will be conducted across a number of rounds via online questionnaire, which will be delivered until consensus is reached. The Delphi panel will consist of those involved in delivering the RTP program at the WA Department of Health, investigators involved in individual projects and other stakeholders. These recommendations will include an evaluation framework specifically for the RTP program to be addressed by future funding recipients and selection panels.

REFERENCES

1. Braithwaite J, Zurynski Y, Ludlow K, et al. Towards sustainable healthcare system performance in the 21st century in high-income countries: a protocol for a systematic review of the grey literature. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(1) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025892
2. Crisp N. What would a sustainable health and care system look like? *BMJ* 2017;358 doi: 10.1136/bmj.j3895
3. Sustainable Health Review. Sustainable Health Review: Final Report to the Western Australian Government. Western Australia.: Department of Health, 2019.
4. Braithwaite J, Testa L, Lamprell G, et al. Built to last? The sustainability of health system improvements, interventions and change strategies: a study protocol for a systematic review. *BMJ open* 2017;7(11):e018568-e68. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018568
5. Cruz Rivera S, Kyte DG, Aiyegbusi OL, et al. Assessing the impact of healthcare research: A systematic review of methodological frameworks. *PLOS Medicine* 2017;14(8):e1002370. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002370
6. Wensing M, Grol R. Knowledge translation in health: how implementation science could contribute more. *BMC medicine* 2019;17(1):88. doi: 10.1186/s12916-019-1322-9
7. Government of Western Australia; Department of Health. Research Translation Projects 2019 [Available from: https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/N_R/Research-Translation-Projects.
8. Tricco AC, Ashoor HM, Cardoso R, et al. Sustainability of knowledge translation interventions in healthcare decision-making: a scoping review. *Implementation science : IS* 2016;11(55):55-55. doi: 10.1186/s13012-016-0421-7
9. Shelton RC, Cooper BR, Stirman SW. The Sustainability of Evidence-Based Interventions and Practices in Public Health and Health Care. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2018;39(1):55-76. doi: 10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040617-014731
10. Whelan J, Love P, Pettman T, et al. Cochrane Update: Predicting sustainability of intervention effects in public health evidence: identifying key elements to provide guidance. *Journal of Public Health* 2014;36(2):347-51. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdu027
11. Lennox L, Maher L, Reed J. Navigating the sustainability landscape: a systematic review of sustainability approaches in healthcare. *Implement Sci* 2018;13(1) doi: 10.1186/s13012-017-0707-4
12. Flynn R, Scott SD. Understanding Determinants of Sustainability Through a Realist Investigation of a Large-Scale Quality Improvement Initiative (Lean): A Refined Program Theory. *Journal of nursing scholarship : an official publication of Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing* 2019 doi: 10.1111/jnu.12527
13. Stirman S, Kimberly J, Cook N, et al. The sustainability of new programs and innovations: a review of the empirical literature and recommendations for future research. *Implement Sci* 2012;7(1) doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-7-17
14. Gruen RL, Elliott JH, Nolan ML, et al. Sustainability science: an integrated approach for health-programme planning. *The Lancet* 2008;372(9649):1579-89. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61659-1
15. Braithwaite J, Ludlow K, Testa L, et al. Built to last? The sustainability of healthcare system improvements, programmes and interventions: a systematic integrative review. *BMJ open* 2020;10(6):e036453. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-036453
16. Greenhalgh T, Macfarlane F, Barton-Sweeney C, et al. "If We Build It, Will It Stay?" A Case Study of the Sustainability of Whole-System Change in London. *Milbank Quarterly* 2012;90(3):516-47. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0009.2012.00673.x
17. Hawe P, Shiell A, Riley T. Theorising Interventions as Events in Systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 2009;43(3-4):267-76. doi: 10.1007/s10464-009-9229-9
18. Caldwell SEM, Mays N. Studying policy implementation using a macro, meso and micro frame analysis: the case of the Collaboration for Leadership in Applied Health Research & Care

(CLAHRC) programme nationally and in North West London. *Health research policy and systems* 2012;10:32-32. doi: 10.1186/1478-4505-10-32

19. Pope C, Robert G, Bate P, et al. Lost in translation: A multi-level case study of the metamorphosis of meanings and action in public sector organizational innovation. *Public Adm* 2006;84(1):59-79.

20. Innovative Care for Chronic Conditions : Building Blocks for Action. Geneva: Geneva : World Health Organization 2002.

21. Chambers DA, Glasgow RE, Stange KC. The dynamic sustainability framework: addressing the paradox of sustainment amid ongoing change. *Implementation science : IS* 2013;8(1):117-17. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-8-117

22. Hedelin B. Complexity is no excuse. *Sustainability Science* 2019;14(3):733-49. doi: 10.1007/s11625-018-0635-5

23. Braithwaite J, Churrua K, Long JC, et al. When complexity science meets implementation science: a theoretical and empirical analysis of systems change. *BMC medicine* 2018;16(1):63. doi: 10.1186/s12916-018-1057-z

24. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, et al. Realist methods in medical education research: what are they and what can they contribute? *Medical Education* 2012;46(1):89-96. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04045.x

25. Pawson R. The science of evaluation : a realist manifesto / Ray Pawson. London: London : SAGE 2013.

26. Greenhalgh T, Wong G, Jagosh J, et al. Protocol—the RAMESES II study: developing guidance and reporting standards for realist evaluation. *BMJ Open* 2015;5(8) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008567

27. Pawson R. Realistic evaluation / Ray Pawson and Nick Tilley. London: London : SAGE 1997.

28. Geoff W, Gill W, Joanne G, et al. Quality and reporting standards, resources, training materials and information for realist evaluation: the RAMESES II project. *Health Services and Delivery Research* 2017;5(28) doi: 10.3310/hsdr05280

29. Rycroft-Malone J, Burton C, Wilkinson J, et al. Collective action for knowledge mobilisation: a realist evaluation of the Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care. *Health Services and Delivery Research* 2015;3(44) doi: 10.3310/hsdr03440

30. Nurjono M, Shrestha P, Lee A, et al. Realist evaluation of a complex integrated care programme: protocol for a mixed methods study. *BMJ Open* 2018;8(3) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017111

31. Shearn K, Allmark P, Piercy H, et al. Building Realist Program Theory for Large Complex and Messy Interventions. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 2017;16(1) doi: 10.1177/1609406917741796

32. Plsek PE, Greenhalgh T. The challenge of complexity in health care. *BMJ* 2001;323(7313):625. doi: 10.1136/bmj.323.7313.625

33. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, et al. Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 2015;350(mar19 6) doi: 10.1136/bmj.h1258

34. Luck K. A proposed program theory for a smoke-free hospital property. *Soc Theory Health* 2017;15(3):323-45. doi: 10.1057/s41285-017-0031-8

35. Manzano A. The craft of interviewing in realist evaluation. *Evaluation* 2016;22(3):342-60. doi: 10.1177/1356389016638615

36. Grol R, Wensing M, Eccles M, et al. Improving patient care: the implementation of change in health care 2013.

37. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, et al. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implementation science : IS* 2009;4(1):50. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-4-50

Authors 'contribution: AM, DH, EG, YZ, SR jointly conceived the study; AM and DH developed the study proposal; AM led the writing of this paper; DH, EG, YZ and SR read and reviewed the final version prior to submission.

Funding statement: This work is supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council Partnership Centre for Health System Sustainability (ID: 9100002). In addition the Western Australian Department of Health provides financial support for the Research Translation Projects program.

Competing interests: None declared.

Patient consent: Not required.

Ethics approval: Curtin University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) has approved this study. Approval number: HRE2020-0464

Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; peer reviewed for ethical and funding approval prior to submission.

PPI statement: Patients and the Public were not involved in the design of this protocol. However public participation does occur in the research translation projects program and will also be involved in conducting the research outlined in this protocol paper.

Word count: 3,874 words.

BMJ Open

Realist evaluation of the impact of the research translation process on health system sustainability: a study protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-045172.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	04-Jun-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Mosedale, Abby; Curtin University, School of Public Health Hendrie, Delia; Curtin University, School of Public Health Geelhoed, Elizabeth; Telethon Kids Institute Zurynski, Yvonne; Macquarie University, Australian Institute of Health Innovation Robinson, Suzanne; Curtin University, Health Policy Management
Primary Subject Heading:	Health services research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice, Health policy
Keywords:	Organisation of health services < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

TITLE

Realist evaluation of the impact of the research translation process on health system sustainability: a study protocol

Corresponding author: *Ms Abby Mosedale*. School of Public Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia.

Email: abby.mosedale@curtin.edu.au

Address: Kent Street, Bentley, Perth

Western Australia, 6102

Tel: +61 8 9266 9266 Fax: +61 8 9266 2255

Co-authors:

Dr Delia Hendrie.

School of Public Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia.

Professor Elizabeth Geelhoed.

Telethon Kids Institute, Perth, Australia

Associate Professor Yvonne Zurynski

Australian Institute of Health Innovation, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

NHMRC Partnership Centre for Health System Sustainability, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia

Professor Suzanne Robinson.

School of Public Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia.

Funding statement: This work is supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council Partnership Centre for Health System Sustainability (ID: 9100002). In addition the Western Australian Department of Health provides financial support for the Research Translation Projects program.

Word count: 4158 words

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

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Sustainability at a system level relates to the capacity of the system to be able to service the ongoing health needs of the population. It is a multifaceted concept encompassing both the affordability and efficiency of a system and the system’s ability to adapt and change.

To address issues that currently threaten health system sustainability, health care leaders, policy makers, clinicians and researchers are searching for solutions to ensure the delivery of safe, value-based care into the future. The timely translation of research evidence into sustainable interventions that can be adopted into the health system is one way of bolstering the sustainability of the system as a whole. We present a protocol for the realist evaluation of a research translation funding program to understand how the research translation process contributes to health system sustainability and value-based health care.

Methods and analysis:

Underpinned by the realist evaluation framework, we will: (1) develop the Initial Program Theory (IPT) of the research translation process; (2) test the program theory through case study analysis; and (3) refine and consolidate the theory through stakeholder consultation. The evaluation uses a case example of a research translation program, chosen for its representation of a microcosm of the broader health system and the heterogeneity of service improvement activities taking place within it. Across the three phases, analysis of data from documents about the research translation program and interviews and focus groups with stakeholders and program users will draw on the context (C), mechanism (M), outcome (O) formula that is core to realist evaluation. In addition, system dynamic methods will capture the feedback loops and complex relationships amongst the IPT and CMO configurations. This approach to evaluation of a research translation funding program may be adapted to similar programs operating in other settings.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- This is the first study to evaluate the impact of the research translation process on health system sustainability.
- Adopting a realist methodology will allow contextual factors and mechanisms to be identified that influence how the research translation process can contribute to health system sustainability.

- 1 • A novel feature of this study is the application of system dynamics modelling within the
- 2 realist evaluation framework, capturing the complexity and feedback relationships between
- 3 context, mechanism and outcome.
- 4 • Using a Delphi method to establish consensus on implementation and evaluation
- 5 recommendations for a research translation program will facilitate perspectives to be gained
- 6 from a broad group of stakeholders.
- 7 • Evaluation of one research translation program as a case example may affect generalisability
- 8 of study findings to the research translation process more generally.

9 INTRODUCTION

10 Health systems around the world are facing challenges relating to rising healthcare expenditure and
 11 the effectiveness and efficiency of the system to deliver high value¹, safe healthcare. A number of
 12 complex interdependent factors contribute to these challenges. An aging population, rising chronic
 13 disease, public expectations, and a lack of value-consciousness amongst healthcare consumers and
 14 providers are the major factors driving growing demand for healthcare ^{2,3}. These issues are occurring
 15 in an environment that is resistant to change, often driven by behaviours associated with vested
 16 interests, and incentives that do not promote value or transparency ⁴. These challenges, pressures
 17 and behaviours raise questions about capacity of the system to deliver affordable, cost-effective
 18 outcomes to the population over time, which is often referred to as the sustainability of the system
 19 ⁵. Research translation, is an essential process for ensuring health systems have ongoing capacity to
 20 service the health needs of a population and address challenges through the integration of cost-
 21 effective interventions based on new research and technology. While there is a wide range of
 22 definitions in the literature in relation to research translation and other associated terminology such
 23 as knowledge translation, and research utilisation⁶, a working definition of research translation for
 24 the purposes of this study has been adopted from Grimshaw and colleagues, as "ensuring that
 25 stakeholders are aware of and use research evidence to inform their health and healthcare decision
 26 making"⁷.

27 Western Australia (WA) is typical of other jurisdictions in Australia facing challenges that threaten
 28 the long-term sustainability of its health system. The demand for health services has grown
 29 substantially in recent years, along with health expenditure, yet outcomes in population health and
 30 acute care in WA have not improved at the same rate ⁴. With major health issues such as increasing
 31 obesity, an aging population, chronic disease, mental health and inequalities in health outcomes
 32 across the WA population, the sustainability of the WA health system is a growing concern for
 33 healthcare leaders and policy makers. The WA Department of Health, along with healthcare leaders,

1
2
3 1 policy makers, clinicians and researchers around the globe, acknowledge the potential of research
4
5 2 evidence to improve health outcomes and optimise resource use ^{4,8,9}. In 2007 the former State
6
7 3 Health Research Advisory Council within the WA Department of Health, introduced the Research
8
9 4 Translation Projects (RTP) program ¹⁰. The RTP program aims to cultivate and translate evidence for
10
11 5 a sustainable health system through the support of health service driven, high-quality research
12
13 6 projects that have the potential to deliver improved cost effectiveness and/or efficiencies to the
14
15 7 health system while maintaining or improving patient outcomes. Internal evaluations of the RTP
16
17 8 program have focused primarily on research outputs such as the number of publications, changes to
18
19 9 practice guidelines and additional research funding obtained. Whilst assessment of research outputs
20
21 10 is important, the RTP program’s contribution to health system sustainability is not well understood.
22
23 11 Therefore, the protocol presented here aims to outline the theories and methods to explain how the
24
25 12 RTP program supports research translation that in turn contributes to health system sustainability.
26
27 13 We provide a rationale for adopting a realist evaluation framework to underpin the evaluation of the
28
29 14 RTP program with the aim of contributing to a more generalizable understanding of the relationships
30
31 15 between the process of research translation and its contribution to health system sustainability.
32
33 16

31 17 **BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE**

33
34 18 Sustainability from a health systems perspective relates to the capacity of the system to be able to
35
36 19 service the health needs of the population into the future⁵. It is a multifaceted concept that
37
38 20 encompasses both the affordability and efficiency of a system, and the system’s ability to adapt and
39
40 21 change ³. Adopting a system thinking approach gives us a framework for understanding the health
41
42 22 system as entities, made up of sub-systems such as interventions, programs, organisations,
43
44 23 stakeholders and agencies (e.g. the emergency departments, quality improvement programs, safety
45
46 24 policies, the workforce, managers and decision-makers and consumers). In this protocol “health
47
48 25 system” means the broader entity as described above. This is an important assertion to make
49
50 26 considering the wide-ranging use of the term ‘health system sustainability’ used in the literature.
51
52 27 For example, the term health system sustainability is often used in literature in relation to the
53
54 28 discrete sub-systems described above (e.g. intervention, organisation and agencies). The
55
56 29 sustainability of the broader health system, which is the focus here, is not well understood and the
57
58 30 question of how does action in the form of multiple research translation activities and projects
59
60 31 impact on the sustainability of the wider health system remains unanswered. To address issues that
32
33 32 currently threaten health system sustainability, healthcare leaders, policy makers, clinicians and
34
35 33 researchers are searching for solutions that capitalise on new research and technologies that

1 promise to deliver safer, value-based care. Such solutions often involve implementing and testing
2 new evidence-based interventions and improvement programs into the health system, and
3 evaluating their effectiveness, often through pragmatic trials ^{11,12}.

4 Increasingly, evaluations also include a focus on the sustainability of the interventions, involving
5 recognition of implementation outcomes such as acceptability, adoption into policy or practice,
6 appropriateness, reach and sustainability to support the spread and adaptation of successful
7 interventions beyond the original setting and context ¹¹.

8 As a result, there are a growing number of theories, models and frameworks of sustainability that
9 address individual programs and interventions ^{11,13,14}. These theories, models and frameworks
10 provide valuable guidance and insights into the facilitators and barriers that contribute to
11 intervention sustainability ¹⁵. In addition, they provide guidance around funding of interventions that
12 are more likely to continue providing desirable benefits beyond the implementation period usually
13 covered by project funding, as well as guidance for planning and evaluation ^{13,14,16-18}. The
14 contribution of health improvement interventions to sustainability at the broader system level has
15 received limited attention. This limitation is evident in the measurement of sustainability presented
16 in the literature, which is often presented in terms of continuity of program activities and outcomes,
17 institutionalisation, adaptation of the intervention components, and sustained attention to the issue
18 or problem ^{16,17,19,20}.

19 While sustainability of effective programs and interventions at the end of the research translation
20 pipeline is valuable, not all interventions need to be sustained in order to be useful or to make a
21 contribution to the larger system goals in which they operate¹⁷. The process and strategies adopted
22 to facilitate research translation offers several other potential benefits to health system sustainability
23 such as workforce collaboration and capacity building, along with the impact that comes from
24 successful implementation^{17,21}.

25 The understanding of research translation as a process within the broader health system, and its
26 contribution to system sustainability needs further exploration. In view of health systems as complex
27 adaptive systems ^{14,22} the dynamic interaction between and within the system and subsystems
28 means that events at one level of the system influence action and events at another, often in a
29 feedback loop relationship ²³. It follows that, our interest is not solely with individual interventions
30 but rather with the interconnections, interdependencies and feedback loops across a large complex
31 system. Whilst research regarding the key factors that influence the sustainability of interventions is
32 important, the next stage is to move beyond the intervention itself, and investigate how the process
33 of research translation can trigger change within the wider health system ^{14,24,25}. This requires a shift

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

1 away from linear cause and effect evaluation design to methods that are capable of dealing with
2 complexity²⁶. The process of research translation can be understood as a disruption to the system
3 which is likely to trigger emergent, adaptive behaviours and nonlinear, feedback interactions across
4 the system which will either reinforce or diminish overall system sustainability²⁶. Therefore, to
5 understand sustainability at the health system level, researchers need to shift their focus from *what*
6 has been achieved, to *how* the process generates change in the system²⁷ to Identify system traps
7 and opportunities that produce system behaviour. The concept of *how* and *why* change occurs
8 within a system is core to the theory driven evaluation design, realist evaluation²⁷⁻³⁰.

9 **Realist evaluation**

10 Realist evaluation is a theory driven evaluation approach grounded in realism, a philosophy which
11 asserts that both the material and social worlds are real^{28,30}. It follows that the reality of the social
12 and material world should be investigated to build a better understanding of what causes change
13 within such systems. Realist evaluation shifts the basic inquiry of evaluation from “does this work?”,
14 to “what works, in what context and how?”²⁸. The realist evaluation approach can be said to be in
15 contrast to traditional linear cause and effect approaches where complexity is controlled for or
16 eliminated³¹. Instead, realist evaluation embraces complexity by acknowledging that context can
17 influence the way an intervention achieves its outcomes through different change mechanisms that
18 are triggered by context. Therefore, the realist approach aims to link intervention to outcome by
19 identifying the various change mechanisms taking place in reality²⁸. Within the realist evaluation
20 framework, interventions are ‘theories incarnate’ embedded in a social reality that makes them
21 prone to interpretation and modification^{32,33}. Often these theories are not explicit and exist in the
22 minds of those who designed a particular intervention²⁸. It is therefore a central task of realist
23 evaluation to make the theories explicit in the form of a program theory.

24 Program theories, in their simplest form, depict how a specific intervention is theorized to achieve
25 change³⁴. The realist evaluation frameworks seek to develop program theories as Context-
26 Mechanism-Outcome (CMO) configurations that explain how interventions trigger different change
27 mechanisms across different contexts to achieve (or not achieve) outcomes. The theory is then
28 tested and refined through data collection and analysis that assesses patterns and regularities not
29 only in the program outputs but also the program context, the process of implementation, and the
30 mechanisms that may be creating change^{28,29}. The outputs from the realist approach lead to a well-
31 articulated program theory as well as a more generalizable theory, often termed a middle range
32 theory, falling between program and grand theory that can be applied across different settings³⁴. In
33 the context of health system sustainability, the interest is in the process by which interventions

trigger the change process across all levels of the system, from micro intervention level through to the macro policy level of the system. Many parallels can be drawn between the principles underlying realist evaluation and that of systems theory and complexity theory. When adding a system dynamics lens to the evaluation, it becomes clear that the CMO configurations that are central to realist evaluation involve complex, non-linear interactions often in the form of feedback loops. Within complex adaptive systems, the context, mechanism and outcomes are interconnected and, as such, the triggering of one mechanism can impact on the context of another³⁵. Realist evaluation is said to be 'methods neutral' and thus provides a perspective and conceptual framework for evaluation rather than strict practical guidelines.²⁷ This study therefore aims to apply the realist evaluation framework, drawing on system dynamics methods and principles, to explain how research interventions, funded to deliver service improvement and value-based health care, impact on sustainability across all levels of a complex adaptive system.

STUDY AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Aim:

Produce a program theory to explain how the research translation process contributes to health system sustainability through the implementation of interventions funded to deliver service improvement and value-based health care.

Objectives:

1. Identify the change mechanisms triggered by the implementation of research translation interventions that contribute to health system sustainability
2. Conduct case study analysis to explore the interconnected and feedback relationships between change mechanisms identified from objective 1, and
3. Refine the initial program theory of the impact of the research translation process on health system sustainability based on outcomes from objectives 1 and 2, through validation with key stakeholders to inform a generalizable theory of mechanisms that influence sustainability at a health system level.

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

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

A realist evaluation approach is applied to this study³⁰. The study draws on a number of theoretical frameworks including complexity science, complex adaptive systems theory and implementation science²⁶. It adopts a realist evaluation methodology to examine the pathways by which the RTP program as a research translation process contributes to health system sustainability. Realist evaluation is increasingly used in health services research to evaluate complex health system interventions^{31,36}. This approach has been chosen for its ability to cope with complexity and its focus on understanding how and why complex health interventions trigger change within complex systems. The RAMESES II reporting standards for realist evaluation will be used to structure the reporting of the study methods and analysis³¹. To enhance the trustworthiness of data collection and documentation throughout the project, we will follow Pawson, et al.³⁷ Transparency, Accuracy, Purposivity, Utility, Propriety, Accessibility (TAPUPAS) quality standards framework³⁸. Patients and the public were not involved in the design of this study. However public participation does occur in the research translation projects program and will also be involved in conducting the research outlined in this protocol paper.

This study will be implemented in three phases, summarised in Table 1

1. Initial program theory development and evidence review: Development and refinement of an initial program theory for the research translation process and the impact on health system sustainability using peer reviewed literature, key informant interviews and program documentation.
2. Program theory testing: Test the initial program theory by applying it to selected case studies of interventions funded under the RTP program using document analysis, key stakeholder interviews and concept mapping workshops with key stakeholders.
3. Theory consolidation: Refine and validate the initial program theory based on the study findings and, peer-reviewed literature where relevant and focus group discussions with relevant stakeholders including program managers, existing and past investigators of funded projects, and members of the RTP selection panel.

Table 1: The three phased approach to realist evaluation of research translation in Western Australia

Phase	Data Sources	Analysis
Phase 1: Initial program theory development and evidence review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholder interviews • Program documentation • Peer reviewed literature 	Qualitative-thematic analysis driven by the realist evaluation and system dynamics principles.
Phase 2: Program theory testing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews • Document review and analysis of individual RTP reports and other key documents • Secondary data analysis of project data such as cost and outcome data (where necessary) 	Iterative process of categorising and connecting strategies, similar to those proposed by Maxwell ³⁹ will be applied to CMO development in light of the information collected during phase 2.
Phase 3: Theory consolidation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key stakeholders' interviews and workshops • Peer reviewed literature • Delphi Survey 	<p>Refine theory that explains how and under which contextual factors that research translation brings about health system sustainability.</p> <p>Delphi survey analysis for consensus relating to recommendation for ongoing research translation practices in the Western Australian Health system.</p>

The Research Translation Projects (RTP) Program

The RTP program, established in 2007 by the WA Department of Health, provides funding for short-term research projects that seek to improve healthcare practice and/or policy in the WA health system. Its aim is to improve or maintain patient outcomes through implementation of research translation projects that have the potential to deliver efficiencies to the WA health system. In an environment of rising healthcare burden and limited resources, the RTP program supports innovation with a focus on high-value care¹ and needs-led research, funding work that might otherwise not have been funded and also providing a focus on issues of importance as identified from the bottom up. Similar programs such as the US Department of Veteran Affairs' Diffusion of Excellence program has demonstrated positive results for implementation of evidence based practice using a bottom up approach, such as diffusion and sustainability of interventions⁴⁰. In addition to the benefits of bottom up research, it had been recognised within the WA health system

1
2
3 1 that clinicians were generally uncompetitive for nationally funded grant programs due to lack of
4
5 2 research training and research track-record. However, they were ideally placed to identify possible
6
7 3 opportunities to implement new practices that promote efficiency while maintaining or improving
8
9 4 patient outcomes. The RTP program was therefore implemented to provide an opportunity to
10
11 5 deliver bottom up innovation and to build research capacity within the clinical environment through
12
13 6 enablement and collaboration with those who have experience in research.

14
15 7 The program is innovative in terms of the requirement for inclusion of health resource appraisal,
16
17 8 with a funding criterion that the proposed intervention would reduce or maintain costs to improve
18
19 9 health outcomes (or reduce costs and maintain health outcomes). The combination of bottom up
20
21 10 clinician led research translation, based on front line need and a key focus on health system
22
23 11 efficiency, encourages clinicians from the WA health system to undertake research that has the
24
25 12 potential to improve the quality and efficiency of their work. Through research translation into
26
27 13 practice, innovation based on frontline need, development of research capacity within the clinical
28
29 14 environment, collaboration amongst research and clinical workforce and the promotion of value-
30
31 15 consciousness amongst clinicians, the RTP program also aims to contribute to the sustainability of
32
33 16 the WA health system. Research translation projects sit along the research translation continuum
34
35 17 and are made up of new research, pilot-studies or applications and evaluations of research that has
36
37 18 been applied elsewhere.

38
39 19 Given the spread of projects funded by the RTP program, across multiple settings and addressing a
40
41 20 variety of health and health service delivery issues, the program can be viewed as a microcosm of
42
43 21 the broader health system, given a shared focus on making health services more effective and
44
45 22 efficient. The RTP program therefore provides a unique opportunity to study how the process of
46
47 23 research translation through clinician led research can trigger change mechanisms to produce
48
49 24 effects that may contribute to sustainability across the WA health system.

45
46 25 **Phase 1: Initial program theory development and evidence review**

47
48 26 A program theory describes how the intervention is expected to bring about changes. The initial
49
50 27 program theory is essential to the realist evaluation logic of inquiry ³⁰. Developing a program theory
51
52 28 shifts the understanding of how an intervention is expected to work from the implicit ideas that
53
54 29 often exist in the heads of policy makers, decision makers, clinicians and researchers, to the explicit.
55
56 30 According to Luck (2017), a program theory consists of both a theory of action and a theory of
57
58 31 change. Program theories in terms of the theory of action and expected outcomes can often be
59
60 32 identified in policy or program documents. However in the context of a realist evaluation further
33 33 information about the theory of change, that is the mechanism by which the action will achieve the

outcomes, is not so obvious and requires the researcher to conduct focused interviews with key stakeholders to elicit the theory of change ⁴¹.

Data sources: The development of the program theory will be informed by three main sources: Input from the key stakeholders of the RTP program, analysis of documentation and the literature ⁴². Program stakeholders such as program managers, existing and past investigators of funded projects, and members of the RTP selection panel (clinicians, health administrators, consumer representatives, health economists) will be interviewed to elicit the hypothesised change mechanisms that explain how the research translation process is thought to influence health system sustainability. In addition, program documents, including RTP research applications, progress reports and final reports of funded projects as well as past evaluations of the program will be accessed. While the initial program theory will be informed and supported by stakeholder interviews, exploration of the literature through a theory driven review is necessary to make sense of the emerging theories elicited from interviews (i.e. hypotheses, hunches, aspirations, intuitions, experiences) ,inherent to complex interventions applied in heterogeneous contexts ⁴³.

The literature review will follow the steps of realist synthesis review outlined by Pawson, et al. ⁴⁴ and Jagosh ⁴⁵ to identify published theories of change within the context of the research translation process (e.g. theories focusing on change within the individual professionals, within the organisation, the social setting or economic context) ⁴⁶.

Data analysis: The CMO framework will underpin an iterative process of reflection and adaptation, which will take place to analyse data and identify relations between contexts, mechanisms of change and outcomes for analysis of stakeholder interviews and literature review. The emergent behaviour of complex adaptive systems such as the health system would suggest that feedback loops would exist between CMO; therefore, the IPT will be depicted using a causal loop diagram (CLD) to capture any feedback interactions between CMOs. While logic models are commonly used to depict a program theory, the complexity of both the intervention and the system in which it is being implemented lends itself to system dynamics methods to depict the program theory.

Phase 2: Program theory testing and validation

We will test the program theory of the research translation process developed in phase one by analysing in detail a series of RTP program case studies. Realist evaluation aims to test program theories for the purpose of refining them as well as informing implementation of the program. As such the core questions asked of the program are; what works (and does not work) for whom, in

1
2
3 1 what circumstances and how? Mechanisms that produce positive outcomes in one context may not
4
5 2 produce the same outcomes in an alternative context. This notion that the success (or failure) of an
6
7 3 intervention is context dependent is one shared in the current literature that explores
8
9 4 implementation science and complex interventions (Braithwaite, Churruarua, Long, Ellis, & Herkes,
10
11 5 2018). Anderson and Hardwick (2016) outline this concept succinctly:
12
13 6 “Recognising that no one policy, programme or intervention will always work, all the time, for
14
15 7 everyone, realist approaches seek to explain this pattern of outcomes through building programme
16
17 8 theories about how an intervention (policy or programme) is meant to work (often according to
18
19 9 programme architects, or policymakers, or participants), and then ‘test’ whether and how this
20
21 10 programme theory plays out in the real world using empirical data.” (Anderson & Hardwick, 2016, p.
22
23 11 325). The question that is at the core of the application of realist evaluation proposed here is what
24
25 12 happens to the individual projects funded by RTP and are there common system pitfalls or
26
27 13 opportunities that lead to their success or failure in terms of research translation.

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 14 Selection criteria: Given the variety of implemented research projects funded by the RTP
45
46 15 program, a descriptive analysis of past RTP projects will be undertaken prior to a case study selection
47
48 16 to enable a selection of cases that captures the variety of activity undertaken within the RTP
49
50 17 program. Projects will be classified based on characteristics such as context of implementation (e.g.
51
52 18 metro hospital, rural hospital, primary care, community health) and type of research translation
53
54 19 intervention (e.g. new practice guideline, new service, new test, role substitution) ¹¹. In the first
55
56 20 instance, case study selection will be purposive in nature by categorising projects into a matrix of the
57
58 21 above criteria to ensure a breadth of projects across those criteria is captured. However, given the
59
60 22 retrospective nature of this study, case study selection may be limited by access to project
investigators and other stakeholders for interview.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 24 Data sources: Case study analysis will be undertaken using three data collection techniques:
45
46 25 key informant interviews, document review and analysis of individual RTP reports and other key
47
48 26 documents, and secondary data analysis of project data such as cost and outcome data where
49
50 27 necessary.

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
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
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
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
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
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
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
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
498
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
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

51 28 Data analysis: Qualitative data, including documentation, interviews and focus groups, will
52
53 29 be analysed in NVivo using the CMO configuration as a guide for analysis. Several authors highlight
54
55 30 the absence of guidance within the realist evaluation approach as to specific analytic tools to be
56
57 31 used ⁴⁷⁻⁵⁰. The qualitative data from the case studies will undergo an iterative process of thematic
58
59 32 analysis by which preliminary codes will be developed for themes identified in the IPT and more
60
61 33 specific codes and themes being induced from further cycles of thematic analysis. This will also

1 involve a process of mapping codes against the CLD developed in phase 1. The IPT will then be
2 refined to best reflect the emerging findings. The aim of this phase in the realist approach is to
3 identify emerging patterns across the case studies to validate and refine the initial program theory
4 to be consolidated in phase three. In addition, the interactions and relationships between change
5 mechanisms will be refined.

6 **Phase 3: Theory consolidation**

7 The final phase of research will involve refining the initial program theory to produce a final iteration
8 of the research translation process to be presented in the form of a mid-range program theory of its
9 impact on sustainability of the system. The final model will articulate a model of complex
10 relationships among program and health service unit, organisation and policy level processes of
11 research translation for sustainability of the health system. Like the process undertaken in phase
12 one, the theory consolidation will be informed through the input of key stakeholders of the RTP
13 program and a rapid review of the literature to update the initial realist review to include
14 relationships and interconnections between change mechanisms. Input from key stakeholders will
15 be elicited through concept mapping workshops and interviews where the theory will be presented
16 to key stakeholders for validation.

17 Implementation and evaluation recommendations for research translation programs: In
18 addition to the refined research translation theory, a Delphi Survey of experts will be undertaken to
19 determine implementation and evaluation recommendations for research translation within the WA
20 health system into the future. The survey will be conducted across several rounds via online
21 questionnaire, which will be delivered until consensus is reached. The Delphi panel will consist of
22 those involved in delivering the RTP program at the WA Department of Health, investigators
23 involved in individual projects and other stakeholders^{51,52}. These recommendations will include an
24 evaluation framework specifically for the RTP program to be addressed by future funding recipients
25 and selection panels.

27 **Ethics and Dissemination:** Curtin University Human Research Ethics Committee, Western Australia,
28 approves this study (approval number: HRE2020-0464). Results will be published in scientific
29 journals, and communicated to respondents and relevant partners.

1
2
3 1 REFERENCES
4
5

6 2 1. Elshaug AGP, Rosenthal MBP, Lavis JNP, et al. Levers for addressing medical underuse and
7 3 overuse: achieving high-value health care. *Lancet* 2017;390(10090):191-202. doi:
8 4 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)32586-7
9 5 2. Braithwaite J, Zurynski Y, Ludlow K, et al. Towards sustainable healthcare system performance in
10 6 the 21st century in high-income countries: a protocol for a systematic review of the grey
11 7 literature. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(1) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025892
12 8 3. Crisp N. What would a sustainable health and care system look like? *BMJ* 2017;358 doi:
13 9 10.1136/bmj.j3895
14 10 4. Sustainable Health Review. Sustainable Health Review: Final Report to the Western Australian
15 11 Government. Western Australia.: Department of Health, 2019.
16 12 5. Braithwaite J, Testa L, Lamprell G, et al. Built to last? The sustainability of health system
17 13 improvements, interventions and change strategies: a study protocol for a systematic
18 14 review. *BMJ open* 2017;7(11):e018568-e68. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018568
19 15 6. Tricco AC, Ashoor HM, Cardoso R, et al. Sustainability of knowledge translation interventions in
20 16 healthcare decision-making: a scoping review. *Implement Sci* 2016;11(1):55-55. doi:
21 17 10.1186/s13012-016-0421-7
22 18 7. Grimshaw JM, Eccles MP, Lavis JN, et al. Knowledge translation of research findings. *Implement Sci*
23 19 2012;7(1):50-50. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-7-50
24 20 8. Cruz Rivera S, Kyte DG, Aiyegbusi OL, et al. Assessing the impact of healthcare research: A
25 21 systematic review of methodological frameworks. *PLOS Medicine* 2017;14(8):e1002370. doi:
26 22 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002370
27 23 9. Wensing M, Grol R. Knowledge translation in health: how implementation science could
28 24 contribute more. *BMC medicine* 2019;17(1):88. doi: 10.1186/s12916-019-1322-9
29 25 10. Government of Western Australia; Department of Health. Research Translation Projects 2019
30 26 [Available from: https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/N_R/Research-Translation-Projects.
31 27 11. Tricco AC, Ashoor HM, Cardoso R, et al. Sustainability of knowledge translation interventions in
32 28 healthcare decision-making: a scoping review. *Implementation science : IS* 2016;11(55):55-
33 29 55. doi: 10.1186/s13012-016-0421-7
34 30 12. Patsopoulos NA. A pragmatic view on pragmatic trials. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci* 2011;13(2):217-
35 31 24.
36 32 13. Stirman S, Kimberly J, Cook N, et al. The sustainability of new programs and innovations: a review
37 33 of the empirical literature and recommendations for future research. *Implement Sci*
38 34 2012;7(1) doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-7-17
39 35 14. Gruen RL, Elliott JH, Nolan ML, et al. Sustainability science: an integrated approach for health-
40 36 programme planning. *The Lancet* 2008;372(9649):1579-89. doi: 10.1016/S0140-
41 37 6736(08)61659-1
42 38 15. Scheirer MA. Is Sustainability Possible? A Review and Commentary on Empirical Studies of
43 39 Program Sustainability. *The American journal of evaluation* 2005;26(3):320-47. doi:
44 40 10.1177/1098214005278752
45 41 16. Shelton RC, Cooper BR, Stirman SW. The Sustainability of Evidence-Based Interventions and
46 42 Practices in Public Health and Health Care. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2018;39(1):55-76. doi:
47 43 10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040617-014731
48 44 17. Whelan J, Love P, Pettman T, et al. Cochrane Update: Predicting sustainability of intervention
49 45 effects in public health evidence: identifying key elements to provide guidance. *Journal of*
50 46 *Public Health* 2014;36(2):347-51. doi: 10.1093/pubmed/fdu027
51 47 18. Braithwaite J, Ludlow K, Testa L, et al. Built to last? The sustainability of healthcare system
52 48 improvements, programmes and interventions: a systematic integrative review. *BMJ open*
53 49 2020;10(6):e036453. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-036453
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

19. Lennox L, Maher L, Reed J. Navigating the sustainability landscape: a systematic review of sustainability approaches in healthcare. *Implement Sci* 2018;13(1) doi: 10.1186/s13012-017-0707-4
20. Flynn R, Scott SD. Understanding Determinants of Sustainability Through a Realist Investigation of a Large-Scale Quality Improvement Initiative (Lean): A Refined Program Theory. *Journal of nursing scholarship : an official publication of Sigma Theta Tau International Honor Society of Nursing* 2019 doi: 10.1111/jnu.12527
21. Chambers DA, Glasgow RE, Stange KC. The dynamic sustainability framework: addressing the paradox of sustainment amid ongoing change. *Implementation science : IS* 2013;8(1):117-17. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-8-117
22. Hawe P, Shiell A, Riley T. Theorising Interventions as Events in Systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 2009;43(3-4):267-76. doi: 10.1007/s10464-009-9229-9
23. Innovative Care for Chronic Conditions : Building Blocks for Action. Geneva: Geneva : World Health Organization 2002.
24. Hedelin B. Complexity is no excuse. *Sustainability Science* 2019;14(3):733-49. doi: 10.1007/s11625-018-0635-5
25. Greenhalgh T, Macfarlane F, Barton-Sweeney C, et al. "If We Build It, Will It Stay?" A Case Study of the Sustainability of Whole-System Change in London. *Milbank Quarterly* 2012;90(3):516-47. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0009.2012.00673.x
26. Braithwaite J, Churrua K, Long JC, et al. When complexity science meets implementation science: a theoretical and empirical analysis of systems change. *BMC medicine* 2018;16(1):63. doi: 10.1186/s12916-018-1057-z
27. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, et al. Realist methods in medical education research: what are they and what can they contribute? *Medical Education* 2012;46(1):89-96. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04045.x
28. Pawson R. The science of evaluation : a realist manifesto / Ray Pawson. London: London : SAGE 2013.
29. Greenhalgh T, Wong G, Jagosh J, et al. Protocol—the RAMESES II study: developing guidance and reporting standards for realist evaluation. *BMJ Open* 2015;5(8) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008567
30. Pawson R. Realistic evaluation / Ray Pawson and Nick Tilley. London: London : SAGE 1997.
31. Geoff W, Gill W, Joanne G, et al. Quality and reporting standards, resources, training materials and information for realist evaluation: the RAMESES II project. *Health Services and Delivery Research* 2017;5(28) doi: 10.3310/hsdr05280
32. Rycroft-Malone J, Burton C, Wilkinson J, et al. Collective action for knowledge mobilisation: a realist evaluation of the Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care. *Health Services and Delivery Research* 2015;3(44) doi: 10.3310/hsdr03440
33. Nurjono M, Shrestha P, Lee A, et al. Realist evaluation of a complex integrated care programme: protocol for a mixed methods study. *BMJ Open* 2018;8(3) doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017111
34. Shearn K, Allmark P, Piercy H, et al. Building Realist Program Theory for Large Complex and Messy Interventions. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 2017;16(1) doi: 10.1177/1609406917741796
35. Plsek PE, Greenhalgh T. The challenge of complexity in health care. *BMJ* 2001;323(7313):625. doi: 10.1136/bmj.323.7313.625
36. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, et al. Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 2015;350(mar19 6) doi: 10.1136/bmj.h1258
37. Pawson R, Boaz A, Grayson L, et al. Types and quality of social care knowledge. Stage two: Towards the quality assessment of social care knowledge. *ESRC UK Center for Evidence Based Policy and Practice: Working Paper* 2003;18:1-31.

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

38. Flynn R, Rotter T, Hartfield D, et al. A realist evaluation to identify contexts and mechanisms that enabled and hindered implementation and had an effect on sustainability of a lean intervention in pediatric healthcare. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2019;19(1):912-12. doi: 10.1186/s12913-019-4744-3

39. Maxwell JA. A realist approach for qualitative research: Sage 2012.

40. Nevedal AL, Reardon CM, Jackson GL, et al. Implementation and sustainment of diverse practices in a large integrated health system: a mixed methods study. *Implementation Science Communications* 2020;1(1):61-61. doi: 10.1186/s43058-020-00053-1

41. Luck K. A proposed program theory for a smoke-free hospital property. *Soc Theory Health* 2017;15(3):323-45. doi: 10.1057/s41285-017-0031-8

42. Manzano A. The craft of interviewing in realist evaluation. *Evaluation* 2016;22(3):342-60. doi: 10.1177/1356389016638615

43. Greenhalgh T, Wong G, Westhorp G, et al. Protocol--realist and meta-narrative evidence synthesis: evolving standards (RAMESES). *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2011;11(1):115-15. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-11-115

44. Pawson R, Greenhalgh T, Harvey G, et al. Realist review – a new method of systematic review designed for complex policy interventions. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2005;10(1_suppl):21-34. doi: 10.1258/1355819054308530

45. Jagosh J. Realist Synthesis for Public Health: Building an Ontologically Deep Understanding of How Programs Work, For Whom, and In Which Contexts. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2019;40(1):361-72. doi: 10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031816-044451

46. Grol R, Wensing M, Eccles M, et al. Improving patient care: the implementation of change in health care 2013.

47. Gilmore B, McAuliffe E, Larkan F, et al. How do community health committees contribute to capacity building for maternal and child health? A realist evaluation protocol. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(11):e011885-e85. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011885

48. Byng R, Norman I, Redfern S. Using Realistic Evaluation to Evaluate a Practice-level Intervention to Improve Primary Healthcare for Patients with Long-term Mental Illness. *Evaluation (London, England 1995)* 2005;11(1):69-93. doi: 10.1177/1356389005053198

49. Marchal B, van Belle S, van Olmen J, et al. Is realist evaluation keeping its promise? A review of published empirical studies in the field of health systems research. *Evaluation (London, England 1995)* 2012;18(2):192-212. doi: 10.1177/1356389012442444

50. Salter KL, Kothari A. Using realist evaluation to open the black box of knowledge translation: a state-of-the-art review. *Implement Sci* 2014;9(1):115-15. doi: 10.1186/s13012-014-0115-y

51. Boulkedid R, Abdoul H, Loustau M, et al. Using and reporting the Delphi method for selecting healthcare quality indicators: a systematic review. *PLoS One* 2011;6(6):e20476-e76. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0020476

52. Hasson F, Keeney S, McKenna H. Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *J Adv Nurs* 2000;32(4):1008-15. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01567.x

Authors 'contribution: AM, DH, EG, YZ, SR jointly conceived the study; AM and DH developed the study proposal; AM led the writing of this paper; DH, EG, YZ and SR read and reviewed the final version prior to submission.

Funding statement: This work is supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council Partnership Centre for Health System Sustainability (ID: 9100002). In addition the Western Australian Department of Health provides financial support for the Research Translation Projects program.

Competing interests: None declared.

Patient consent: Not required.

Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; peer reviewed for ethical and funding approval prior to submission.

PPI statement:

Word count: 3,874 words.