

1 TITLE PAGE

2 ThinkCancer! The multi-method development of a complex behaviour change intervention  
3 to improve the early diagnosis of cancer in primary care

4 Authors

5 Alun Sursey<sup>1\*</sup>, Stefanie Disbesch<sup>1</sup>, Ruth Lewis<sup>1</sup>, Julia Hiscock<sup>1</sup>, Sadia Nafees<sup>1</sup>, Rebecca J Law<sup>1</sup>, Jessica  
6 L Roberts<sup>1</sup>, Annie Hendry<sup>1</sup>, Zoe Hoare<sup>2</sup>, Nia Goulden<sup>2</sup>, Marian A Stanciu<sup>3</sup>, Andrew Carson-Stevens<sup>4</sup>,  
7 Stephanie Smits<sup>4</sup>, Kate Brain<sup>4</sup>, Rhiannon T Edwards<sup>5</sup>, Nefyn Williams<sup>6</sup>, Richard D Neal<sup>7</sup>, Clare  
8 Wilkinson<sup>1</sup>

9 Affiliations

10 1) North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research, Bangor University, Bangor, United Kingdom

11 2) North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health (NORTH), Bangor University, Bangor,  
12 United Kingdom

13 3) School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom

14 4) Division of Population Medicine, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, Cardiff, United Kingdom

15 5) Centre for Health Economics and Medicines Evaluation (CHEME), Bangor University, Bangor,  
16 United Kingdom

17 6) Department of Primary Care and Mental Health, Institute of Population Health, University of  
18 Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom

19 7) Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, University of Leeds, Worsley Building, Leeds, United Kingdom

20

21 \*Correspondence: Dr A Sursey: [a.sursey@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:a.sursey@bangor.ac.uk) Orcid 0000-0002-6019-7787

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33 ABSTRACT

34 Background

35 Relatively poor UK cancer outcomes are blamed upon late diagnosis. Despite most cancer patients  
36 presenting to their GP with symptoms, diagnostic delay remains a common theme, with many  
37 clinical and non-clinical factors responsible. Early diagnosis is key to improving outcomes and  
38 survival. This paper reports the multi-method process to design a complex intervention to improve  
39 the timely diagnosis of symptomatic cancer.

40 Methods

41 A review of reviews, survey, discrete choice experiment, qualitative interviews and focus groups, all  
42 informed a realist evidence synthesis. This in turn informed the design of a complex intervention,  
43 guided by the Behaviour Change Wheel framework using a multi-step process.

44 Results

45 Key themes from the realist evidence synthesis included effective safety netting at practitioner and  
46 practice system level, increased vigilance and lowering referral thresholds. Qualitative findings  
47 explored the tensions, barriers and facilitators affecting suspected cancer referral. The Think Cancer!  
48 intervention is an educational and quality improvement workshop directed at the whole primary  
49 care team. Bespoke cancer safety netting plans and appointment of cancer champions are key  
50 components.

51 Conclusions

52 Think Cancer! is a novel primary care early cancer diagnosis intervention, requiring evaluation  
53 through a cluster randomised control trial.

54

55

56

57

58

59

## 60 **Background**

61 The role and importance of primary care (PC) in the diagnosis of cancer is well established.<sup>1</sup> Wales,  
62 like other UK countries, has relatively poor cancer outcomes<sup>2,3</sup> with late diagnosis recognised as a  
63 major contributor resulting in low one-year survival rates.<sup>4,5</sup> Early diagnosis has been shown to be  
64 key in improving cancer outcomes<sup>6</sup> and cancer survival.<sup>7</sup> It is therefore unsurprising that national  
65 and international cancer policies are heavily focussed on diagnosis. Referral rates and adherence to  
66 guidelines are lower in Wales,<sup>8,9</sup> with General Practitioners (GPs) in the UK overall less likely to take  
67 action on potential cancer symptoms.<sup>2</sup> These findings are unlikely to be unique to Wales with  
68 expected similar findings in other countries with comparable health care systems and areas of  
69 deprivation.


70 Most (85%) cancer patients initially present to their GP with symptoms,<sup>10,11</sup> yet diagnostic delay  
71 remains a common and emotive theme in cancer research.<sup>12</sup> Access to secondary care diagnostics  
72 and treatment within the UK health services, as with many other countries with similar models of  
73 care, places the GP as the first point of contact in a 'gatekeeping' role. Therefore, irrespective of  
74 scientific advances such as new diagnostic tests, rapid diagnostic centres for vague symptoms and  
75 evolving cancer therapies, unless the GP thinks about the possibility that their patient may have an  
76 underlying cancer, delays in investigation and referral will continue.

77 The Wales Interventions and Cancer Knowledge about Early Diagnosis (WICKED) Programme (Figure  
78 1) aims to develop and test a behavioural intervention targeted at GPs and primary care teams to  
79 improve early diagnosis of cancer using the Medical Research Council's framework for developing  
80 and evaluating complex interventions.<sup>13</sup> The aims of this phase of the project are to synthesise  
81 current evidence and to develop a complex intervention that will improve the quality of PC  
82 practitioners' knowledge, attitudes and referral behaviour (work packages 1-3). This paper describes  
83 the findings of those work packages and their contribution to intervention development, resulting in

84 the production of a complex behaviour change intervention that will be tested in a feasibility trial  
85 (work package 4).

86 Figure 1. Diagram of the WICKED Programme

87



88  
89

90

## 91 Method

92 The background, rationale, design and methods of the WICKED programme, leading to the  
93 development of the ThinkCancer! intervention, have been reported elsewhere.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, this  
94 section summarises the methods, focusing on their interconnectivity with the intervention  
95 development process.

### 96 Work package 1a: Review of reviews

97 A systematic review of reviews was undertaken to:

- 98 • identify the reasons for (or causes of) longer primary care intervals (PCIs) in the diagnosis of  
99 cancer;
- 100 • identify all interventions designed to reduce the PCI;

- 101 • identify the causes of longer PCIs, which could be modified by a behaviour change  
102 intervention;
- 103 • identify interventions designed to modify the behaviour of PC health professionals;
- 104 • identify non-behaviour change intervention components that could contribute to the  
105 ThinkCancer! intervention (e.g., structural or organisational modifications that could  
106 facilitate the behaviour change elements); and,
- 107 • identify which types of interventions (or intervention components) are applicable to UK and  
108 similar health systems.

109

110 The review of reviews followed methodological guidelines for rigorous conduct and reporting.<sup>16 17</sup>

111 The search strategy and rationale are reported in the protocol paper,<sup>14</sup> and are included in detail  
112 (supplementary file 1). The searches were conducted in October 2016 and extended to reviews  
113 published from 1995 onwards. These searches have not been updated as data was used to inform  
114 the starting point of the later intervention development steps, rather than as a stand-alone research  
115 output. Two reviewers independently screened titles and abstracts and then the full-text of relevant  
116 papers for inclusion. Disagreements were resolved by discussion. Data were extracted in tabular  
117 format. We did not formally appraise or exclude studies on the basis of quality; where relevant data  
118 contributed to the realist review we considered their 'trustworthiness' (i.e., the plausibility and  
119 coherence of the methods used to generate the data, and its contribution to the development of the  
120 synthesis) in that context.<sup>18</sup>

121

#### 122 Work package 1b: Realist review

123

124 The realist review aimed to identify and test programme theories underpinning identified  
125 interventions, and determine what works/or not, for whom and in what contexts. This process

126 informed, and was informed by, components of work package 2, and aided the design and  
127 development of the ThinkCancer! intervention. Specific objectives were to:

- 128 • identify evidence about interventions promoting prompt diagnosis/referral of suspected  
129 cancer in PC settings;
- 130 • identify the mechanisms through which these interventions directly or indirectly effect  
131 changes in the behaviour of individuals, groups and organisations in PC that lead to earlier  
132 referral and diagnosis;
- 133 • investigate the contextual characteristics that mediate the potential impact of these  
134 mechanisms on early referral and diagnosis in PC; and,
- 135 • develop a practical programme theory from the evidence synthesis that can be applied to  
136 the development of the ThinkCancer! Intervention.

137

138 The realist review followed on from the systematic review of reviews, in agreement with Rycroft-  
139 Malone, et al.,<sup>19</sup> adapted from Pawson, et al.<sup>20</sup> and RAMESES methodological guidance and  
140 reporting standards.<sup>21 22</sup> The first stage of the process involved data collection from multiple sources  
141 organised into a matrix of evidence (supplementary file 2), starting with a list of possible causes of  
142 longer PCIs in cancer referral, and examples of interventions to promote prompt diagnosis/referral  
143 drawn from scoping searches and background reading. Evidence was mapped against categories of  
144 barriers and facilitators to timely referral and diagnosis, further developed through a process of  
145 discussion and consensus between the research team operational group (see Figure 2).

146

147

148

149

150

151

152 Figure2. Areas of programme theory used in realist review.

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167


168

169

170

171

172



173 The six areas of focus were then developed as theory areas for the realist review in the form of

174 conjectured Context-Mechanism-Outcomes (CMOs) by two experienced researchers with a

175 background in primary care cancer research, and further refined through several stakeholder group

176 meetings of clinicians and patient participant involvement (PPI) representatives. The final stage of

177 the realist review involved testing and refining the programme theory by searching for and

178 compiling further evidence. A realist narrative was written up for each programme theory area with

179 recommendations.

180

181 Work Package 2a: Quantitative Survey and Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE)

182 The survey measured the GPs' cancer knowledge, investigation and referral attitudes, along with  
183 their behaviours, learning needs and preferences, and mechanisms supportive of change. The  
184 findings were used to identify the influences of Capability, Opportunity and Motivation on the target  
185 behaviour (COM-B). COM-B describes how changing behaviour at the individual and/or system level  
186 is a result of changing one or more components of psychological and physical Capability, social and  
187 physical Opportunity, and automatic and reflective Motivation which informed subsequent  
188 intervention development.<sup>14</sup>

189 All GPs in Wales (approximately 2000) were sent an email invitation to complete the survey between  
190 22<sup>nd</sup> August 2017 and 18<sup>th</sup> December 2017. A DCE was part of the online survey. The respondents  
191 were required to state preferences regarding hypothetical scenarios,<sup>23</sup> in order to explore GPs'  
192 preferences for different attributes relating to the earlier diagnosis of cancer in PC, and to explore  
193 how GPs are willing to trade between attributes. The attributes and levels were identified from a  
194 scoping search, results of which included a review of reviews, experts' opinions and consensus.  
195 Seven attributes used were prompts, audit, type of education and delivery, mode of delivery of  
196 education and training, access to diagnostic testing, safety netting and time spent on activities to  
197 achieve timely cancer diagnosis. Work Package 2b – Qualitative component

198 The qualitative component explored underlying GP and practice team beliefs and behaviours in  
199 identifying, investigating and referring cancer signs and symptoms (including perceived constraints,  
200 barriers or concerns), through telephone interviews and focus groups. The purposive sampling  
201 procedure and semi-structured topic guide are described elsewhere.<sup>14</sup> The focus groups also  
202 contributed to understanding the practicalities of how the intervention should be focused.



203 Twenty GPs were interviewed and four focus groups with PC practice teams were conducted. Both  
204 data sets were transcribed verbatim, organised and analysed using the five stages of the Framework  
205 process: familiarisation, thematic framework identification, indexing, charting, mapping and  
206 interpretation.<sup>24</sup>

207 Work package 3 – Behaviour Change Wheel (BCW) driven intervention development

208 All data from work packages 1 and 2 were collated to inform the BCW process and guide the  
209 development of an intervention designed to change a target behaviour (see Figure 3).<sup>14,25</sup> The  
210 starting point in designing a behaviour change intervention is to clarify the target behaviour, or the  
211 ‘behavioural diagnosis’.<sup>25</sup> For ThinkCancer! this was refined according to the main aims of the  
212 programme and discussed within the research team and wider stakeholder group. Our proposed  
213 target behaviour was identified as *GPs thinking of and acting on clinical presentations\* that could be*  
214 *cancer.*


215 Figure 3 depicts the different layers of the BCW with the COM-B model at its centre. (see  
216 supplementary file 3 for the detailed methodology of the application of the BCW).

217

218

219

220 Figure 3: The Behaviour Change Wheel (Reproduced with permission from authors)



221

222 Using a matrix of intervention functions and applying the APEASE criteria (Affordability,  
 223 Practicability, Effectiveness/cost-effectiveness, Acceptability, Side effects/safety and Equity)<sup>25 26</sup> we  
 224 selected the following functions that best suited our target behaviour: education, training,  
 225 enablement, environmental restructuring, modelling, persuasion and incentivisation. Intervention  
 226 functions were then matched to relevant Behaviour Change Techniques (BCTs), for example, in  
 227 relation to education and training, the relevant intervention functions included: *instruction,*  
 228 *information about health consequences, feedback on outcomes, prompts/cues, self-monitoring, and*  
 229 *verbal persuasion about capability.* A multidisciplinary intervention working group was convened to  
 230 develop the intervention, including members of the research team, a wider stakeholder group  
 231 including GPs to ensure real world applicability and an expert patient.

232 Public and Patient Involvement (PPI)

233 There has been continued and active Public and Patient Involvement (PPI) within the research  
 234 programme from its initial design and continued through each work package, with regular

235 contribution to research group meetings and advice and comment gained on project  
236 documentation.

237

## 238 **Results and Intervention Development**

### 239 Work package 1a: Review of reviews

240 After discarding duplicate references, 334 studies were identified, of which 37 were deemed to be  
241 potentially relevant and full papers were retrieved. Seventeen of these were included in the review.

242 <sup>7 27-42</sup> A summary of findings is presented in supplementary file 4.

243

244 Thirteen of the included studies were systematic reviews <sup>27 29 31-36 38-42</sup> and three were non-systematic  
245 narrative literature reviews. <sup>7 30 37</sup> The final study reported a consensus process with key informants

246 that was based upon an earlier literature review. <sup>28</sup> Ten studies focused on specific cancers:

247 haematological, breast and colon; <sup>27</sup> bladder <sup>29 39</sup>; colorectal <sup>30 33 41 42</sup>; upper gastro-intestinal <sup>31 32</sup>; and

248 colorectal and lung. <sup>36</sup> The remaining seven considered any cancer. Broadly speaking, three studies

249 focused on the impact on cancer referral of features of healthcare systems, <sup>28 33 37</sup> two focussed on

250 clinical roles and practices, <sup>29 31</sup> two on signs, symptoms and the process of diagnosis, <sup>39 40</sup> and six on

251 identifying or describing factors relating to diagnostic intervals. <sup>7 27 30 32 35 36</sup>

252

253 Only three reviews aimed to include studies that evaluated interventions to address delays or

254 promote early diagnosis of cancer. <sup>32 34 38</sup> Macdonald, et al. <sup>32</sup> evaluated factors associated with longer

255 patient and PC practitioner intervals for upper gastrointestinal cancer and aimed to describe an

256 intervention designed to reduce those intervals, but found no intervention studies that met their

257 inclusion criteria. <sup>32</sup> Mansell, et al. <sup>34</sup> aimed to identify interventions that reduce PC delay. Although

258 the review covered any cancer, only skin, breast, colorectal studies met the inclusion criteria; 22

259 interventions were identified, but no evidence that any intervention directly reduced PC delay in the

260 diagnosis of cancer. Limited evidence suggested that complex interventions such as audit and  
261 feedback, and specific skills training had the potential to reduce delays. Schichtel, et al.<sup>38</sup> examined  
262 the evidence for the effectiveness of educational interventions for primary healthcare professionals.  
263 Twenty studies were included but the authors concluded that, although some educational  
264 interventions delivered at a clinician as well as at a practice level may promote the early diagnosis of  
265 cancer in PC, there is limited evidence for their long-term sustainability and effectiveness.

266 Work package 1b: Realist review

267 The following initial conjectured Context-Mechanism-Outcome configurations (CMOs) were  
268 developed and refined:

269

270 CMO 1: Where explicit systems are put in place to plug potential gaps in the patient pathway (i.e.  
271 safety netting) (**context**), and members of the healthcare team identify and perceive themselves to  
272 have safety-netting responsibilities that are important and relevant to their role (e.g. to ensure test  
273 results are acted upon, referrals sent, follow-up appointments made and attended as advised etc.)  
274 (**mechanism**), then they will act upon them, and patients will be more likely to progress to referral  
275 without undue delay (**outcome**).

276

277 CMO2: Where systems are in place and patients are engaged in safety-netting processes (e.g. by  
278 being advised to come back if symptoms are not resolved or get worse, asked to ring if they don't  
279 hear about a test result, hospital appointment etc.) (**context**), and, by becoming more involved, they  
280 perceive the importance of these actions and are empowered to take more responsibility  
281 (**mechanism**), then they will adopt a more proactive role in their care and will be less likely to miss  
282 appointments etc. (**outcome**).

283

284 CMO 3: Where all practice staff who have contact with patients have been trained to recognise  
285 unexpected signs and uncharacteristic behaviours (e.g. altered appearance such as weight-loss,  
286 unusual consulting pattern) (**context**), and are therefore alert to, and notice these signs, and  
287 recognise the possibility of cancer (**mechanism**), then staff will be more likely to question patients  
288 and report suspicions, and GPs may identify more patients who they *should* worry about, pay closer  
289 attention to these patients, and perhaps elicit important information (signs, symptoms, previous or  
290 family history etc. that the patient may not recognise as relevant and would not otherwise  
291 volunteer) (**outcome**).

292

293 CMO 4: Where usual practice includes discussion of patient-safety (e.g. 'safety huddles', significant  
294 event audits), and there is a culture of frank, informal, non-judgemental interaction (**context**), and  
295 by sharing experiences and supporting each other, GPs benefit in terms of improved knowledge and  
296 confidence in their actions (**mechanism**) then they will be more likely to recognise when  
297 investigations and referrals are warranted, and less likely to delay referral because of uncertainty  
298 (**outcome**).

299

300 CMO 5: Where a practice audit of cancer referrals is conducted and feedback is given to GPs on  
301 whether recommended investigations and examinations were conducted (**context**), they will be  
302 aware of and reflect on their own personal performance, compared with local or national  
303 performance, and recognise how it can be improved and (**mechanism**) then they will be more likely  
304 to perform these tasks consistently, in line with good clinical practice and NICE guidance (**outcome**).

305

306 CMO 6: In the face of uncertainty about individual cancer referral decisions (e.g. vague symptoms,  
307 low-risk but not no-risk), if a philosophy of cancer-risk-averseness, and a practice culture of case-  
308 finding rather than gate-keeping are engendered (**context**), GPs will be more likely to lower their

309 individual risk threshold for urgent referrals and Think Cancer! (**mechanism**), so that more cases of  
310 suspected cancer will be identified and referred (**outcome**).

311 The final stage of the realist evidence synthesis led to completion of narrative summaries  
312 (Supplementary File 2), summarised into the following key headlines:

313

- 314 • Wider use of high quality and effective safety-netting in every aspect of the patient/health  
315 care professional interaction;
- 316 • Dual safety-netting responsibility between patient and practitioner by encouraging aware,  
317 engaged and empowered patients to co-navigate the patient journey;
- 318 • Increased vigilance and taking action when suspicions are raised (including all practice staff);
- 319 • Improving the practice level patient safety agenda;
- 320 • The right test, for the right patient, at the right time (guidelines, awareness, false negatives);  
321 and,
- 322 • Lowering the threshold to referral trigger (challenging gate keeper mentality, acting on gut  
323 feelings).

324

#### 325 Work package 2a: Quantitative Survey

326 In total, 1993 GPs were invited and 269 responded (13.5%). Respondents were representative of  
327 GPs in Wales in terms of personal and practice factors. There was strong agreement amongst  
328 respondents that they had changed their behaviour with regard to safety netting of symptoms in the  
329 past few years, and changing thresholds for investigation and referral, but less so for the use of  
330 decision support tools. The most prominent drivers of change were case discussions with colleagues  
331 and significant event audits. There was strong agreement that timelier diagnosis leads to better  
332 survival for the six cancers included in the survey (breast, colorectal, endometrial, myeloma,  
333 pancreas and renal), and that GPs had a large amount of influence on timely diagnosis of these

334 cancers. Respondents were less confident about patient management when they did not have  
 335 qualifying symptoms for urgent referral. GPs conveyed that they can, and have, changed their  
 336 cancer-related diagnostic activity, and believe that they can influence timely diagnosis. They also  
 337 identified a number of ways in which future interventions may be targeted to maximise behaviour  
 338 change.

339 Table 1 Exploring Capability, Opportunity and Motivation for behaviour change COM-B

<b>When it comes to you personally referring patients with suspected cancer symptoms, what do you think it would take for you to do it even better</b>				
I would have to....	N	Missing	Yes	No
<b>Capability</b>				
Know more about why it was important	253	16	85 (33.6%)	<b>168 (66.4 %)</b>
Know more about how to do it	253	16	71 (28.1%)	<b>182 (71.9%)</b>
Have better physical skills	253	16	60 (23.7%)	<b>193 (76.3%)</b>
Have more mental strength	253	16	67 (26.5%)	<b>186 (73.5%)</b>
Overcome mental obstacles	253	16	94 (37.2%)	<b>159 (62.8%)</b>
Have more mental stamina	253	16	101 (39.9%)	<b>152 (60.1%)</b>
<b>Opportunity</b>				
Have more time to do it	253	16	<b>195 (77.1%)</b>	58 (22.9%)
Have more money	253	16	19 (7.5%)	<b>234 (92.5%)</b>
Have it more easily accessible	253	16	<b>218 (86.2%)</b>	35 (13.8%)
Have more people around me doing it	253	16	90 (35.6%)	<b>163 (64.4%)</b>
Have more triggers to prompt me	253	16	110 (43.5%)	<b>143 (56.5%)</b>
Have more support from others	253	16	<b>154 (60.9%)</b>	99 (39.1%)

---



---

Motivation

Feel that I want to do it enough	252	17	55 (21.8%)	<b>197 (78.2%)</b>
Feel that I need to do it enough	252	17	83 (32.9%)	<b>169 (67.1%)</b>
Believe that it would be a good thing to do	252	17	126 (50.0%)	126 (50.0%)
Develop better plans for doing it	252	17	<b>142 (56.3%)</b>	110 (43.7%)
Develop a habit of doing it	252	17	<b>139 (55.2%)</b>	113 (44.8%)

---

340

341 \*Bold entries indicate the highest response category

342 Work package 2a: Discrete Choice Experiment (DCE)

343 Of the 269 survey respondents, 151 fully completed the DCE. Seven attributes and preferences were  
 344 explored, with five showing statistical significance. Open access to diagnostic tests was ranked as  
 345 most important, followed by practice level cancer audit. The other statistically significant  
 346 preferences were computerised prompts, blended online and face to face education sessions and a  
 347 preference towards patient responsibility in safety netting. The focus of educational continuing  
 348 professional development and time spent doing it were not ranked as statistically significant  
 349 attributes. (Supplementary File 5 shows the attributes and attribute levels offered along the logit  
 350 regression model and detailed DCE data analysis).

351 Work package 2b: Qualitative component

352 The qualitative work undertaken as part of the WICKED programme revealed important insights and  
 353 rich data relating to current challenges of PC teams dealing with patients who might have cancer. A  
 354 separate scientific paper is proposed to illustrate the methods and findings in detail. To highlight  
 355 some common themes with regard to intervention development, participants explained how they go  
 356 about identifying, investigating and referring patients with potential signs and symptoms of cancer.



357 They described how they address the need to diagnose cancer earlier, and what influences their  
358 behaviour, including NICE guidance, clinical judgement, patient factors and 'gut feeling'.

359 *"Well, some of them [the guidelines] you use every day, so it just becomes...something you're*  
360 *thinking about constantly...just part of the everyday decision making."* (Male, urban, medium  
361 deprivation, < 10yrs experience)

362 However, they were also influenced by their knowledge of the pressures within secondary care, and  
363 a concern not to add to an already strained system. This created a tension between GPs' internal,  
364 individual decision-making and their knowledge of the context-dependent pressures.

365 *"A big part of me wants to refer everyone. Yeah, 3% risk, you're more likely to catch that earlier*  
366 *diagnosis and get a curable disease. But at the same time, you don't want to completely swamp the*  
367 *system so that no one's getting it. It is very resource-limited. It does affect my practice significantly."*

368 (Female, urban, high deprivation, 15-25yrs experience)

369 Exploring perspectives from practice teams during the focus groups, it appears that some of this  
370 tension can potentially be offset by positive practice culture and helpful practice-based systems. For  
371 example, open door communication systems between staff members and a feeling that the whole  
372 practice team is united in a common goal.

373 *"I think on the phone you don't see people do you, but at the desk you do. So you notice their weight,*  
374 *or the yellowness or, you know if you think there is something not right, I mention it to one of the*  
375 *doctors."*

376 (Receptionist, urban area, non-training practice)

377

378


379

380 **The novel intervention - ThinkCancer!**

381 Data from all earlier work packages were included to build the content and proposed modes of  
382 delivery for a host of potential interventions. The recurring themes of safety netting, use of guidance  
383 and lowering referral thresholds were strongly represented with regard to content of the  
384 intervention, among other key topics. The most common intervention functions identified through  
385 the BCW process were education, training, enablement and environmental restructuring.

386 The resultant ThinkCancer! Intervention (see Figure 4) is a whole practice-based educational and  
387 quality improvement workshop, consisting of themed sessions for both clinical and non-clinical staff,  
388 the co-production of a bespoke practice-specific Cancer Safety Netting Plan (CSNP) and the  
389 appointment of a Cancer Safety Netting Champion (CSNC). The workshop aims to raise awareness  
390 and increase knowledge around current cancer diagnosis guidance and be delivered over half a day  
391 during GP protected educational time in the form of face-to-face or remotely delivered web based  
392 educational sessions. Sessions will consist of a series of interactive activities exploring existing  
393 processes within practices and developing plans for change to implement each component.  
394 Members of the research team will deliver the intervention; a member qualified as a GP Educator  
395 will oversee the workshop, supported by up to two research team staff members.

396 Figure 4 Summary outline of the ThinkCancer! intervention



397

398

399 Session 1

400 This session of the workshop will deliver a face-to-face or remote video linked educational session  
401 for all clinical staff at the practice. The overall aim is to raise knowledge and awareness around  
402 current guidance, hot topics in early diagnosis and safety netting, including the introduction of a new  
403 safety netting tool – the Shared Safety Netting Action Plan (SSNAP). The educational component of  
404 the ThinkCancer! Intervention has been developed in accordance with well-established educational  
405 principles and theories such as social cognitive theory and andragogical assumptions.<sup>43</sup> The  
406 curriculum principle, constructive alignment, was considered in mapping the intended learning  
407 outcomes (ILOs) against the learning activities and experiences, along with the assessment and  
408 evaluation plan.<sup>44</sup> Opportunities for discussion and reflection within the workshops will allow  
409 learners to connect any new learning with prior experience,<sup>45</sup> and making clear the relevance of the  
410 learning programme to daily practice should increase both the engagement and effectiveness of the  
411 learning experience. The session will specifically focus around key Intended Learning Outcomes  
412 (ILOs) as described below. The ILOs were developed from stakeholder review of data collected from  
413 work packages 1 and 2, specifically the programme theory developed from the realist review. This

414 was later further developed and refined in collaboration with RedWhale GP Update™ who are an  
415 established organisation delivering PC update courses, including a specific not for profit cancer and  
416 palliative care training programme. Hot topics in early diagnosis of cancer and common pitfalls were  
417 included in the ILOs from their materials. This collaboration allowed educational and content  
418 oversight and peer review. The ILOs for the clinician session comprise the following:

- 419 1. Understand the key points about the latest NICE guidelines;
- 420 2. Consider the recurrent themes in delayed diagnosis;
- 421 3. Be aware of guidance around thrombocytosis and cancer;
- 422 4. Be alert to common pitfalls in cancer detection and the dangers of false negative  
423 investigations;
- 424 5. Understand the importance of and techniques considered essential for high quality safety  
425 netting, with introduction of the safety-netting prescription;
- 426 6. Use the *ThinkCancer!* toolkit/manual as an information and signposting resource.

#### 427 Shared Safety Netting Action Plan (SSNAP) Tool

428 The SSNAP tool is a co-designed novel safety netting intervention in the form of a physical leaflet  
429 that can be given to a patient that formalises the advice given within a consultation detailing when  
430 and how to seek further medical review. Developed by a research team within the Yorkshire and  
431 Humber Patient Safety Translational Research Centre, the tool was developed from a mixed-method  
432 programme of research involving systematic review and exploratory qualitative work,<sup>46 47</sup> and  
433 culminating in a series of iterative co-design workshops and focus groups, including PC teams and  
434 patients. The use of the tool within the ThinkCancer! intervention practices and incorporation into  
435 their own bespoke safety netting plan is at the discretion of the individual practice.

436

437

438 Session 2

439 The non-clinical session will focus on patient-facing staff and their role in the early diagnosis of  
440 cancer. The aim is to increase awareness of red flag symptoms (using the Cancer Research UK Be  
441 Clear on Cancer Campaign)<sup>48</sup> and highlight non-specific but concerning symptoms that patients may  
442 complain of or present, that could indicate early presentation of cancer.<sup>49</sup> The secondary aim of this  
443 workshop is to improve confidence in sharing concerns within the practice team by placing the  
444 patient at the centre of all healthcare interactions and empowering staff. The format will be  
445 interactive and in two parts. Part 1 will include a gallery of posters on the wall with a walk around  
446 and discussion focussed on the Be Clear on Cancer campaigns. Symptom cards will be given that will  
447 include red flag symptoms for possible cancer and also other common symptoms reception staff are  
448 faced with when interacting with patients. Participants will then be asked to separate the symptom  
449 cards into two groups; red flag versus non red flag for cancer symptoms. The format for the  
450 matching exercise was conceived by a member of the research team with experience in adult and  
451 medical education. The second part will be a case discussion exploring common themes in early  
452 presentation of cancer, such as patient behaviours, for example changes in consultation patterns.

453

454 Session 3 – Cancer Safety Netting Plan (CSNP) and Cancer Safety Netting Champion (CSNC)

455 The aim of this component of the workshop is to facilitate the design and implementation of a  
456 practice-specific Cancer Safety Netting Plan (CSNP). This component of the workshop will be  
457 attended by both clinical and administrative staff. Information gathered prior to the workshop from  
458 a baseline practice questionnaire regarding current safety netting procedures will be discussed and  
459 reflected upon in an exercise involving the use of the CRUK safety netting flow diagram  
460 (Supplementary File 6). The practice team will consider the practice's existing safety netting

461 arrangements (if any), and the need for modification, augmentation, or the development of an  
462 entirely new plan. Overall leadership and responsibility for implementing the plan will rest with the  
463 practice-appointed Cancer Safety Netting Champion (CSNC), who will ideally be identified before the  
464 workshop but may be identified during the workshop. The use of a champion to affect positive  
465 change in projects and organisations is now well established.<sup>50</sup> The CSNC will take 'ownership' of the  
466 CSNP and be responsible for implementing it within and throughout the practice as well as the  
467 encouragement of a supportive environment for staff. The production, implementation, monitoring  
468 and evaluation of the plan will follow recognised Quality Improvement (QI) principles.<sup>51 52</sup> However,  
469 the minimum output of the intervention will be the reflective discussion generated and testing  
470 whether the development of a safety netting plan is feasible.


471

#### 472 Logic model

473 In order to assess and evaluate ThinkCancer!, drawing on the UK MRC framework for evaluation of  
474 complex interventions,<sup>13</sup> a logic model of the proposed intervention has been created (Figure 5).  
475 This will allow the research team to gain a greater understanding of each working part of the  
476 intervention by mapping out each individual component of the intervention by its input and activity.  
477 Detailing the anticipated outputs and outcomes allow the research team to consider the most  
478 effective ways of measuring and recording the effects of the intervention, therefore suggesting  
479 primary and secondary outcome measures as featured in this logic model. The current primary  
480 outcome measures for ThinkCancer! are Two Week Wait referral rate and Primary Care Interval  
481 (PCI), where the assumption is made that raising awareness and providing education will raise  
482 referral rates, and improving safety netting and GP practice systems will shorten the PCI, thereby  
483 reducing diagnostic delay in the more difficult to diagnose cancers. These measures are expected to  
484 best assess effectiveness of the intervention during a definitive phase 3 randomised controlled trial.  
485 The secondary outcome measures relate to feasibility criteria as this is a novel complex intervention.

486 Refinement of the logic model from data collected during a proposed feasibility trial will allow  
 487 iterative development of the intervention.

488 Figure 5. The ThinkCancer! Intervention Logic Model



489

490

491 **Discussion**

492 The WICKED programme involved a rigorous and structured process of intervention development,  
 493 built on a sound foundation of primary research, by a core team of multi-professional researchers  
 494 supported by methodological specialists. The process was guided at each stage by expert patient  
 495 involvement and stakeholders, contributing to the validity and future implementation of the

496 intervention. This research programme was originally set up to improve cancer outcomes in Wales,  
497 and has developed an intervention that is relevant across the whole of the United Kingdom and for  
498 any other country where health care is structured around primary care as the first point of contact.  
499 The landscape of cancer diagnosis is topical and fast changing with research and policy change  
500 occurring at a rapid rate. Single pathway referral processes may aid referrers and patients along their  
501 diagnostic journeys when cancer is suspected, and the introduction of Rapid Diagnostic Centres for  
502 patients presenting with low risk but not no risk symptoms are likely to reduce diagnostic intervals.  
503 However, if the possibility of a cancer diagnosis is not considered, if the clinician does not Think  
504 Cancer!, the patient will not be referred and diagnostic delays continue.

505 This potential limitation to the validity of the data collected in the early review work has been  
506 mitigated by the research team regularly reviewing new published papers and policy against the  
507 original findings. The strength of this multidimensional approach applied in the WICKED programme  
508 lies in two important factors. Firstly, the deep insight gained within the qualitative work in revealing  
509 the attitudes, feelings and behaviours of the clinical staff in relation to real world challenges of  
510 cancer diagnosis and referral, giving sharp focus to what is most important within the literature to  
511 exploit in an intervention to promote timely cancer diagnosis. Secondly, in the use of the BCW to  
512 guide the intervention development, all data from each work package was recycled to inform the  
513 process, eliminating any “research waste”. This environmentally friendly research method has added  
514 to the strength, depth and scientific rigour of the format and delivery of the proposed intervention. It  
515 is difficult to objectively measure the quality of intervention development and reporting but there  
516 are limited guidelines, such as The Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDiER)  
517 checklist.<sup>53</sup> ThinkCancer! satisfies all domains relating to initial design prior to testing as described in  
518 this check list. A recently published eDelphi consensus aiming to provide more in-depth guidance on  
519 the reporting of intervention development studies in health research (GUIDED),<sup>54</sup> achieved  
520 consensus on fourteen reporting items. The intervention development described in this paper  
521 satisfies the majority of those reporting items. ThinkCancer! will be tested and iteratively developed



522 within a feasibility trial delivered in Wales in 2020, with an economic and mixed method process  
523 evaluation.

## 524 **Conclusion**

525 ThinkCancer! is a novel, theory-informed educational and quality improvement practice-level  
526 intervention, aiming to improve the early diagnosis of cancer in primary care. The content of the  
527 intervention and the way it will be delivered has been the output of a comprehensive multi-method  
528 programme of primary research, developed in accordance with the MRC framework.<sup>13</sup> This complex  
529 intervention will be tested in a randomised controlled feasibility trial, with embedded process and  
530 economic evaluation, to iteratively adapt and refine the intervention, assess the usual feasibility  
531 criteria and test proposed outcome measures. The findings will go on to inform a definitive large-  
532 scale phase 3 randomised control trial.

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552 Additional Information

553

554 Funding and Disclosures

555 The WICKED research programme is entirely funded by Cancer Research Wales. RDN is an associate  
556 director of the CanTest Collaborative funded by Cancer Research UK (C8640/A23385).

557

558 Authorship

559 All named authors meet the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) criteria for  
560 authorship for this article, take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, and have given  
561 their approval for this version to be published.

562

563 Authors' contribution

564 The authors contributions are as follows: conceiving and designing the study: CW,RDN,NW,RTE, KB,  
565 SS, ACS, MAS, NG, ZH, R JL, SN, JH, RL; data gathering and interpretation: CW,RDN, NW, RTE, KB, SS,  
566 ACS, MAS, NG, ZH, AH, JLR, R JL, SN, JH, RL, SD, AS; drafting or revising the manuscript CW, RDN, NW,  
567 RTE, KB, SS, ACS, MAS, NG, ZH, AH, JLR, R JL, SN, JH, RL, SD, AS.

568

569 Data availability

570 All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article/as  
571 supplementary information files.

572

573 Acknowledgements

574 The authors would like to thank our patient representative Jan Rose and all clinical and research  
575 colleagues who assisted in the design, delivery and data interpretation of the WICKED research  
576 programme. We acknowledge the contributions of Maggie Hendry (programme design and review  
577 work), Dr Lynne Williams (realist review), Dr Jane Heyhoe (Yorkshire and Humber Patient Safety  
578 Translational Research Centre - intervention development and process evaluation) and Dr Caroline  
579 Greene (RedWhale GPUupdate – intervention development and medical education expertise).

580

581

582

583

584

585

586

587 **References**

- 588 1. Emery JD, Shaw K, Williams B, Mazza D, Fallon-Ferguson J, Varlow M, et al. The role of primary  
589 care in early detection and follow-up of cancer. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* 2014;11(1):38-48.
- 590 2. Rose PW, Rubin G, Perera-Salazar R, Almberg SS, Barisic A, Dawes M, et al. Explaining variation in  
591 cancer survival between 11 jurisdictions in the International Cancer Benchmarking  
592 Partnership: a primary care vignette survey. *BMJ Open* 2015;5(5):e007212.
- 593 3. CRUK. Cancer Research UK position paper: The diagnostic workforce in Wales. London, 2018.
- 594 4. Richards MA. The size of the prize for earlier diagnosis of cancer in England. *Br J Cancer* 2009;101  
595 Suppl 2:S125-9.
- 596 5. Butler J, Foot C, Bomb M, Hiom S, Coleman M, Bryant H, et al. The International Cancer  
597 Benchmarking Partnership: an international collaboration to inform cancer policy in  
598 Australia, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom. *Health Policy*  
599 2013;112(1-2):148-55.
- 600 6. Rubin G, Berendsen A, Crawford SM, Dommert R, Earle C, Emery J, et al. The expanding role of  
601 primary care in cancer control. *Lancet Oncol* 2015;16(12):1231-72.
- 602 7. Hamilton W, Walter FM, Rubin G, Neal RD. Improving early diagnosis of symptomatic cancer. *Nat*  
603 *Rev Clin Oncol* 2016;13(12):740-49.
- 604 8. Nicholson BD, Mant D, Neal RD, Hart N, Hamilton W, Shinkins B, et al. International variation in  
605 adherence to referral guidelines for suspected cancer: a secondary analysis of survey data.  
606 *Br J Gen Pract* 2016;66(643):e106-13.
- 607 9. Wales Cancer Network. Cancer Delivery Plan for Wales 2016-2020. The highest standard of care  
608 for everyone with cancer. : Welsh Government, 2016.
- 609 10. Hansen RP, Vedsted P, Sokolowski I, Sondergaard J, Olesen F. Time intervals from first symptom  
610 to treatment of cancer: a cohort study of 2,212 newly diagnosed cancer patients. *BMC*  
611 *Health Serv Res* 2011;11:284.
- 612 11. Allgar VL, Neal RD. Delays in the diagnosis of six cancers: analysis of data from the National  
613 Survey of NHS Patients: Cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2005;92(11):1959-70.
- 614 12. Neal RD, Din NU, Hamilton W, Ukoumunne OC, Carter B, Stapley S, et al. Comparison of cancer  
615 diagnostic intervals before and after implementation of NICE guidelines: analysis of data  
616 from the UK General Practice Research Database. *Br J Cancer* 2014;110(3):584-92.
- 617 13. <https://mrc.ukri.org/documents/pdf/complex-interventions-guidance/>
- 618 14. Stanciu MA, Law RJ, Nafees S, Hendry M, Yeo ST, Hiscock J, et al. Development of an intervention  
619 to expedite cancer diagnosis through primary care: a protocol. *BJGP Open* 2018;2(3). DOI:  
620 <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgpopen18X101595>.
- 621 15. Weller D, Vedsted P, Rubin G, Walter FM, Emery J, Scott S, et al. The Aarhus statement:  
622 improving design and reporting of studies on early cancer diagnosis. *Br J Cancer*  
623 2012;106(7):1262-7.
- 624 16. CRD. Systematic Reviews: CRD's Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Healthcare University of  
625 York: CRD, 2009.
- 626 17. Smith V, Devane D, Begley CM, Clarke M. Methodology in conducting a systematic review of  
627 systematic reviews of healthcare interventions. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2011;11(1):15.
- 628 18. Pawson R. Digging for Nuggets: How 'Bad' Research Can Yield 'Good' Evidence. *International*  
629 *Journal of Social Research Methodology* 2006;9(2):127-42.
- 630 19. Rycroft-Malone J, McCormack B, Hutchinson AM, DeCorby K, Bucknall TK, Kent B, et al. Realist  
631 synthesis: illustrating the method for implementation research. *Implement Sci* 2012;7:33.

- 632 20. Pawson R, Greenhalgh T, Harvey G, Walshe K. Realist Synthesis: An Introduction. RMP Methods  
633 Paper 2/2004. *RMP Methods Paper 2/2004*. Manchester, UK: ESRC Methods Programme,  
634 Manchester University, 2004.
- 635 21. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, Buckingham J, Pawson R. RAMESES publication standards:  
636 realist syntheses. *BMC Med* 2013;11:21.
- 637 22. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, Pawson R. Development of methodological guidance,  
638 publication standards and training materials for realist and meta-narrative reviews: the  
639 RAMESES (Realist And Meta-narrative Evidence Syntheses – Evolving Standards) project.  
640 2014.
- 641 23. Ryan M, Gerard K. Using discrete choice experiments to value health care programmes: current  
642 practice and future research reflections. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy* 2003;2(1):55-64.
- 643 24. Ritchie J, Spencer L. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In: Analyzing qualitative  
644 data 2002 Sep 9 (pp. 187-208). Routledge.
- 645 25. Michie S, Atkins L, West R. *The Behaviour Change Wheel. A guide to designing interventions*.  
646 Great Britain: Silverback Publishing, 2014.
- 647 26. Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S. Validation of the theoretical domains framework for use in  
648 behaviour change and implementation research. *Implement Sci* 2012;7:37.
- 649 27. Abel GA, Friese CR, Magazu LS, Richardson LC, Fernandez ME, De Zengotita JJ, et al. Delays in  
650 referral and diagnosis for chronic hematologic malignancies: a literature review. *Leuk*  
651 *Lymphoma* 2008;49(7):1352-9.
- 652 28. Brown S, Castelli M, Hunter DJ, Erskine J, Vedsted P, Foot C, et al. How might healthcare systems  
653 influence speed of cancer diagnosis: a narrative review. *Soc Sci Med* 2014;116:56-63.
- 654 29. Burge F, Kockelbergh R. Closing the Gender Gap: Can We Improve Bladder Cancer Survival in  
655 Women? - A Systematic Review of Diagnosis, Treatment and Outcomes. *Urol Int*  
656 2016;97(4):373-79.
- 657 30. Carter S, Winslet M. Delay in the presentation of colorectal carcinoma: a review of causation. *Int*  
658 *J Colorectal Dis* 1998;13(1):27-31.
- 659 31. Gikas A, Triantafyllidis JK. The role of primary care physicians in early diagnosis and treatment of  
660 chronic gastrointestinal diseases. *Int J Gen Med* 2014;7:159-73.
- 661 32. Macdonald S, Macleod U, Campbell NC, Weller D, Mitchell E. Systematic review of factors  
662 influencing patient and practitioner delay in diagnosis of upper gastrointestinal cancer. *Br J*  
663 *Cancer* 2006;94(9):1272-80.
- 664 33. Mangion D, Brennan A. Relationship between the 'two-week rule' and colorectal cancer  
665 diagnosis. *Br J Nurs* 2014;23(12):660-7.
- 666 34. Mansell G, Shapley M, Jordan JL, Jordan K. Interventions to reduce primary care delay in cancer  
667 referral: a systematic review. *Br J Gen Pract* 2011;61(593):e821-35.
- 668 35. Mitchell E, Macdonald S, Campbell NC, Weller D, Macleod U. Influences on pre-hospital delay in  
669 the diagnosis of colorectal cancer: a systematic review. *Br J Cancer* 2008;98(1):60-70.
- 670 36. Mitchell ED, Pickwell-Smith B, Macleod U. Risk factors for emergency presentation with lung and  
671 colorectal cancers: a systematic review. *BMJ Open* 2015;5(4):e006965.
- 672 37. Ott JJ, Ullrich A, Miller AB. The importance of early symptom recognition in the context of early  
673 detection and cancer survival. *Eur J Cancer* 2009;45(16):2743-8.
- 674 38. Schichtel M, Rose PW, Sellers C. Educational interventions for primary healthcare professionals  
675 to promote the early diagnosis of cancer: a systematic review. *Educ Prim Care*  
676 2013;24(4):274-90.
- 677 39. Schmidt-Hansen M, Berendse S, Hamilton W. The association between symptoms and bladder or  
678 renal tract cancer in primary care: a systematic review. *Br J Gen Pract* 2015;65(640):e769-75.
- 679 40. Shapley M, Mansell G, Jordan JL, Jordan KP. Positive predictive values of  $\geq 5\%$  in primary care  
680 for cancer: systematic review. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010;60(578):e366-77.

- 681 41. Thompson MR, Heath I, Swarbrick ET, Wood LF, Ellis BG. Earlier diagnosis and treatment of  
682 symptomatic bowel cancer: can it be achieved and how much will it improve survival?  
683 *Colorectal Dis* 2011;13(1):6-16.
- 684 42. Williams TG, Cubiella J, Griffin SJ, Walter FM, Usher-Smith JA. Risk prediction models for  
685 colorectal cancer in people with symptoms: a systematic review. *BMC Gastroenterol*  
686 2016;16(1):63.
- 687 43. Mann KV. Theoretical perspectives in medical education: past experience and future possibilities.  
688 *Med Educ* 2011;45(1):60-8.
- 689 44. Biggs J. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. 2 ed. Buckingham: The Society for Research  
690 into Higher Education and Open University Press, 2003.
- 691 45. Dornan T, Mann K, Scherpbier A, Spencer J. *Medical Education: Theory and Practice. Integrates*  
692 *practice, theory and research.*: Churchill Livingstone, Elsevier, 2011.
- 693 46. Heyhoe J, Reynolds C, Dunning A, Johnson O, Howat A, Lawton R. Patient involvement in  
694 diagnosing cancer in primary care: a systematic review of current interventions. *Br J Gen*  
695 *Pract*. 2018 Mar;68(668):e211-e224.
- 696 47. Heyhoe, J, Reynolds, C, Lawton, R. The early diagnosis of cancer in primary care: A qualitative  
697 exploration of the patient's role and acceptable safety-netting strategies. *Eur J Cancer*  
698 *Care*. 2020; 29:e13195.
- 699 48. <https://www.nhs.uk/be-clear-on-cancer#jjh8yMZAroC6BsP0.97>
- 700 49. Pearson C, Poirier V, Fitzgerald K, et al. Crosssectional study using primary care and cancer  
701 registration data to investigate patients with cancer presenting with nonspecific symptoms.  
702 *BMJ Open* 2020;10:e033008. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033008
- 703 50. Shaw EK, Howard J, West DR, Crabtree BF, Nease DE, Jr., Tutt B, et al. The role of the champion in  
704 primary care change efforts: from the State Networks of Colorado Ambulatory Practices and  
705 Partners (SNOCAP). *J Am Board Fam Med* 2012;25(5):676-85.
- 706 51. Langley GJ, Moen RD, Nolan KM, Nolan TW, Norman CL, Provost LP. *The improvement guide: a*  
707 *practical approach to enhancing organizational performance*. John Wiley & Sons; 2009.
- 708 52. Parry GJ, Carson-Stevens A, Luff DF, McPherson ME, Goldmann DA. Recommendations for  
709 evaluation of health care improvement initiatives. *Academic Pediatrics*. 2013 Nov  
710 1;13(6):S23-30.
- 711 53. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, et al. Better reporting of interventions: template for  
712 intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ* 2014;348:g1687.
- 713 54. Duncan E, O'Cathain A, Rousseau N, et al. Guidance for reporting intervention development  
714 studies in health research (GUIDED): an evidence-based consensus study. *BMJ Open*  
715 2020;10:e033516.
- 716
- 717