

A scoping systematic review of implementation frameworks to effectively transition interventions into clinical practice in oncology, nuclear medicine and radiology

Gayathri DELANEROLLE^{1,3}, Heitor CAVALINI^{3,4}, Peter PHIRI³, Leslie GELLING²

University of Oxford¹

University of Bournemouth²

Southern Health NHS Foundation Trust³

University of Pernambuco, Postgraduate Program in Rehabilitation and Functional Performance, Petrolina Campus, Brazil⁴

University of Southampton, School of Primary Care, Population Sciences and Medical Education, Faculty of Medicine⁵

Summary

Background: Clinical research studies have made significant strides globally requiring clear processes to transition research interventions into clinical practice. Theoretically, implementation of novel interventions require clear methods as part of a fit-for-purpose (FFP) framework comprising of effective adaptation processes in conjunction with practice policies. Implementation science (IS) based operational research (OR) is vital in global health as it addresses the ‘know-how-do’ gap using a real-world setting to achieve best practices to sustain healthcare. Despite this, limited OR is available to evaluate and validate implementation frameworks for complex clinical specialties such as oncology, diagnostic radiology (DR), nuclear medicine (NM) and interventional radiology (IR). This is the first study to systematically review implementation frameworks including its’ validity and applicability in healthcare.

Method: We searched 17 databases including PubMed, Medline/OvidSP, Science Direct, PROSPERO, PRISMA, PubMed Health, Embase, EBSCOhost, SciELO, TRIP, ProQuest, Academic search complete, Ageline, Cochrane, Web-of-Science and BIOSIS using a comprehensive search strategy and MeSH indexing to review publications from January 1st 1980 to 31st March 2019 in English. We selected 20 publications as per the inclusion/exclusion criteria developed under a review protocol registered with PROSPERO (CRDG42019124020).

Findings: There were no publications indicating a validated framework or a specific system used to implement evidence based interventions (EBIs) within oncology, IR, NM and DR although there were generalized implementation processes, adaptation models and policies. Furthermore, validation studies were not conducted against these frameworks to review their applicability and viability in healthcare especially in the UK.

Interpretation: It is evident there is a research implementation gap in healthcare and further research is required to establish a fit for purpose framework to cover multiple ‘blind spots’ using a real-world (RW) setting. Current evidence also suggests, alignment of academic theories to healthcare including its applicability to various clinical specialties is needed.

Introduction

Clinical research is considered as a cross-disciplinary specialty in modern day medicine that merges science and clinical arenas to develop treatments, methodologies and medical technologies to better public health (CRUK 2018; Garralda *et al.* 2019). The rapidly changing clinical research landscape has led to an array of clinical treatments that are moving towards a precision medicine platform (Choi *et al.* 2018, Garralda *et al.* 2019) giving rise to complex interventions (CI), especially in oncology, nuclear medicine (NM), diagnostic radiology (DR) and interventional radiology (IR). CIs vary across clinical specialties thus, a detailed summary of those relevant to this study has been listed in table 1.

According to the world health organisation (WHO), the cancer incidence rates will continue to increase globally whilst the cancer registry in the UK reported 303,135 new cancer cases in 2016 (CRUK, 2018). The WHO attributed 9.6 million global deaths to cancer in 2018. Therefore, the importance of delivering high quality oncological care is vital to maintain the ‘covalent bond’ shared between research innovation and the clinical interphase (Garralda *et al.* 2019, Harris *et al.* 2009). Within the last decade, oncological care has become heavily dependent on NM, DR and IR for diagnostic and treatment purposes. Despite these significant strides in precision medicine, there appears to be challenges in translating research outcomes to policy and clinical practice (CRUK, 2018, Franks & Schroeder 2013, Garralda *et al.* 2019). This also includes challenges within workforce training practices (Chambers & Norton 2016, McKleroy *et al.* 2006, Montez *et al.* 2016) which indicate a significant variability in knowledge management and transfer within healthcare as indicated in table 2.

Implementation science (IS) has the ability to address these challenges using an evidence-based practice (EBP) approach (Durlak 2015, Escoffery *et al.* 2019, Mailk *et al.* 2018). Some implementation practices show success through empirical driven concepts instead of published theories (Madon *et al.* 2007). Eccles and colleagues (2005) indicated that this type of research appear to be ‘an expensive version of a trial-and-error method’ (Eccles *et al.* 2005) whilst Davies and colleagues (2003) stipulated that only 10% of studies identified guidelines for implementation strategies with an explicit rationale but provided no evidence to indicate these

were effectively used in any healthcare setting (Davies 2013). However, there is a general acceptance that implementing EBP in different environments attributed to limitations in the theories used (Nilsen 2015). In addition to this, there appears to be poor theoretical underpinning to track the failure of implementation strategies and their precise reasoning, thus, preventing opportunities to better predict and formulate a series of processes as part of a framework that is verified and fit-for-purpose (FFP).

Analysis of the global drug (Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency 2014) and device development landscape indicates that oncology has the highest therapeutic class in terms of clinical innovations and specialization, thereby, directly influencing innovations and practices in NM, IR and DR due to its/ intra-dependency (Clinical trials NHS 2018, European Medicines Agency 2019). Hence, it isn't a surprise that oncology as well as imaging research is considered highly complex (Malik *et al.* 2018, Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency 2014). Study complexity varies depending upon the type of drugs or interventions developed, regulatory requirements, treatment demand, development time, research and developmental costs, patient expiration, globalization and the implementation into clinical practice (International agency for research on cancer 2017, Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency 2014). Furthermore, fast-track approvals of new therapies (EAMS, 2019) have also been discussed in detail in the US (Moore *et al.* 2013, National Cancer Institute 2018) and Europe (EAMS, 2019), thereby supporting the need for FFP implementation procedures to succeed ensuring timely access for patients. Therefore, the responsibility of conducting research and its' adaption into healthcare has become a vigorous exercise on a global scale (Bartholomew *et al.* 2001, Castro *et al.* 2004).

In addition, maintaining pace with the changing research landscape with rising CIs and increase in treatment demand due to an aging population and increases in incidence of cancers (Clinical trials NHS 2018, CRUK 2018, International agency for research on cancer 2017), it has become challenging to promote logarithmic growth in the UK as the current NHS infrastructure is consistent with rate limiting factors involving infrastructure (CRUK 2018). In a bid to support the much needed infrastructure, healthcare organisations consist of a clinical and research service provision especially in the UK with shared resources (Chambers & Norton 2016, CRUK 2018, Escoffery *et al.* 2019). Furthermore, the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) was established as the 'research arm' of the NHS, centrally coordinating research setup and delivery

between industry, academia and NHS organisations. In addition to the NIHR, the Health Research Authority (HRA) supports research study setup by coordinating between industry, academia, the NHS and national ethics committees using a multitude of processes (Clinical trials NHS 2018, Cooke 2005). The responsibility of delivering research care is entirely at an organisation level (Clinical trials NHS 2018) and it is evidence based on the NIHR recruitment matrix, all NHS organisations show a commitment to conducting research which is also supported by the NHS constitution.

Although, the NIHR report increases in research activities, clinicians, researchers and policy makers continue to equally report of challenges to conduct research and translate outcomes to clinical practice in a timely manner (Moore *et al.* 2013, National Cancer Institute 2018). These barriers include time taken to conduct clinical trials, complexities in procedures, funding concerns, delays in publishing results and influencing governing bodies as well as organizational cultural issues (Dilts *et al.* 2009, Franks & Schroeder 2013). Dilts and colleagues (2009) reported process complexities that indicate approximately 300 distinct processes associated with activating a phase III study and an associated median time from conception to activation being approximately 600 days (Dilts *et al.* 2009). Furthermore, trial outcome reporting was explored by Ross and colleagues (2012) indicating the overall publication rate to be 68% whilst Goldacre and colleagues (2018) reported this to be 49.5%, highlighting majority of these are from commercial sponsors. Although the difference in the rates of publications could be attributed to changes in the number of studies explored and difference in time frames, it still indicates research performance by way of reporting outcomes has reduced despite increases in the number of clinical trials being conducted globally (Choi *et al.* 2018). Based on this collective evidence and in comparison to high activity reporting from the NIHR, it is clear that current processes require improvements for effective implementation of interventions into clinical practice. Furthermore, it also evident, better strategies are required to promote transparency into research outcome reporting leading to the construction of better adaptation models as part of an effective framework especially for Cis (McKleroy *et al.* 2006, Moore *et al.* 2013). Also, to promote evidence based practices/interventions (EBP/EBIs), dissemination and implementation processes need to be more synergistic across research feasibility, setup and delivery (Castro *et al.* 2004, Franks & Schroeder 2013, McKleroy *et al.* 2006). There, is also an added complexity in that currently, there is limited research in IS especially in the UK compared to the US for example

(International agency for research on cancer 2017, Krivitsky *et al.* 2012). Therefore, improvement and implementation science based research within complex clinical arenas such as oncology and imaging is nascent. It is also unclear thus far, if general framework theories identified and published is useful and effective within complex specialties as there is lack of evidence to indicate the validity and viability within healthcare systems such as the NHS organisation. In order to address this issue, extensive operational research based studies are required. Thus, the purpose of this systematic review is to use scoping methodologies to identify and summaries the systems and/or frameworks currently available to promote EBP in oncology, IR, NM and DR. The study also aims to review any empirical research and grey literature from an operational performance outcomes perspective and any published cultural paradigms in implementing EBIs in a healthcare setting.

Panel 1: Research in context

Evidence before this study

We performed a thorough search of the scientific literature using Pubmed, PROSPERO, Medline and Cochrane Reviews prior to undertaking this study. The initial review indicated there are challenges around implementation of research interventions within clinical practice due to a variety of challenges. It also indicated implementation science is at its foetal stages within many clinical specialties in the UK. Challenges were reported via empirical and grey literature. There was minimal implementation research available to use within the context of the UK healthcare system that focused on IR, NM, DR and oncology, indicating a potential knowledge gap and a conjugate-bridge between theory, its' practice and validation. With growing healthcare demands, a robust implementation framework is required to deliver quality clinical care safely and minimize research waste. Therefore for the purpose of this study, we have considered the following implementation characteristics to be used as part of the framework;

- *Context specific*
- *Fit for purpose and demand driven*
- *Real world and real time*
- *Focuses on processes and outcomes*

Implications of all the available evidence

The current evidence postulated from this study indicates the need for further research to obtain an implementation framework that would be purposeful to oncology, IR, NM and DR enabling a smoother transition of complex interventions from the research arena to clinical practice. Furthermore, it is also evident, better practice policies to mitigate barriers to implement and uptake of novel interventions is required. In addition to this, further knowledge is required to bridge the ‘*theory and practice*’ gap within implementation science, as currently, most published literature appears to lack validation methods.

Table 1

Complex interventions (CI) within clinical specialties

Specialism	Category	Examples	Development	Implementation method
Oncology	Drug	Immunotherapy-monoclonal antibody based therapy such as Nivolumab, Pembrolizumab, Durvalumab, Atezolizumab and Ipilimumab.	These drugs have a complex pathway to treat the cancer and the infrastructure required also is of a complex nature. These are 2 nd and 3 rd generation oncological treatments, therefore, currently at various phases in the clinical trials pathway.	Adaptation models and general business plans are available within various healthcare systems globally to gain access to these although a FFP implementation framework isn’t available based on published literature.
	Medical device	Single use disposable device-Human papilloma virus (HPV) vaccination	This is developed as a capital equipment as part of preventative strategies to manage and ultimately eradicate HPV induced cervical cancer	Procurement processes available with programme adaptation methods to deliver HPV vaccines to healthcare professionals. However, an implementation framework appears to be unavailable based on the current publications.
		Micro-fluid device	Developed to check for pathogens associated with various cancers to review flow control, non-conventional micro-fabrication strategies and surface treatments. There are studies developing this concept further to evaluate DNA-protein interactions.	Currently there is no evidence available to indicate this will be part of clinical practice although there has been some use of the method in the research intervention arena in USA. Currently in the clinical trial phase.
	Technologies	Mobile applications	Mobile apps developed to support breast cancer patients to better understand the progress they are making following their pre, during and post-	Currently available using various mobile service providers although the patents and IPs in place have limited availability to some parts of the world. Thus,

			treatment scans	there is no evidence to suggest the availability of a FFP implementation framework.
		Augmented reality surgery	Currently being developed for medical trainees as well as continuous professional development of clinical teams. These concepts are also used in the form of software used in scanner to obtain real-time diagnosis and treatment planning especially for trauma patients.	Adaptation models and general business plans are available within various healthcare systems globally to gain access to these although a FFP implementation framework isn't available based on published literature.
		Artificial T-cell stimulating matrix for immunotherapy	Artificial lymph node has been developed as a hydrogel consisting of immuno-stimulatory antigen presenting nanoparticles to encourage T-cell proliferation. This could make T-cell therapies more potent.	Currently these systems are used in clinical practice within pockets of the world such as USA, UK, Australia, France and Germany although implementation frameworks used are not available to review.
Interventional Radiology	Drug	Drug coated targeted therapies. Common choice of drug is Paclitaxel.		Currently these systems are used in clinical practice within pockets of the world such as USA, UK, Australia, France and Germany although implementation frameworks used are not available to review.
	Medical device	LC Beads for liver cancer	Microspheres developed for use in embolization of hypervascular tumours and arteriovenous malformations. Irinotecan-eluting LC Bead-M1 for patients with liver cancer.	Currently there is no evidence available to indicate this will be part of clinical practice although there has been some use of the method in the research intervention arena in USA. Currently in the clinical trial phase.
		Cryotherapy	Treat neoplasms of the breast, cervical and colorectal cancers	Currently there is no evidence available to indicate this will be part of clinical practice. Currently in the clinical trial phase.
		Robotic minimally invasive surgical system		Currently these systems are used in clinical practice within pockets of the world such as USA, UK, Australia, France and Germany although implementation frameworks used are not available to review.
		Radiofrequency thermal treatment: NeoTherma is a non-invasive treatment to target solid tumours	This treatment is delivered in an IR suite using MRI and computational simulation guidance to deliver	Currently there is no evidence available to indicate this will be part of clinical practice although there has been some use of the method in the research

				intervention arena in USA. Currently in the clinical trial phase.
	Technologies	Minimally invasive, image guided surgery for liver cancer using embolization methods	Transarterial embolization to treat liver cancer.	Currently these systems are used in clinical practice within pockets of the world such as USA, UK, Australia, France and Germany although implementation frameworks used are not available to review.
		Ablation-percutaneous tumour ablation		Currently these systems are used in clinical practice within pockets of the world such as USA, UK, Australia, France and Germany although implementation frameworks used are not available to review.
Nuclear Medicine	Drug	Radiopharmaceutical	Gallium 68 is one of the most important new therapies developed for prostate cancer.	Currently these systems are used in clinical practice within pockets of the world such as USA, UK, Australia, France and Germany although implementation frameworks used are not available to review.
	Medical device	Scanner; PET/CT, SPECT and PET/MRI	Digital scanner with 3D imaging using PET/CT and MRI. SPECT/CT scanner are currently undergoing development to formulate SPECT/MRI scanners	Currently these systems are used in clinical practice within pockets of the world such as USA, UK, Australia, France and Germany although implementation frameworks used are not available to review.
	Technologies	Nanotechnology	Functional nano-particles used to image tumour micro-environments	Currently these systems are used in clinical practice within pockets of the world such as USA, UK, Australia, France and Germany although implementation frameworks used are not available to review.
Diagnostic Radiology	Drug	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
	Medical device	General devices-mammographic X-ray system	Mammography procedures to detect abnormalities within the breast and a pre-empt procedure to evaluate breast tissue using MRI and/or ultrasound and anatomical issues using CT	Currently in use within clinical practice although there is currently no implementation framework specified. However, there is an adaptation framework used to increase the uptake of the procedure with a special focus on women from ethnic minorities.
		General devices-focused ultrasound with microbubbles	Focused ultrasound and microbubbles is a non-invasive method to penetrate the blood brain barrier to deliver a drug.	Currently there is no evidence available to indicate this will be part of clinical practice. Currently in the clinical trial phase.

		Previously, chemotherapy and many other treatments were unable to cross the blood-brain barrier to treat brain cancers. This method has also been validated using PET imaging hence has the potential to use two sub-specialist areas of imaging.	
Technologies	Proctoscopy	Developed originally for rectal examinations pre-treatment procedures. CT Virtual Proctoscopy for staging and evaluating volume in rectal cancers was successfully developed.	Currently these systems are used in clinical practice within many parts of the world although implementation frameworks used are not available to review, as these are not published. Furthermore, this procedure appears to have been introduced to healthcare systems in the UK through adaptation models based on empirical research.
	Image fusion; Hyperspectral imaging tumour marking tags; DOLPHIN technology	Hyperspectral imaging will be available as a new modality for imaging specialties.	Currently there is no evidence available to indicate this will be part of clinical practice although there has been some use of the method in the research intervention arena in USA. Currently in the clinical trial phase.
	Artificial intelligence and machine learning based algorithms to develop better diagnostic tools	Several software have been invented to better diagnose conditions.	Adaptation models and general business plans are available within various healthcare systems globally to gain access to these although a FFP implementation framework isn't available based on published literature.

Anderson and Distelhorst (2008), Damschroder and Hagedorn (2011), Dang *et al.* (2019), Escoffery *et al.* (2018), Garralda *et al.* (2019), Harvey *et al.* (2002), Hickey *et al.* (2019), Informa (2018), National Comprehensive Cancer Network (2019), National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2014), Nilsen *et al.* (2013).

Table 2

Implementation research facets with targeted audience

	Primary audience	Research questions	Core disciplines
Operational research	Decision makers	How to optimize performance?	Healthcare management, public policy, research management
Management improvements	Managers	How are effective and efficient services delivered?	Engineering, healthcare management and general management
Programme management	Stake holders including funders and implementers	Is the programme effective, fit for purpose and efficient?	Sociology, public policy, social work and general management
Dissemination, adaptation and	Practitioners, health organisation managers	How to promote dissemination of evidence based interventions to	Epidemiology, sociology, education and general

implementation of EBM	and policy makers	better practices in healthcare?	management
Action research	Research participants	How does knowledge management transfer to practice to promote empowerment?	Anthropology, sociology and non-disciplinary management
Policy implementation	National policy makers, regional and institutional policy makers	How does programme implementation influence healthcare outcomes?	Political science, healthcare management, public policy and administration
Mixed method based research implementation	Research manager, Research practitioners and policy makers	How do you use operational research methodology to improve research setup and delivery in healthcare? How do you increase implementation and operational science based methods and practices to improve research and clinical service provisions?	All clinical specialisms (e.g. Neurology, Oncology, Nephrology and Pathology) from a physician and surgical perspective

Backer (2002), Breton & De Leeuw (2011), Brown *et al.* (2017), Carvalho *et al.* (2013), Damschroder and Hagedorn (2011), Davies *et al.* (2013), Eldredge *et al.* (2016), Escoffery *et al.* (2018), Galbraith *et al.* (2009), Garralda *et al.* (2019), National Comprehensive Cancer Network (2019), National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2014), Nilsen *et al.* (2013).

Method

Added value of this study

This study aims to review the current published literature that indicates implementation frameworks globally available within healthcare and/or clinical specialties. This is the first systematic review conducted to evaluate implementation frameworks used in CIs. Outcomes from this study could optimise operational performance and establish relevant processes and policies to improve inter and intra-disciplinary workings in oncology, IR, NM and DR practices to better deliver and use clinical trials to enhance clinical practices.

Search strategy and selection criteria

The methodology was developed as part of a protocol that is consistent of a structure approved by the NHS centre for reviews and disseminations managed by University of York and the NIHR. This systematic review was registered with the international register for systematic reviews PROSPERO: CRDG42019124020. The developed protocol provides transparency, reproducibility and transferability to promote good practices.

The systematic strategy developed used literature search engines such as Medline/OvidSP, Science Direct, PROSPERO, PubMed, PubMed Health, Embase, EBSCOhost, SciELO, ProQuest, Academic search complete, Ageline, Google Scholar, PRISMA (preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses, Cochrane, Web-of-Science and BIOSIS. These databases were searched until the 10th of June 2021. The search was conducted using a ‘shot gun’

explosions and combinations approach along with the medical subject headings (MeSH) indexing method. Using the MeSH method, a multi-text classification approach was used with key phrases and words such as adaptation research, implementation science and research, in oncology, implementation research in imaging, translational framework for research delivery in oncology, research systems, evidence based policy, evidence based health services research, research culture impact in implementation and research delivery framework. Within the context of this study, specific definitions were also developed and used for key terms of “*frameworks, model, research capacity-capability and theory*”, which have been described in Appendix 2.


As part of the systematic methodology, an inclusion and exclusion criteria was developed to generate a bibliography of candidate studies. At the onset, the process of selection was evaluated by piloting the inclusion/exclusion criteria on a subset of studies as indicated in figure 1. A second independent evaluator reviewed the reliability of the initial finding. The inclusion criteria included papers, reports and grey literature in English, published in journals and reputable websites which indicated research processes and/or systems associated with delivering research outcomes in a healthcare setting, specifically in oncology, IR, DR and NM. Furthermore, publications which indicated an implementation framework based on empirical research, implementation models and any other compliance driven frameworks or policies were also included if there was evidence to indicate their validation by any healthcare organisation. Publications in the form of commentaries and professional opinions were included with the exception of those without research and/or clinical evidence to support any conclusions.

Quality assessment of reviews

One reviewer and checked/verified extracted data by another from publications, which was crosschecked for accuracy. Three main types of data were extracted which includes methods, characteristics of operational frameworks and improvements. Quality assessment of the material reviewed is an important aspect to consider. Therefore, the strength of evidence presented in each of publication was considered on an individual basis. The quality as well as the scope of the publications used varies widely. AMSTAR was used to assess methodological quality of this systematic review (Ayres *et al.* 2005).

Figure 1

Shows the study review procedure used



Results

Locating the most appropriate literature for this subject matter was challenging. As this is a primary research review, the paradigm used was a mixed methods approach. Thus, exploring the current level of general practice knowledge available and published in other clinical areas such as immunology and mental health. The results were based upon on reviewing the data with 3

levels of knowledge synthesis of system, correlation and descriptive analysis. Of the 30 studies, there were no studies published that were directly relevant to oncology, IR, DR and NM. However, 20 publications with adjunct text were found that indirectly showed key characteristics required to cultivate adoption of EBIs within a clinical service provision. As there was limited data available, a meta-analysis was not conducted to synthesize the research findings. A narrative synthesis with specific outcome measures as per the protocol designed was used to review the 20 publications that met the inclusion criteria.

We identified 20 frameworks although only 2 have a direct association with the research question. Out of the 20 frameworks identified, 13 included adaptation steps from gray literature specific to the US (Backer 2002, Bartholomew *et al.* 2001, Chen *et al.* 2013, Eldredge *et al.* 2016) and 7 from published literature (Bartholomew *et al.* 1998, Chen *et al.* 2013, Eldredge *et al.* 2016). Although, some aspects of these publications could be transferrable, it is evident the conclusions are dialectic with mutual citations as well as acknowledgment of building new frameworks based on previous work using adjustments thereby diluting any meaningful applicability to complex specialist areas such as oncology, IR, DR and NM. Furthermore, vast majority of this interconnectedness is applicable in the US as the frameworks developed were supported mainly by US government agencies such as the National Institute of Allergy and Infection, National Institute for Child Health and Human Development, Centre for Substance Abuse Prevention and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (Krivitsky *et al.* 2012). This further justifies the frameworks developed have used the specialties of HIV (Galbraith *et al.* 2009), infection control and pregnancy and any direct applicability to other specialties would be negligible. The use of intervention mapping (IM) to adapt EBIs is becoming more common as indicated through empirical research and case studies reviewed. Although, IM indicates to be a useful tool for increasing uptake of a particular intervention and evaluating EBIs such as mammography, it remains to be seen if this method remains purposeful for CIs, as currently there is a lack of published data (Harris *et al.* 2009).

Discussion

The systematic evaluation stipulates the need for a more formative and constructive implementation framework for CIs within oncology, IR, DR and NM. It is evident, there is a lack of data available to enable meaningful use of frameworks available. Current theories and

concepts that could provide a meaningful framework and subsequent policy to implement EBIs rapidly is rate limiting. Currently, implementation of novel programs appear to use practice facilitation and learning collaborative initiatives to promote implementation strategies using organisation structures and workflows despite being labour intensive to staff and minimal service improvement as per patient reported outcomes (Ayres *et al.* 2005, Harvey *et al.* 2002). The costs of using these 2 methods also hinder widespread adoption and inclusion into implementation strategies, frameworks and any logic models used within research management structures. However, implementation tools that are cost effective and electronically available with tailour made options provide better efficiency and consistency to adopt site-specific requirements thereby increasing the uptake of the strategy. This structured approach could be proactively shared between a clinical and research service provision thereby sharing data more readily. However, regulatory restrictions within research may require additional steps to be included into the electronic system to adhere to research governance policies (Johnson *et al.* 2007, Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency, 2014).

Cole and colleagues (2015) indicate the use of an implementation strategies based adaptation programs for their mail based colorectal cancer screening service which identifies a consolidated framework for implementation research (CFIR). This framework highlights 5 factors within the model; intervention and individual characteristics, inner and outer setting and processes, which influence success of implementation when translating EBIs (Choi *et al.* 2018). The CFIR method has also been used to guide adaptation and evaluate EBP programs for substance abuse (Damschroder & Hagedorn 2011, Hsiao *et al.* 2013). However, generalizability of the CFIR in the context of complex interventions may have rate limiting factors within a secondary care setting in the UK given Cole and colleagues (2015) conducted their research only in 3 out of 7 centers in a primary care setting without any statistical significance (Choi *et al.* 2018).

Another facet to IS is dissemination and implementation (DAI) (Nilsen 2015). DAI is composed of single concept models than a framework. DAI is a fairly new area of operational research in which EBI adaptation is observed using multiple processes in various settings (Nilsen 2015). This concept has been used to build multiple taxonomies to adapt programs to implement EBI using modifications including lengthening, shortening, removing, substituting, addition, re-ordering program components, integration of multiple EBIs, loosening structures or departing from the EBI completely as discussed by Stirman and colleagues. On the contrary, Chambers and

Norton indicated this ‘adaptome model’ enables knowledge synthesis in regards to program adaptation and its impact on implementation as well as outcomes thereby could function without a framework (Chambers & Norton 2016). There are however, debates in relation to fidelity versus adaptation whilst there is also evidence to suggest some level of adaptation occurring via empirical research, which isn’t often published (Carvalho *et al.* 2013). Furthermore, this data indicates these require validation in the context of CIs. The tension between adaptation and fidelity resulted in adaptation frameworks stipulating steps institutions should take to select and implement EBI to make the program (Bartholomew *et al.* 2001, Carvalho *et al.* 2013, Harvey *et al.* 2002). The converse could also occur if the most FFP context is not used, any changes made could make the EBI ineffective (Hsiao *et al.* 2013, Montez *et al.* 2016). However, common denominators of multiple frameworks with systematic processes could influence organisations to adapt any program. By way of these theories, frameworks and models, D&I research could improve EBI delivery and maintain long-term sustainability and increase rate of acceptability (McKleroy *et al.* 2006). Wingood *et al.* (2008) and McKleroy *et al.* (2006) indicates researchers and practitioners recommend frameworks to guide implementation of CIs (McKleroy *et al.* 2006, Wingood & DiClemente 2008). There are a limited number of D&I models and frameworks published and used in healthcare globally but the absence of a comprehensive review of processes and systems used in adaptation processes and practices within the literature prompted Bartholomew and colleagues original study (Bartholomew *et al.* 1998).

Furthermore, processes and their systems associated with delivering research and its outcomes as well as its’ transition into clinical practice differ across institutions and continents. Publications from the US show organisations are likely to be conducting D&I on an ad-hoc basis which is driven by the requirements of the population size and organisational capacity (Carvalho *et al.* 2013, Castro *et al.* 2004, Galbraith *et al.* 2009, Hsiao *et al.* 2013). This further purports, a need for a specific framework to be introduced for CIs seen within cumbersome clinical areas. Although dissemination of research is vital to ensure EBI could be implemented to improve clinical practice, the adaption process can be complex and laborious given the variables observed across clinical specialties as well as healthcare organisations and their country of origin. Some researchers state adaptations is a vital and natural ‘next step’ as part of the implementation process to clinical practices, which could be further influenced by modifying the original CI, although this could reduce the efficacy and effectiveness (Bartholomew *et al.* 2001, Brown *et al.*

2017, Johnson *et al.* 2007, Krivitsky *et al.* 2012). Currently, most of the frameworks published for D&I are specific to the USA and specialties such as HIV, mental health, pregnancy and infection control specifically for diseases such as Malaria (Escoffery *et al.* 2018, McKleroy *et al.* 2006, Wingood & DiClemente 2008). Escoffery and colleagues conducted the first systematic research study, which showed a summary of adaptation frameworks for public interventions that can be used in practice highlighting adaptation tasks and steps as part of a framework (Escoffery *et al.* 2018). The study highlights frameworks to guide healthcare staff working in HIV, pregnancy and substance abuse prevention domains (Eldredge *et al.* 2016, Escoffery *et al.* 2018, Escoffery *et al.* 2019). However, the frameworks used were validated using the US healthcare system, which limits its use. Furthermore, the study lacked evidence to show it's applicability in CI implementation.

Although 'one size does not fit all', validated FFP frameworks are required to better policy and practice within healthcare. This is further substantiated by several European governments acknowledging the implementation policy gap that is to improve healthcare practice (table 3). The mixed method systematic review approach used in this study indicates minimal research was available. Therefore, comprehensive research is required to better understand specialty based needs to design sustainable and FFP frameworks to enhance clinical practices.

Table 3

Key features published in policies associated with implementation science based research

Evidence of research policy use in different areas		
Policy	Methodology preference	Evidence base
Healthcare (including NHS and World Health Organisation)	The current gold standard is systematic reviews although this is primarily appropriate for non-interventional research. This approach could be used retrospectively as well as prospectively. Systematic reviews could also include a multitude of sampling and synthesis methods using a single or multiple protocols (inclusive of longitudinal sampling).	1. Systematic reviews can be expensive if conducted along with longitudinal studies via Cochrane collaborations and/or NHS clinical effectiveness unit data evaluation strategies. However, not all systematic reviews are expensive to conduct especially if it is conducted using applied or operational science models.
		2. Systematic reviews are also used in the context of 'real-world' data in conjunction with meta-analysis methods to aggregated statistics approaches.
		3. Systematic reviews provide evidence for low intensity support services, which include publications that have

		methods poorly developed. However, this written evidence is strengthened with the inclusion of empirical knowledge and phenomenology.
	The gold standard for novel therapeutic interventions are randomized controlled trials (RCT) inclusive of qualitative and socio-economical modeling methods to provide a comprehensive overview of the efficacy of the therapy explored as well as the views of the participants. This is often referred to as mixed-methods based RCT. This method could be used prospectively only.	1. These studies are expensive and often require a great length of time to collate as well as analyse the data. They can often use existing data via Cochrane collaborations as part of the RCT analysis method to further the evidence base.
Social care	Current gold standard is to use qualitative methods, which includes quantification and experimentation with minimal evidence. Often qualitative research is analyzed in a narrative format, which is viewed with suspicion and even hostility ().	1. Care data database of research is available via the Social Care Institute for excellence. This data is outside of the NIHR's clinical trial gateway database making it challenging to draw conclusions for clinicians or even use within existing diagnostic or screening based studies.
	There is growing evidence to indicate social care methods are being used as part of mixed method approaches in the context of operational and applied science based research. The benefits of this approach enhances the manner in which interventional based clinical research is conducted and delivered in addition to the optimization of service	2. Evidence using these methods is now being published in clinical and applied science journals, which is allowing a broader use.

Breton and De Leeuw (2011), Clinical trials NHS (2018), CRUK (2018), Krivitsky *et al.* (2012), Mayer (2017), Montez *et al.* (2016), National Cancer Institute (2018).

References

- Anderson, B. O., & Distelhorst, S. (2008). Guidelines for international breast health and cancer control–implementation. *Cancer*, **113**, 2215–371.
- Ayres, L. R. *et al.* (2005). Quality improvement learning collaboratives, *Quality Management Health Care*, **14**, 234-47.
- Backer, T. (2002). *Finding the balance: Program fidelity and adaptation in substance abuse prevention: A state-of-the-art review*. Rockville, MD: Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.
- Bartholomew, L. K. *et al.* (1998). Intervention mapping: a process for developing theory- and evidence-based health education programs. *Health Education Behaviour*, **25**, 545-563.
- Bartholomew, L. K. *et al.* (2001). *Intervention mapping: designing theory-and evidence-based health promotion programs*. Mountain View: Mayfield.
- Breton, E., & De Leeuw, E. (2011). Theories of the policy process in health promotion research:

- a review. *Health Promotion International*, **26**, 82-90.
- Brown, C. H. *et al.* (2017). An Overview of Research and Evaluation Designs for Dissemination and Implementation. *Annual Review Public Health*, **38**, 1-22.
- Carvalho, M. L. *et al.* (2013). Balancing fidelity and adaptation: implementing evidence-based chronic disease prevention programs. *Journal of Public Health Management Practice*, **19**, 348-356.
- Castro, F. G. *et al.* (2004). The cultural adaptation of prevention interventions: resolving tensions between fidelity and fit. *Prev Sci.*, **5**, 41-45.
- Chambers, D. A., & Norton, W. E. (2016). The Adaptome: Advancing the Science of Intervention Adaptation. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, **51**, S124-S131.
- Chen, E. K. *et al.* (2013). Tailoring evidence-based interventions for new populations: a method for program adaptation through community engagement. *Evaluation and The Health Professions*, **36**, 73-92.
- Choi, P. J. *et al.* (2018). The Current Trend of the Translational Research Paradigm. *Cureus*, **10**, e2340.
- Clinical trials NHS. Available at: <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/clinical-trials/> (Accessed 5 February 2018).
- Cooke, J. (2005). A framework to evaluate research capacity building in health care. *BMC Family Practice*, **6**, 11.
- CRUK. (2018). Cancer. Available at: <https://www.cancerresearchuk.org/health-professional/cancer-statistics-for-the-uk> (Accessed 5 February 2018).
- Damschroder, L. J., & Hagedorn, H. J. (2011). A guiding framework and approach for implementation research in substance use disorders treatment. *Psychol Addict Behav*, **25**, 194-205.
- Dang, X. *et al.* (2019). Deep-tissue optical imaging of near cellular-sized features, *Nature*, **9**, 1-12.
- Davies, P. *et al.* (2013). Theories of behaviour change in studies of guideline implementation *Proc Br Psychol Soc* **11**, 120.
- Dilts, D. M. *et al.* (2009). Steps and time to process clinical trials at the Cancer Therapy Evaluation Program. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, **27**, 1761-1766.
- Durlak, J. A. (2015). What everyone should know about implementation. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.). *Handbook of social and emotional learning: research and practice* (pp. 395-405). New York: The Guilford Press.

- EAMS. (2019 April 26). Apply for the early access to medicines scheme: original 19 December 2014 and updated 26 April 2019. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/apply-for-the-early-access-to-medicines-scheme-eams>. (Accessed 5 February 2018).
- Eccles, M. *et al.* (2005). Changing the behaviour of healthcare professionals: the use of theory in promoting the uptake of research findings. *Journal Clinical Epidemiology*, **58**, 107-12.
- Eldredge, L. B. *et al.* (2016). Using Intervention Mapping to Adapt Evidence-Based Interventions. In L. Bartholomew Eldredge L. *et al.* (Eds). *Planning health promotion programs: an intervention mapping approach* (pp. 597-649). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Escoffery C. E. *et al.* (2018). A systematic review of adaptations of evidence based public health interventions globally. *Implementation Science*, **13**,125.
- Escoffery, C. *et al.* (2019). A scoping study of frameworks for adapting public health evidence-based interventions *Translational Behavioural Medicine*, **9**, 1-10.
- European Medicines Agency (EMA). (30 April 2019). Fast track routes for medicines that address unmet needs. Available at: <https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/human-regulatory/research-development/prime-priority-medicines>. (Accessed 5 February 2018).
- Franks, B., & Schroeder, J. (2013). Implementation science: what do we know and where do we go from here? In T. Hall, A. Metz, & I. Martinez-Beck (Eds). *Applying implementation science in early childhood programs and systems* (pp. 5-21). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Pub. Co.
- Galbraith, J. S. *et al.* (2009). Exploring implementation and fidelity of evidence-based behavioral interventions for HIV prevention: lessons learned from the focus on kids' diffusion case study. *Health Education Behaviour*, **36**, 532-549.
- Garralda, E. *et al.* (2019). New clinical trial designs in the era of precision medicine *Molecular oncology*, **13**, 1-26.
- Garralda, E., & Dienstmann, R. (2019). New clinical trial designs in the era of precision medicine *Molecular Oncology*,**13**, 549-557.
- Harris, P. A. *et al.* (2009). Research electronic data capture (REDCap) - A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, **42**, 377-381.
- Harvey, G. *et al.* (2002). Getting evidence into practices: the role and function of facilitation. *Journal of Advance Nursing*, **37**, 577-88.
- Hickey, J. W. *et al.* (2019). Engineering an Artificial T-cell stimulating matrix for immunotherapy, *Advanced Materials*, 1-14.
- Hsiao, C. J. *et al.* (2013). Office based physicians are responding to incentives and assistance by adopting and using electronic health records. *Health Aff (Millwood)*, **32**, 1470-7.

- Informa (4 August 2018). *From binary to bedside: bridging the implementation gap in medical AI*. Available at: <https://www.informa.com.au/insight/binary-bedside-bridging-implementation-gap-medical-ai/> (Accessed 5 February 2018).
- International agency for research on cancer (WHO). (11 April 2017). *Press release number 251: latest data show a global increase of 13% in childhood cancer incidence over two decades*. Available at: https://www.iarc.fr/en/media-centre/pr/2017/pdfs/pr251_E.pdf. (Accessed 5 February 2018).
- Johnson, R. B. *et al.* (2007). Toward a Definition of Mixed Methods Research, *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, **1**, 112-133.
- Krivitsky, L. N. *et al.* (2012). American Psychological Association A systematic review of health promotion and disease prevention program adaptations: how are programs adapted? In E. Wethington, & R. E. Dunifon (eds). *Research for the public good: Applying the methods of translational research to improve human health and wellbeing* (pp. 73-99). Washington.
- Madon T. *et al.* (2007). Public health. *Implementation science*, **318**, 1728-9.
- Malik, L. *et al.* (2018). Increasing complex in oncology Phase I clinical trials. *Investigational New Drugs*, 1-6.
- Mayer, S. (2017). WHO Priority list of medical devices for cancer management, *Lancet*, **18**, 7.
- McKleroy, V. S. *et al.* (2006). ADAPT Team. Adapting evidence-based behavioral interventions for new settings and target populations. *Aids Educ Prev.*, **18**, 59-73.
- Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (2014). *Medicines, medical devices and blood regulation and safety – guidance. Apply for the early access to medicines scheme (EAMS)*. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/apply-for-the-early-access-to-medicines-scheme-eams> (accessed 27 January 2019).
- Montez, L. *et al.* (2016). Translational Research Training at various levels of professional experience to address health disparities *J Best Pract Health Prof Divers*, **9**, 1178-1187.
- Moore, J. E. *et al.* (2013). Examining adaptations of evidence-based programs in natural contexts. *Journal Primary Prevention*, **34**, 147-161.
- National Cancer Institute (2018). *Guidelines for choosing and adapting programs (Research-tested Intervention Programs)*. Available at: http://rtips.Cancer.gov/rtips/reference/adaptation_guidelines.pdf (accessed 27 January 2019).
- National Comprehensive Cancer Network (2019). *Prostate cancer early detection*. Available at: http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate_detection.pdf (accessed 27 January 2019).

- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2014). *Colorectal cancer: diagnosis and management. NICE clinical guideline 131*. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Available at: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg131> (accessed 27 January 2019).
- Nilsen P. (2015). Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. *Implementation Science*, **10**, 53.
- Nilsen, P. *et al.* (2013). Never the twain shall meet? – a comparison of implementation science and policy implementation research. *Implementation Science*, **8**, 63.
- Wingood, G. M., & DiClemente, R. J. (2008). The ADAPT-ITT model: a novel method of adapting evidence-based HIV Interventions. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome*, **47**, S40-S46.