1 Title

- 2 Effect of a needs-based model of care on the characteristics of healthcare services in
- 3 England: the i-THRIVE National Implementation Programme
- 4

5 Short title

- 6 Effect of needs-based care on healthcare services
- 7

8 Authors

- 9 R Sippy¹, L Efstathopoulou^{2,3}, E Simes^{2,3}, M Davis^{2,3}, S Howell^{2,3}, B Morris², O Owrid^{2,3}, N
- 10 Stoll^{2,3}, P Fonagy^{2,3}, A Moore^{1,2,3}*

11

- ¹Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom
- 13 ²Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families, London, United Kingdom
- ³Department of Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology, University
- 15 College London, London, United Kingdom
- 16
- 17 * corresponding author, am2708@medschl.cam.ac.uk, Clifford Allbutt Building, Hills Road,
- 18 Cambridge, CB2 0XY

19

- 20 Word count
- 21 3,584

- 23
- 24
- 25
 - -
- 26
- 27

28 Abstract

29 Aims: Developing integrated mental health services that focus on the needs of children and 30 young people is a key policy goal in England. The THRIVE Framework and its associated 31 implementation programme, i-THRIVE, are now used in areas covering over 65% of 32 England's children. This study explores the experiences of staff involved with the i-THRIVE 33 programme, assesses its effectiveness, and examines how local system working 34 relationships influence the programme's success. 35 **Methods**: The i-THRIVE programme was evaluated using a guasi-experimental study 36 among twenty participating sites (ten implementation and ten comparison sites). 37 Measurements included surveys of staff and leaders at each site and assessment of the 38 "THRIVE-like" features of each site. Additional site-level characteristics were collected from 39 health system reports. The effect of i-THRIVE was evaluated using a four-group propensity-40 score weighted difference-in-differences model; the moderating effect of local system 41 working relationships was evaluated with a difference-in-difference-in-differences model. 42 **Results**: Staff at implementation sites were more likely to report using THRIVE in their own 43 practice and exhibited better knowledge of THRIVE principles than comparison sites. The 44 mean improvement among i-THRIVE sites was 16.7, and 8.8 among comparison sites. The 45 results show that strong working relationships in the local system significantly enhances the 46 effectiveness of the i-THRIVE programme. Sites with highly effective working relationships 47 showed a notable improvement in "THRIVE-like" features, with an average increase of 16.41 48 points (95% confidence interval: 1.69-31.13, p-value: 0.031) compared to control sites. In 49 contrast, sites with ineffective working relationships did not benefit from the i-THRIVE 50 programme (-2.76, 95% confidence interval: -18.25–12.73, p-value: 0.708). This influence of 51 working relationship effectiveness was consistent across various levels of THRIVE features. 52 **Conclusions**: The findings underscore the importance of working relationship effectiveness 53 in the successful adoption and implementation of health policies like i-THRIVE.

54

55 Background

56	Mental healthcare has numerous well-supported models. Globally, systems are challenged
57	to provide appropriate services efficiently, necessitating reform of current care models
58	(Hodgins et al., 2024). However, the continued presence of inadequate care is mainly due to
59	difficulties in applying these changes (Shortell et al., 1993; Grol and Grimshaw, 2003), as
60	systemic transformation is a complex process (Best et al., 2012). The transformative "Future
61	in Mind" report (Department of Health, 2015) suggested deviating from a generic, tiered
62	service model to a more responsive model for the specific mental health needs of local
63	young populations. It called for service providers and funders to overhaul children and young
64	people's mental health (CYPMH) services into comprehensive systems, offering a range of
65	services from prevention to risk management. The "Future in Mind" report focuses on
66	reforming a flawed system of service provision, characterised by disunity, inefficiency, and
67	limited access to services. Since 2016, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services
68	(CAMHS) within England's National Health Service (NHS) have seen significant changes,
69	advancing more comprehensive approaches to care (Rocks et al., 2020).
70	The THRIVE Framework provides a set of principles to guide system reformation,
71	summarising the needs of CYP into five groups: Getting Advice, Getting Risk Support,
72	Getting Help, Getting More Help, and Thriving (Wolpert et al.). Support is provided to CYP in
73	these groups using a set of guiding principles. The THRIVE principles of care encompass
74	characteristics of support at three levels: macro, meso, and micro. At the macro level,
75	characteristics include interagency function and cooperation. This means a CAMHS system
76	following the "THRIVE-like" approach would involve supporting bodies such as educational
77	and social services in its policy-making and service delivery (Moore et al., 2023). At the
78	meso level, they include a needs-based perspective focusing on CYP and their support
79	services. A site adhering to meso-level THRIVE principles would be expected to have a
80	network of community providers (Moore et al., 2023). At the micro level, these characteristics
81	involve the interactions between CYP, their families, and healthcare professionals; we would

expect to see shared decision-making, with everyone understanding the needs of the childand interventions being used (Moore et al., 2023).

84 The National i-THRIVE Programme (NIP) assists CAMHS sites in adopting the THRIVE 85 principles, which prioritise patient needs and cohesive service provision through 86 collaborative care networks (Moore et al., 2023). Over 65% of children and young people 87 (CYP) live in areas where i-THRIVE has been adopted (i-THRIVE Team). i-THRIVE was 88 created following implementation science guidelines to facilitate the adoption of THRIVE 89 principles by CAMHS (Moore et al., 2016). The NIP is explained in a published study 90 protocol (Moore et al., 2023). Briefly, i-THRIVE translates the complex aspects of a 91 'THRIVE-like' system into practical structures and tools for CAMHS to use in their 92 transformation. The NIP guides CAMHS staff and leaders in developing local models based 93 on THRIVE principles and creating detailed plans for implementation over four phases, using 94 six components (Moore et al., 2023). The implementation strategies in the NIP are drawn 95 from the Quality Implementation Framework (Meyers et al., 2012) and the Normalisation 96 Processing Theory (May, 2006). The embodiment of THRIVE principles depends not only on 97 efforts by the CAMHS site but also on broader community involvement (Wolpert et al.), 98 requiring effective working relationships among local systems. According to the 99 implementation strategy clusters created by the Expert Recommendations for Implementing 100 Change study (Waltz et al., 2015), the implementation strategies used in the NIP include use 101 of evaluative and iterative strategies, providing interactive assistance, adaptation and 102 tailoring to context, development of stakeholder interrelationships, training and education of 103 stakeholders, engagement of consumers, utilisation of financial strategies, and changes to 104 infrastructure. 105 Evaluation of implementation strategies is needed to understand the impacts of the 106 implementation and determine if it should be adopted for use in real-world scenarios. The 107 evaluation could include several outcome metrics, such as acceptability, feasibility, fidelity or 108 cost (Smith and Hasan, 2020). Fidelity is a particularly important metric, as it helps to 109 determine if observed effects can be attributed to the intervention of interest; poor

110 implementation may explain cases with no observed effects (Sanders et al., 2022). In this 111 work, we evaluate the impact of the NIP implementation model on fidelity to the THRIVE 112 principles of care; a healthcare service unit that embodies the THRIVE principles of care 113 would exhibit high fidelity to THRIVE at macro, meso, and micro levels. 114 Although in use since 2016, the NIP as an implementation model has not been assessed. 115 We focus on the average effect of NIP on the THRIVE fidelity of implementation sites. For 116 this estimate, we need to know the outcome at each site if NIP had not been implemented 117 (the potential outcome or unobserved counterfactual) (Stuart, 2010). The difference in 118 differences (DiD) approach compares changes in outcomes between implementation and 119 control sites before and after the intervention (Stuart et al., 2014). A key assumption for DiD 120 is that the average outcomes for both groups would have similar trends over time (Xu, 2017), 121 which may not always be plausible. Participation in NIP is voluntary, meaning sites that 122 choose to participate may differ from those that do not. The four-group propensity score-123 weighted DiD method overcomes these issues by adjusting the implementation and control 124 groups while considering time factors. This adjustment ensures comparability among the 125 groups and reduces bias in estimating the desired effect. It's particularly useful when group 126 composition changes during the study, such as when health practitioners move between 127 Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs). 128 In this study, we evaluate the alignment of frontline staff with THRIVE principles, and assess 129 the effect of the NIP on THRIVE fidelity. We hypothesize that i-THRIVE had a positive effect

on THRIVE fidelity. Additionally, we examine how the effectiveness of local system working
relationships moderates the impact of the NIP on THRIVE fidelity.

132

133 Methods

134 Study Setting and Design

135 The study protocol is detailed elsewhere (Moore et al., 2023). In brief, we selected twenty

- 136 CAMHS sites in England: ten of these sites have been using i-THRIVE since 2016
- 137 (NIP/implementation sites), and ten others were using different approaches for

138 transformation (comparison sites). Details on the implementation strategies and delivery of 139 NIP are in Supplemental Material S1. This study reporting conforms to the Template for 140 Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR) statement (Hoffmann et al., 2014); the 141 TIDieR checklist is provided in Supplemental Material S2. 142 The NIP sites were Bexley, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough, Camden, Hertfordshire, 143 Luton, Manchester, Stockport, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest, and Warrington. The 144 comparison sites included Bradford, Ipswich and East Suffolk, Lewisham, Norfolk, 145 Northampton, Portsmouth, Southampton, Stoke-on-Trent, Sunderland, and South 146 Worcestershire. Sites will be pseudonymised as Site A-T. Additional site details are in 147 Supplemental Material S3. Implementation of THRIVE started in April 2016; data from April 148 2015 to March 2016 were used as the pre-implementation period. Data from April 2018 to 149 March 2019 were used as the post-implementation period. To examine staff alignment with 150 and understanding of THRIVE principles, a survey was administered. To assess site 151 transformation or implementation, site leaders were also surveyed. To assess whether 152 THRIVE principles were embraced by sites, fidelity scores were assigned. To understand 153 whether the NIP impacted site adoption of THRIVE principles, fidelity scores from pre- and 154 post-implementation were compared between implementation and comparison sites, while 155 adjusting for site-level characteristics (auxiliary data). 156 Measurements and Data

157 Surveys

158 Two surveys were designed based on the RE-AIM Adoption Framework (Glasgow et al.,

159 2019), a guide for evaluation of programmes. Both surveys were primarily quantitative in

160 nature, but several questions requested open-ended responses. Copies of the surveys are in

- 161 Supplemental Materials S4—S6. The staff survey assessed the staff awareness of THRIVE
- 162 and use of THRIVE principles. Site leaders distributed the survey to professionals involved in
- 163 providing and commissioning CYPMH services at both i-THRIVE and comparison sites. The
- survey was administered in August 2019, October 2019, and January 2020.

165 A survey for transformation leads was also conducted among i-THRIVE and comparison 166 sites. This survey, completed by programme managers, gathered information about site 167 transformation activities and the support they received. It was distributed from January to 168 May 2020. Additional details on the surveys are in Supplemental Material S3. 169 Principal Outcome: Fidelity 170 The primary focus is the degree to which sites follow the THRIVE principles. The THRIVE 171 principles of care encompass macro-, meso-, and micro-level features. We assessed these 172 features in participating sites using the i-THRIVE Assessment Tool (Moore et al., 2023), 173 wherein a score is assigned to each of 75 items describing THRIVE principles (1: low, 4: 174 high). Purposive sampling was used to recruit three staff members at macro (senior 175 leadership), meso (service management), and micro (frontline staff) levels for in-depth 176 interviews. Interview transcripts were scored by evaluators: sites received an overall fidelity 177 (300 possible) and level-specific scores (macro: 84 possible, meso: 104 possible, micro: 112 178 possible). Higher scores indicate better adherence to THRIVE principles. Fidelity to i-179 THRIVE was measured at each site before and after the intervention by at least two 180 independent evaluators, with scores averaged for each site and period. When there was not 181 enough information to assign a score, we estimated the missing scores using the mean 182 difference between pre- and post-intervention scores for the site, based on the score for the 183 available period. Additional details on fidelity ratings are in Supplemental Materials S3. 184 Auxiliary Data 185 To calculate propensity score weights, it is important to identify site characteristics that might 186 cause selection bias or have a confounding effect (Stuart et al., 2014). These characteristics 187 were measured in 2016 and 2019, unless stated otherwise. They included population density 188 (total population per square kilometre) for each CCG (Office for National Statistics, 2016; 189 Office for National Statistics, 2017), annual funding support (£100,000 increments) per CCG 190 (NHS England, 2017), Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) ranks (Department for 191 Communities and Local Government, 2015; Department for Communities and Local 192 Government, 2019), the initial number of CCGs per site (NHS England, 2019), and

193	compliance in 2017 with the CCG Improvement and Assessment Framework Mental Health
194	Transformation Milestones (NHS England, 2017). For sites comprising multiple CCGs, we
195	summed the annual funding and averaged the population density, effectiveness of working
196	relationships in the local system, and transformation compliance across CCGs. Site-level
197	IMD ranks were calculated using the method recommended by the Office of National
198	Statistics (Noble et al., 2019).
199	Statistical Analysis
200	We analysed the staff survey results using the chi-squared test and Cramer's V as a
201	measure of association between i-THRIVE/comparison sites and staff responses
202	("yes"/"no"). We used a binomial distributed generalised linear model with a log link for site-
203	specific results, excluding "I don't know" responses. To determine if any site had an unusual
204	probability of a "yes" response, we compared the "yes" probability for each site to the
205	average among comparison sites.
206	The responses from the survey of the implementation leads are in Supplemental Material
207	S1. Their experience of the delivery of i-THRIVE was summarised as proportions.
208	To assess inter-rater reliability for the fidelity scores, we used Krippendorf's alpha (see
209	Supplemental Material S3 for more details).
210	Voluntary participation in health policy implementations like the NIP can lead to selection
211	bias, as the sites that choose to participate may differ from those that do not. To correct for
212	this, we applied propensity score weighting (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1985) to equalise the
213	distribution of characteristics between the implementation and comparison sites. We used a
214	four-group weighting method (pre-implementation i-THRIVE, post-implementation i-THRIVE,
215	pre-implementation comparison, and post-implementation comparison) to align
216	characteristics across all groups with those of the pre-implementation i-THRIVE sites (Stuart
217	et al., 2014). These propensity scores were calculated using a multinomial model with five
218	site characteristics (population density, annual funding, IMD rank, the number of CCGs per
219	site, and transformation compliance). Characteristic balance was checked using the
220	standardised difference in means (Stuart, 2010). The impact of NIP on fidelity was estimated

221 using maximum-likelihood repeated measures linear regression with an auto-regressive

222 correlation structure, weighted with the calculated propensity scores. To account for

223 remaining characteristic imbalances, we included population density, IMD, and

transformation compliance in the final model. The results from this model represent the four-

225 group weighted DiD effect estimate.

To assess the reliability of our fidelity results, we conducted a series of sensitivity analyses.

227 We employed different methods to estimate the effect of the NIP, including the standard

228 (unweighted) DiD and alternative model specifications. We examined the impact of non-

229 compliant control sites by repeating the analysis, excluding these sites. More details can be

230 found in Supplemental Material S7.

231 To examine variations in the effect of i-THRIVE, we investigated a possible effect moderator,

232 specifically the quality of local system working relationships (NHS England, 2021) on i-

233 THRIVE implementation. Further details are available in Supplemental Material S9.

All data visualisation, cleaning, and propensity score modelling was performed in R version

4.2.3 (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) and RStudio version

236 2023.03.0 (RStudio, Inc., Boston, MA, USA), with R packages cowplot, extrafont, ggpattern,

237 ggspatial, gridExtra, haven, irr, nnet, RColorBrewer, readxl, reshape2, sf, tableone, and

tidyverse (Venables and Ripley, 2002; Wickham, 2007; Neuwirth, 2014; Auguie, 2017;

239 Wickham and Miller, 2017; Pebesma, 2018; Gamer et al., 2019; Wickham et al., 2019;

240 Wilke, 2020; FC et al., 2022; Yoshida and Bartel, 2022; Chang, 2023; Dunnington, 2023;

241 Pebesma and Bivand, 2023; Wickham and Bryan, 2023). The simple DiD, four-group

242 weighted DiD, and effect modification analyses were performed in SAS® version 3.81 (SAS

243 Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA) in SAS® Studio.

244

245 Results

246 <u>Surveys</u>

The staff survey had 689 responses across 19 sites (no responses from Luton). Detailedsurvey results are in Supplemental Material S8.

249 While the THRIVE Framework was widely known, more implementation respondents

- recognised it (83.9% vs. 70.5%, p<0.0001). A higher proportion of implementation
- respondents reported using THRIVE principles in their daily practice (58.5% vs. 49.0%,
- 252 p=0.03). Implementation respondents were more likely to score perfectly on a test of the
- 253 THRIVE Framework (34.1% vs. 22.9%, p=0.001).
- 254 The transformation leads survey included eight managers from seven implementation sites
- and eight managers from seven comparison sites. Notably, managers from four comparison
- sites (Sites E, J, K, and S) reported using THRIVE as their service transformation model.
- 257 This prompted a more detailed examination of staff survey results concerning THRIVE
- 258 implementation at comparison sites.
- 259 The site-level analysis of survey results can be found in Supplemental Material S8. Among
- those who provided a yes/no response at comparison sites, J and K reported a higher
- 261 likelihood of implementing THRIVE. The odds of respondents reporting site implementation
- of THRIVE were 4.43 in J (95% CI: 2.32–8.47) compared to other comparison sites (76.5%
- 263 vs. 59.5%), and 4.43 in K (95% CI: 1.33–14.80) compared to other comparison sites (76.5%
- vs. 59.5%). Among respondents at comparison sites, there was no difference in personal
- use of THRIVE principles compared to other comparison sites. Regarding knowledge of the
- 266 THRIVE Framework, respondents from J had a higher probability of achieving a perfect
- score on the quiz: the odds of scoring perfectly were 3.73 (95% CI: 2.25–6.19), compared to
- 268 other comparison sites (37.7% vs. 22.9%).
- 269 <u>THRIVE Fidelity</u>
- 270 During the pre-implementation period, i-THRIVE sites had an average fidelity score of 149.0
- 271 (range: 132.0—180.2) and comparison sites had an average score of 133.4 (range: 113.0—
- 158.2). Following implementation, i-THRIVE sites had an average score of 166.6 (range:
- 273 145.5—195.0), while comparison sites had an average of 142.2 (range: 132.0 —175.0). The
- 274 mean difference between pre- and post-implementation among i-THRIVE sites was 16.7;
- among comparison sites the mean difference was 8.8. Two sites had incomplete fidelity
- 276 score information: the macro-level components for Site T during the post-implementation

- 277 period and the meso-level components for Site F during the pre-implementation period
- 278 (scores were assigned as outlined in the methods section). Detailed fidelity scores by level
- and site are illustrated in Figure 1, and a map showing the changes in scores by site
- throughout the study is presented in Figure 2.

281

283 Figure 1: Fidelity Scores by Site

- 284 Total fidelity scores during the pre- and post-implementation periods are represented by bar
- 285 height, with patterned overlay to indicate component levels (macro, meso, micro).
- 286 Implementation sites are in panel A (blue) while comparison sites are in panel B (red).

288 Figure 2: Change in Fidelity Scores Over Study Period

- 289 The difference in total fidelity scores during the pre- and post-implementation periods are
- 290 represented by colour, with an increased score in green and a decreased score in red, on a
- 291 background map of Clinical Commissioning Groups in panel A. Study sites have a bold
- 292 outline (comparison sites in red, implementation sites in blue). Inset maps for North
- 293 West/Midlands, London, and South East are in panels B–D, respectively.

294

296 Site characteristics, adjusted using four-group propensity-score weighting, are in Table S6, 297 Supplemental Material S8. In our analysis of the weighted standardised differences, we 298 identified some remaining imbalances, specifically in population density for the pre-299 implementation control group, IMD rank for both control groups, and transformation 300 compliance for both control groups. These covariates were included in our effect estimate 301 model, ensuring a more accurate assessment of NIP impact. 302 The NIP effect estimates are presented in Table 1. Our analysis reveals that the overall 303 fidelity scores were moderately influenced by the NIP. Specifically, i-THRIVE sites showed 304 an average improvement of 7.05 points (95% CI: -4.47-18.57). The most notable 305 improvements were at the macro level, where i-THRIVE sites increased by an average of 306 2.92 points (95% CI: -1.09–6.92), followed by the meso level with an average increase of 307 2.76 points (95% CI: -1.98–7.51), and the micro level with an average increase of 1.39 308 points (95% CI: -3.94–6.72). None of these improvements were statistically significant. 309 When comparing the four-group weighted DiD with the standard DiD analyses 310 (Supplemental Material S7), we found comparable effects on overall and macro-level fidelity. 311 There were shifts in the impacts on meso- and micro-level fidelity. This suggests that lower-312 level fidelity was more sensitive to the disparities between i-THRIVE and comparison 313 groups, which were corrected through the four-group propensity-score weighting approach. 314 Alternative modelling approaches produced results similar to our analysis. The exclusion of 315 non-compliant comparison sites (i.e. Site J; see Supplemental Material S7) did not alter the 316 results. 317 Among the study sites, five implementation sites and five comparison sites were found to 318 have highly effective working relationships among their local systems (Supplemental 319 Material S9). We observed a moderating effect of local systems working relationship 320 effectiveness on the impact of the NIP for overall and macro-level fidelity. i-THRIVE was 321 found to be more effective at sites with highly effective working relationships. The detailed 322 results are in Table 2. i-THRIVE sites with highly effective working relationships showed 323 increased fidelity scores compared to comparison sites with highly effective working

324 relationships. The most significant impact was on overall fidelity scores (16.41, 95% CI: 325 1.69-31.13), followed by macro-level scores (6.95, 95% Cl: 2.15-11.75). The moderating 326 influence of highly-effective working relationships on meso-level and micro-level fidelity was 327 modest (5.52, 95% CI: -0.66–11.71 and 3.95 points, 95% CI: -3.24–11.15, respectively). 328 Notably, there was no discernible impact of the NIP on sites with ineffective working 329 relationships across any fidelity level. 330 331 Discussion 332 A major obstacle in implementing any complex intervention is ensuring it becomes a routine 333 practice across the entire organisation. This concept is often described as making it 'the way 334 we do things around here' (Haines et al., 2004; Proctor et al., 2011). Both THRIVE and i-335 THRIVE are frequently mentioned in child mental health policy documents, by NHS 336 England's regional transformation boards, and in media related to child mental health. It is 337 encouraging for policymakers to note that over 70% of staff at comparison sites were aware 338 of THRIVE, and nearly 23% exhibited perfect knowledge of THRIVE principles. At the site 339 level, respondents from most i-THRIVE sites had an increased odds of reporting site 340 implementation of THRIVE, compared to the average among comparison sites, though two 341 comparison sites (Sites J and K) also had an increased odds of reporting site 342 implementation of THRIVE. When asked about personal use of THRIVE principles, 343 respondents from many i-THRIVE sites had an increased odds of reporting personal use, 344 compared to the average among comparison sites, and with Site J also exhibiting an 345 increased odds of reporting personal use. This motivated a sensitivity analysis in which Site 346 J was excluded from the fidelity analysis; the results were not affected. Overall, staff at i-347 THRIVE sites were significantly more likely to be familiar with, understand, and apply 348 THRIVE principles in their daily work. This indicates that the NIP aids in embedding THRIVE 349 principles within an organisation. 350 Previous research has found staff development and training are key to the successful 351 implementation of a new intervention (Rahman et al., 2012; Resnick et al., 2018). Training

352 activities and attendance at both i-THRIVE Academy and Community of Practice events 353 were reported among implementation sites, and staff from implementation sites exhibited 354 knowledge of THRIVE principles. Continued engagement of staff will likely be important for 355 the integration of THRIVE, and formal assessments or competency checks may be useful to 356 monitor THRIVE delivery (Sanders et al., 2022). In addition to educational activities, several 357 of the implementation strategies used by the NIP, including site diagnostics activities, 358 coaching and support, and involving key partners were found to have positive results at least 359 75% of the time in a recent review (Ashcraft et al., 2024) Implementation research generates critical evidence for selecting effective strategies for 360 361 health system transformation (Ashcraft et al., 2024). Like the NIP, most implementations 362 include multiple strategies (Ashcraft et al., 2024), meaning it is difficult to attribute a 363 successful implementation to any single strategy. There are few examples of implementation 364 research for mental health, many of which focus on implementation effectiveness (Wells et 365 al., 2013; Chung et al., 2014; Kilbourne et al., 2014; Waxmonsky et al., 2014; Chung et al., 366 2015; Sinnema et al., 2015; Morton et al., 2020; Ruud et al., 2021; Bartels et al., 2022; 367 Toropova et al., 2022) with a minority examining the implementation process more broadly 368 (Williams et al., 2017; Bauer et al., 2019; Leone et al., 2022). Among studies of the 369 implementation process or implementation fidelity, a facilitator-implemented collaborative 370 care model resulted in some improvements to team function; adoption of collaborative care 371 model processes varied widely by site (Bauer et al., 2019). Another study examined 372 mediating factors for clinician adoption of evidence-based practices following an 373 organisation-supported implementation strategy, reporting high fidelity to the strategy at both 374 clinician and organisation levels (Williams et al., 2017). Although implementation studies 375 would benefit from enrolment of many participating sites to reduce the impact of between-376 site variation, the enrolment of a high number of sites presents many logistical challenges. 377 Integrated care models, such as THRIVE, are used in Europe, Australia, and North America, 378 and have been tailored for use in services for CYP (Hodgins et al., 2024). A review of 379 integrated care models for youth discusses common features, including multidisciplinary staff

380 members able to partner with external organisations and managers committed to integration, 381 joint planning, and stakeholder partnership (Hodgins et al., 2024). The THRIVE Framework 382 targets a local community, and relies on the involvement of multiple agencies to transform 383 how these agencies provide mental healthcare for CYP (Wolpert et al.). Many of the 384 implementation sites hosted events to build stakeholder relationships. In this study, we found 385 that multi-agency cooperation was critical to the implementation of the NIP itself: the strength 386 of working relationships in the local system moderated the effect of the NIP on THRIVE 387 fidelity among sites. For future users of the NIP, an evaluation of local working relationships 388 or pre-implementation efforts to engage with community stakeholders and strengthen these 389 relationships would be worthwhile. 390 On average, the NIP had a modest impact on THRIVE fidelity among sites, without reaching 391 the level of a statistically-significant change. With a small number of sites included, the study 392 may have been under-powered. When implementation studies find a null effect, it is difficult 393 to know if the effect is truly null or if the implementation itself was incorrect (Sanders et al., 394 2022), or if implementation success depends on site characteristics (Augustsson et al., 395 2015). Site-level changes in THRIVE fidelity had high variability; even when an 396 implementation is supported in the same way for all sites, variation can occur (Augustsson et 397 al., 2015). To better understand the impact of NIP, we examined the moderating effect of an 398 important site characteristic: the strength of local working relationships at the site, finding 399 that the NIP improved THRIVE fidelity (overall and at macro level) at implementation sites 400 with strong local working relationships, compared to comparison sites with strong local 401 working relationships. A similar result was found in a study of an organisational-level 402 intervention for occupational health, where the implementation worked the best among units 403 with strong collaboration (Augustsson et al., 2015). To explain these results, the authors 404 suggest that the intervention was a better fit for those units or that the units were more 405 capable in adapting the intervention. Preliminary work can be done to prepare sites for an 406 implementation; for those sites interested in using the NIP, efforts to strengthen local 407 working relationships prior to implementation should be considered.

The future direction of this research will involve comprehensive evaluations of the service and clinical impacts of the NIP. These evaluations will encompass a range of critical factors, including the accessibility and efficiency of services, clinical outcomes, patient experiences, and the specific impacts on various sub-groups within the patient population. The latter will particularly focus on racial or ethnic minorities and distinct diagnostic categories, ensuring a broad and inclusive understanding of the NIP's effectiveness.

414 Limitations

415 There are several limitations to consider in this work. For the survey of site staff, the

416 response rate was low (28.5%) compared to staff surveys in other implementation studies

417 (46.8—83.1%) (Leone et al., 2022; Toropova et al., 2022). We would expect this to cause

418 some bias in our results if the response rate was differential by implementation/comparison

419 site groups, but there was no difference in response rate by these groups. The low response

420 rate may indicate that the survey results are not generalisable. Future research should

421 consider incentives to encourage survey completion.

422 When introducing new health policies, understanding their impact and identifying the 423 contexts in which they are most effective is crucial. Estimating the mean effect presents 424 several methodological challenges, especially when data from pre-implementation periods 425 are scarce or when only a few sites are involved. Unlike randomised controlled trials, the 426 adoption of health policies is not random. This means that the characteristics of the 427 implementation and control sites are likely to vary, leading to potential selection bias. Yet, it 428 is a useful methodological approach for evaluating complex interventions selected and 429 implanted by policymakers. It is often unclear which characteristics influence a site's 430 decision to adopt a health policy. Even with numerous characteristics measured, careful 431 consideration of each characteristic's role is necessary. Confounding is another potential 432 bias, where some characteristics may influence both the decision to implement and the site's 433 capacity to do so effectively.

434 To adjust for these biases, various methods are available, but these methods can 435 themselves introduce bias. Sensitivity analyses are essential in gaining a deeper 436 understanding of the data. The four-group propensity-score weighting DiD method is 437 designed to mitigate potential selection biases and confounding factors (Stuart et al., 2014). 438 However, a key assumption of DiD, the parallel trends assumption, is not verifiable. 439 Violations of the parallel trends assumption can lead to issues with time-varying confounding 440 (Xu, 2017), complicating the interpretation of results. Thus, while our study provides valuable 441 insights into the effectiveness of the NIP, these issues must be considered when interpreting 442 the findings.

443 The variable transformation approaches used by comparison sites could be considered a

444 limitation, as this could complicate the interpretation of results. Strictly speaking, a

445 comparison group where all sites were transforming their CAMHS into the THRIVE

446 Framework would allow us to test the implementation strategies of the NIP specifically (i.e.

447 all sites seeking to fit the THRIVE Framework but the implementation group testing the NIP

448 implementation strategies). Four comparison sites reported using THRIVE as their

transformation model, but this sample size is too small for a full analysis. The comparison

450 group simply represents routine implementation, a common approach for implementation

451 research control groups (Smith and Hasan, 2020).

452 Conclusions

This study's investigation into the effectiveness of the NIP in England offers significant insights into the implementation of complex health interventions, particularly in the field of CAMHS. The findings underscore the importance of effective working relationships among local systems in the successful adoption and implementation of health policies like i-THRIVE. Specifically, the study demonstrates that sites with highly effective working relationships exhibit substantial improvements in adhering to THRIVE principles, as evidenced by the increase in fidelity scores.

460 The broad awareness of the THRIVE framework among staff, even in comparison sites,

- 461 highlights the programme's permeation in the field of CYPMH. However, implementation
- 462 strategies are critical in embedding these principles more deeply within organisations. This
- distinction is crucial for policymakers and healthcare leaders aiming to foster more effective,
- 464 integrated mental health services tailored to the needs of CYP.
- 465 Methodologically, the study navigates the challenges of evaluating health policy
- 466 implementations in non-randomised settings. The use of four-group propensity-score
- 467 weighted DiD analysis is an effective approach to address potential biases, such as

468 selection bias and confounding factors. However, it also highlights the inherent complexities

469 and limitations in evaluating policy impact in real-world settings. The study's sensitivity

- 470 analyses further strengthen the validity of its findings.
- 471 In conclusion, the NIP presents a promising model for CAMHS. Its emphasis on effective
- 472 working relationships and the tailored approach to implementation are key factors in its
- 473 success. The insights from this study contribute valuable knowledge to the ongoing efforts to
- 474 improve mental health services and can guide future policies and programmes aimed at
- 475 enhancing the well-being of CYP.
- 476

477 Financial support

- 478 This study is independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care
- 479 Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration North Thames (grant number CRJM,
- 480 46AZ74-/RCF/CLAHRC/UCL004, 52AZ95/AA2/UCL5, 52AZ95/AA2/UCL6, UCLP) and
- 481 UCLPartners, both awarded to AM. The views expressed in this publication are those of the
- 482 author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR, the Department of Health and Social Care
- 483 or UCLPartners. All research at the Department of Psychiatry in the University of Cambridge
- 484 is supported by the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre (BRC-1215-20014) and
- 485 NIHR Applied Research Centre. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not
- 486 necessarily those of the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.
- 487 Conflicts of Interest

- 488 AM was the lead for i-THRIVE between January 2015 and January 2017 during which she
- 489 led the development of the i-THRIVE implementation approach and established the
- 490 community of practice. She was an employee of one i-THRIVE implementation site during
- 491 the evaluation.
- 492 LE was an employee of one i-THRIVE implementation site during the evaluation.
- 493 PF is currently on the board of the i-THRIVE Implementation Programme. Anna Freud
- 494 Centre hosted the development and on-going implementation of the THRIVE Framework in
- 495 collaboration with the Tavistock & Portman NHS Foundation Trust. He is Programme
- 496 Director of Mental Health at UCLPartners which provides programme management of the i-
- 497 THRIVE Implementation Programme.

498 Ethical Standards

- 499 The NHS/University Joint Research Office reviewed this study and classified it as a service
- 500 evaluation, meaning it does not need ethical approval or a review by the Research Ethics
- 501 Committee (IRAS application number: 250439). For the qualitative parts of the study,
- 502 participants included implementation leads, managers, and front-line staff, who were
- 503 interviewed about their service transformation projects. At the start of each interview, verbal
- 504 informed consent was obtained, which included explicit permission for the interview to be
- 505 recorded, analysed, and used in the service evaluation. This consent was recorded, and
- 506 transcripts of each interview were made to document it.

507 The data for the quantitative evaluation is retrospective and was routinely collected from

- service records. It was anonymised at the source by the business intelligence staff at each
- 509 trust, with all identifying information removed. After review by local information governance
- 510 leads, this anonymised data was provided to the evaluation team. As the data is
- 511 retrospective and de-identified, consent for its use in the evaluation is neither legally nor
- 512 ethically required. The requirement for ethical approval was therefore waived by the joint
- 513 research office.

514 Availability of Data and Materials

515 All datasets and code are accessible on GitHub (Sippy, 2023).

516

517 Acknowledgements

- 518 The authors are indebted to the clinicians, managers and academics who have created
- 519 THRIVE and their generous help and thoughtful advice throughout the evaluation to assess
- 520 its effectiveness, in particular Sophie Dunn. We would also like to thank Rudolf Cardinal for
- 521 help with the research.
- 522

523 References

- Ashcraft LE, Goodrich DE, Hero J, Phares A, Bachrach RL, Quinn DA, Qureshi N,
 Ernecoff NC, Lederer LG, Scheunemann LP, et al (2024) A systematic review of
 experimentally tested implementation strategies across health and human service
 settings: evidence from 2010-2022. Implementation Science 19: 43
- 528 Auguie B (2017) gridExtra: Miscellaneous functions for "Grid" graphics.
- Augustsson H, Von Thiele Schwarz U, Stenfors-Hayes T, Hasson H (2015) Investigating
 Variations in Implementation Fidelity of an Organizational-Level Occupational Health
 Intervention. International Journal of Behavioral Medicine 22: 345–355
- Bartels SJ, Aschbrenner KA, Pratt SI, Zubkoff L, Jue K, Williams G, Godfrey MM,
 Cohen MJ, Banerjee S, Xie H, et al (2022) Virtual Learning Collaborative Compared
 to Technical Assistance as a Strategy for Implementing Health Promotion in Routine
 Mental Health Settings: A Hybrid Type 3 Cluster Randomized Trial. Administration
 and Policy in Mental Health 49: 1031–1046
- Bauer MS, Miller CJ, Kim B, Lew R, Stolzmann K, Sullivan J, Riendeau R, Pitcock J,
 Williamson A, Connolly S, et al (2019) Effectiveness of Implementing a
 Collaborative Chronic Care Model for Clinician Teams on Patient Outcomes and
 Health Status in Mental Health: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA network open 2:
 e190230
- 542 Best A, Greenhalgh T, Lewis S, Saul JE, Carroll S, Bitz J (2012) Large-system
 543 transformation in health care: a realist review. The Milbank Quarterly 90: 421–456
- 544 Chang W (2023) extrafont: Tools for Using Fonts.
- 545 Chung B, Ngo VK, Ong MK, Pulido E, Jones F, Gilmore J, Stoker-Mtume N, Johnson
 546 M, Tang L, Wells KB, et al (2015) Participation in Training for Depression Care
 547 Quality Improvement: A Randomized Trial of Community Engagement or Technical
 548 Support. Psychiatric Services (Washington, DC) 66: 831–839
- 549 Chung B, Ong M, Ettner SL, Jones F, Gilmore J, McCreary M, Sherbourne C, Ngo V,
 550 Koegel P, Tang L, et al (2014) 12-month outcomes of community engagement
 551 versus technical assistance to implement depression collaborative care: a partnered,
 552 cluster, randomized, comparative effectiveness trial. Annals of Internal Medicine 161:
 553 S23-34

- 554 **Department for Communities and Local Government** (2015) English Indices of 555 Deprivation 2015 File 5 Scores for the Indices of Deprivation.
- 556 **Department for Communities and Local Government** (2019) English Indices of 557 Deprivation 2019 File 5 Scores for the Indices of Deprivation.
- 558 **Department of Health** (2015) Future in mind: Promoting, protecting and improving our 559 children and young people's mental health and wellbeing.
- 560 **Dunnington D** (2023) ggspatial: Spatial data framework for ggplot2.
- 561 FC M, Davis TL, ggplot2 authors (2022) ggpattern: 'ggplot2 Pattern Geoms.
- 562 **Gamer M, Lemon J, ;puspendra.pusp22@gmail.com; IFPS** (2019) irr: Various 563 coefficients of interrater reliability and agreement.
- 564 Glasgow RE, Harden SM, Gaglio B, Rabin B, Smith ML, Porter GC, Ory MG,
- 565 **Estabrooks PA** (2019) RE-AIM Planning and Evaluation Framework: Adapting to 566 New Science and Practice With a 20-Year Review. Frontiers in Public Health **7**: 64
- 567 **Grol R, Grimshaw J** (2003) From best evidence to best practice: Effective implementation 568 of change in patients' care. Lancet **362**: 1225–1230
- Haines A, Kuruvilla S, Borchert M (2004) Bridging the implementation gap between
 knowledge and action for health. Bulletin of the World Health Organization 82: 724–
 731; discussion 732
- Hodgins M, McHugh C, Eapen V, Georgiou G, Curtis J, Lingam R (2024) Creation of the
 Youth Integration Project Framework: A Narrative Synthesis of the Youth Mental
 Health Integrated Care Literature. International Journal of Integrated Care 24: 5
- Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, Altman DG,
 Barbour V, Macdonald H, Johnston M, et al (2014) Better reporting of
 interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist
 and guide. British Medical Journal Clinical Research 348: g1687
- 579 **i-THRIVE Team** National i-THRIVE Community of Practice. Anna Freud National Centre for 580 Children and Families
- 581 Kilbourne AM, Almirall D, Goodrich DE, Lai Z, Abraham KM, Nord KM, Bowersox NW
 582 (2014) Enhancing outreach for persons with serious mental illness: 12-month results
 583 from a cluster randomized trial of an adaptive implementation strategy.
 584 Implementation science: IS 9: 163
- Leone SS, Smeets O, Lokman S, Boon B, van der Poel A, Van Doesum T, Shields Zeeman L, Kramer J, Smit F (2022) Comparing a ses-sensitive and an all-ses
 implementation strategy to improve participation rates of patients with a lower
 socioeconomic background in a web-based intervention for depressive complaints: a
 cluster randomised trial in primary care. BMC primary care 23: 205
- 590 May C (2006) A rational model for assessing and evaluating complex interventions in health
 591 care. BMC health services research 6: 86

- 592 Meyers DC, Durlak JA, Wandersman A (2012) The quality implementation framework: a
 593 synthesis of critical steps in the implementation process. American Journal of
 594 Community Psychology 50: 462–480
- Moore A, Jenkins P, Harris R, Fonagy P, Wolpert M (2016) The crisis in CAMHS: Can i Thrive provide a solution? British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy
 Children, Young People and Families 4–10
- 598 **Moore A, Lindley Baron-Cohen K, Simes E, Chen S, Fonagy P** (2023) A protocol for a 599 multi-site cohort study to evaluate child and adolescent mental health service 600 transformation in England using the i-THRIVE model. PLoS ONE **18**: e0265782
- Morton I, Hurley B, Castillo EG, Tang L, Gilmore J, Jones F, Watkins K, Chung B,
 Wells K (2020) Outcomes of two quality improvement implementation interventions
 for depression services in adults with substance use problems. The American
 Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse 46: 251–261
- 605 **Neuwirth E** (2014) RColorBrewer: ColorBrewer Palettes.
- 606 **NHS England** (2017) Mental Health Five Year Forward View Dashboard.
- 607 NHS England (2019) CCG Allocations 2019/20 to 2023/24 Technical Guidance.
- 608 NHS England (2021) CCG Improvement and Assessment Framework (CCG IAF) Data
 609 Extract 2017/18.
- Noble S, McLennan D, Noble M, Plunkett E, Gutacker N, Silk M, Wright G (2019) The
 English Indices of Deprivation 2019.
- 612 **Office for National Statistics** (2016) CCG (July 2015) Ultra Generalised Clipped 613 Boundaries in England.
- 614 **Office for National Statistics** (2017) CCG (April 2018) Ultra Generalised Clipped 615 Boundaries in England.
- 616 **Pebesma E** (2018) Simple features for R: Standardized support for spatial vector data. The 617 R Journal **10**: 439–446
- 618 Pebesma E, Bivand R (2023) Spatial data science: With applications in R. doi:
 619 10.1201/9780429459016
- Proctor E, Silmere H, Raghavan R, Hovmand P, Aarons G, Bunger A, Griffey R,
 Hensley M (2011) Outcomes for implementation research: conceptual distinctions,
 measurement challenges, and research agenda. Administration and Policy in Mental
 Health 38: 65–76
- Rahman AN, Applebaum RA, Schnelle JF, Simmons SF (2012) Translating research into
 practice in nursing homes: can we close the gap? The Gerontologist 52: 597–606
- Resnick B, Kolanowski A, Van Haitsma K, Galik E, Boltz M, Ellis J, Behrens L,
 Flanagan NM, Eshraghi KJ, Zhu S (2018) Testing the evidence integration triangle
 for implementation of interventions to manage behavioral and psychological
 symptoms associated with dementia: Protocol for a pragmatic trial. Research in
 Nursing & Health 41: 228–242

- Rocks S, Fazel M, Tsiachristas A (2020) Impact of transforming mental health services for
 young people in England on patient access, resource use and health: a quasi experimental study. British Medical Journal Open 10: e034067
- Rosenbaum PR, Rubin DB (1985) Constructing a Control Group Using Multivariate
 Matched Sampling Methods That Incorporate the Propensity Score. The American
 Statistician 39: 33
- Ruud T, Drake RE, Šaltytė Benth J, Drivenes K, Hartveit M, Heiervang K, Høifødt TS,
 Haaland VØ, Joa I, Johannessen JO, et al (2021) The Effect of Intensive
 Implementation Support on Fidelity for Four Evidence-Based Psychosis Treatments:
 A Cluster Randomized Trial. Administration and Policy in Mental Health 48: 909–920
- Sanders G, Griffiths C, Flint S, Christensen A, Gately P (2022) Implementation fidelity of
 an Integrated Healthy Lifestyle Service: a process evaluation. Perspectives in Public
 Health 142: 278–286
- Shortell SM, Gillies RR, Anderson DA, Mitchell JB, Morgan KL (1993) Creating
 organized delivery systems: The barriers and facilitators. Hospital and Health
 Services Administration 38: 447–466
- 647 Sinnema H, Majo MC, Volker D, Hoogendoorn A, Terluin B, Wensing M, van Balkom A
 648 (2015) Effectiveness of a tailored implementation programme to improve recognition,
 649 diagnosis and treatment of anxiety and depression in general practice: a cluster
 650 randomised controlled trial. Implementation science: IS 10: 33
- 651 Sippy R (2023) rsippy/THRIVE-fidelity: submission. doi: 10.5281/ZENODO.10402515
- Smith JD, Hasan M (2020) Quantitative approaches for the evaluation of implementation
 research studies. Psychiatry Research 283: 112521
- Stuart EA (2010) Matching Methods for Causal Inference: A Review and a Look Forward.
 Stat Sci. doi: 10.1214/09-STS313
- 656Stuart EA, Huskamp HA, Duckworth K, Simmons J, Song Z, Chernew ME, Barry CL657(2014) Using propensity scores in difference-in-differences models to estimate the658effects of a policy change. Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology65914: 166–182
- Toropova A, Björklund C, Bergström G, Elinder LS, Stigmar K, Wåhlin C, Jensen I,
 Kwak L (2022) Effectiveness of a multifaceted implementation strategy for improving
 adherence to the guideline for prevention of mental ill-health among school personnel
 in Sweden: a cluster randomized trial. Implementation science: IS 17: 23
- 664 Venables WN, Ripley BD (2002) Modern Applied Statistics with S, 4th Edition. Springer,
 665 New York
- Waltz TJ, Powell BJ, Matthieu MM, Damschroder LJ, Chinman MJ, Smith JL, Proctor
 EK, Kirchner JE (2015) Use of concept mapping to characterize relationships
 among implementation strategies and assess their feasibility and importance: results
 from the Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change (ERIC) study.
 Implementation Science 10: 109
- Waxmonsky J, Kilbourne AM, Goodrich DE, Nord KM, Lai Z, Laird C, Clogston J, Kim
 HM, Miller C, Bauer MS (2014) Enhanced fidelity to treatment for bipolar disorder:

- 673 results from a randomized controlled implementation trial. Psychiatric Services
 674 (Washington, DC) 65: 81–90
- Wells KB, Jones L, Chung B, Dixon EL, Tang L, Gilmore J, Sherbourne C, Ngo VK,
 Ong MK, Stockdale S, et al (2013) Community-partnered cluster-randomized
 comparative effectiveness trial of community engagement and planning or resources
 for services to address depression disparities. Journal of General Internal Medicine
 28: 1268–1278
- 680 **Wickham H** (2007) Reshaping Data with the reshape Package. Journal of Statistical 681 Software **21**: 1–20
- Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, Grolemund G,
 Hayes A, Henry L, Hester J, et al (2019) Welcome to the Tidyverse. Journal of
 Open Source Software 4: 1686
- 685 Wickham H, Bryan J (2023) readxl: Read Excel Files.
- 686 Wickham H, Miller E (2017) haven: Import and Export "SPSS", "Stata" and "SAS" Files.
- 687 Wilke CO (2020) cowplot: Streamlined plot theme and plot annotations for "ggplot2."
- Williams NJ, Glisson C, Hemmelgarn A, Green P (2017) Mechanisms of Change in the
 ARC Organizational Strategy: Increasing Mental Health Clinicians' EBP Adoption
 Through Improved Organizational Culture and Capacity. Administration and Policy in
 Mental Health 44: 269–283
- Wolpert M, Harris DR, Hodges DS, Fuggle DP, James DR, McKenna DC, Jones DM,
 Fonagy P, Fleming DI, Munk DS, et al THRIVE Framework for system change.
- Ku Y (2017) Generalized Synthetic Control Method: Causal Inference with Interactive Fixed
 Effects Models. Political Analysis 25: 57–76
- 696 Yoshida K, Bartel A (2022) tableone: Create "table 1" to describe baseline characteristics
 697 with or without propensity score weights.
- 698
- 699
- 700
- 701
- 702

Table 1: Estimates of Association Between the National i-THRIVE Programme and THRIVE Fidelity

Outcome	Estimated Score Change	95% CI	p-value			
Overall Fidelity	7.05	-4.47–18.57	0.212			
Macro-level Fidelity	2.92	-1.09–6.92	0.141			
Meso-level Fidelity	2.76	-1.98–7.51	0.234			
Micro-level Fidelity	1.39	-3.94–6.72	0.588			
CI = confidence interva	al	·				

Outcome	Working Relationship Quality	Estimated Score Change	95% CI	p-value
Overall Fidelity	Highly effective	16.41	1.69–31.13	0.031
	Ineffective	-2.76	-18.25–12.73	0.708
Macro-level Fidelity	Highly effective	6.95	2.15–11.75	0.007
·	Ineffective	-1.24	-6.29–3.80	0.605
Meso-level Fidelity	Highly effective	5.52	-0.66–11.71	0.076
·	Ineffective	-0.75	-7.26–5.76	0.808
Micro-level Fidelity	Highly effective	3.96	-3.24–11.15	0.257
	Ineffective	-0.78	-8.35–6.79	0.828
CI = confidence ir	nterval			

A. Implementation Sites





