

1 **Early Psychosis Informatics into Care [EPICare]: A co-designed protocol for**
2 **implementing and evaluating a national integrated digital registry and clinical**
3 **decision support system within early intervention in psychosis services**

4
5 Siân Lowri Griffiths,¹ Graham K. Murray,^{2,3} Yanakan Logeswaran,⁴ John Ainsworth,⁵ Sophie M.
6 Allan,^{3,4} Niyah Campbell,¹ Richard Drake,⁵ Mohammad Zia Katshu,⁶ Matthew Machin,⁵ Megan A.
7 Pope,¹ Sarah A. Sullivan,^{7,8} Justin Waring,⁹ Tumelo Bogatsu,¹ Julie Kane,¹⁰ Tyler Weetman,¹⁰ Sonia
8 Johnson,^{4,11} James B. Kirkbride,^{4*} Rachel Upthegrove^{1,10*}

9
10 **Joint senior authorship*

11
12 ¹ Institute for Mental Health, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

13 ² University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

14 ³ CAMEO, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust

15 ⁴ University College London, London, UK

16 ⁵ The University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

17 ⁶ The University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

18 ⁷ Centre for Academic Mental Health, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

19 ⁸ Biomedical Research Centre, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

20 ⁹ School of Social Policy, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

21 ¹⁰ Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK

22 ¹¹ Camden and Islington NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

23
24 *Corresponding Author:* Professor Rachel Upthegrove, Institute for Mental Health, Wolfson Centre,
25 University of Birmingham, 52 Pritchatts Road, Birmingham, B15 2TT; Email:
26 r.upthegrove@bham.ac.uk

27
28 **FUNDING STATEMENT**

29 EPICare is fully funded by the NIHR Programme Development Grants: PDG Mental Health Call
30 2021, grant number [NIHR203669]. Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust
31 agreed to act as sponsor for this study. The work is supported by the NIHR UCLH Biomedical
32 Research Centre.

33
34 **COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT** NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

35 GKM has received consultancy fees from ieso. RU reports speaker fees from Sunovion, Springer
36 Healthcare, Otsuka and Vitaris outside the submitted work and holds unpaid officership with the
37 British Association for Pharmacology - Honorary General Secretary 2021-2024 and is Deputy
38 Editor, The British Journal of Psychiatry. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not
39 necessarily those of the NIHR.

40

41 Word Count: 4,361; Abstract: 296

42

43 **ABSTRACT**

44 **Introduction:** Early Intervention in Psychosis services are nationally mandated in England to
45 provide multidisciplinary care to people experiencing first-episode psychosis, which
46 disproportionately affects deprived and ethnic minority youth. Quality of service provision varies by
47 region, and people from historically underserved populations have unequal access. In other disease
48 areas, including stroke and dementia, national digital registries coupled with clinical decision
49 support systems have revolutionised delivery of equitable, evidence-based interventions to
50 transform patient outcomes and reduce population-level disparities in care and prognosis. Given
51 psychosis is ranked the third most burdensome mental health condition by the World Health
52 Organization, it is essential that we achieve the same parity of health improvements. Here, we
53 provide details of a co-designed protocol to produce an evidence-based, stakeholder-informed
54 framework for the build, implementation, and evaluation of a national integrated digital registry and
55 clinical decision support system for psychosis, known as EPICare (Early Psychosis Informatics for
56 Care).

57 **Methods and Analysis:** Using a participatory co-design framework, we engaged key stakeholders
58 (N~40-50) across four meetings to establish the parameters and essential features of EPICare and
59 identify factors likely to influence adoption and implementation into routine practice. Stakeholders
60 consisted of organisational, clinical, academic, and patient and public contributors. In collaboration
61 with National Health Service (NHS) informatics teams, we identified how to retrieve key data items
62 from Electronic Health Records and subsequently design the software architecture and data model
63 to create an infrastructure plan for future implementation. Guided by Normalisation Process Theory,
64 data synthesised from observations of stakeholder meetings and individual interviews (n=10) were
65 subject to interpretative qualitative analysis. Finally, a co-designed set of guides were produced to
66 allow for the build, implementation, and evaluation of EPICare in a larger, future study. An
67 inclusive, representative stakeholder group, fully engaged with the future co-development of
68 EPICare, was also established.

69

70 INTRODUCTION

71 Psychotic disorders, including schizophrenia, are among the most disabling illnesses worldwide and
72 are often accompanied by enormous personal, family, societal and carer burden (1). Rates of
73 psychosis are unequally distributed throughout the population, with the highest rates found in
74 historically underserved communities, younger populations, and those from minority ethnic
75 backgrounds (2-5). For example, within the UK, people from Black ethnic backgrounds (African,
76 Caribbean, British) are between 3-5 times more likely to experience a first episode of psychosis than
77 White British individuals, and there is evidence that rates are also approximately twice as high for
78 people from Pakistani, Bangladeshi, and mixed ethnic backgrounds in England (2, 6). Further, the
79 need for treatment delivered by Early Intervention Psychosis (EIP) services in England has been
80 identified as highest in several historically underserved regions of England, and in related major
81 conurbations, such as Birmingham, Greater Manchester, Bradford and parts of inner-city London
82 (6). This need for EIP care is closely aligned to populations exposed to greater structural
83 disadvantage including multiple deprivation and social fragmentation (6).

84

85 EIP is an internationally adopted model of care, based largely on social inclusion, service user and
86 care engagement, and relapse prevention. In England, EIP services are nationally commissioned to
87 provide evidence-based, multidisciplinary care according to eight NICE-based national standards
88 for people experiencing first-episode psychosis: 1) a maximum waiting time of 14 days from initial
89 referral to commencement of treatment; 2) offer of cognitive behavioural therapy for psychosis; 3)
90 take up of family interventions; 4) offer of clozapine after poor response to at least two other
91 antipsychotic medications; 5) take up of supported employment and education programmes; 6)
92 annual physical health assessments; 7) offer of interventions relevant to physical health (for
93 example, smoking cessation, exercise or substance use programmes); and 8) take up or referral to
94 carer-focused education and support programmes (7). Each care standard is evidence-based, often
95 from randomised controlled trials. Each standard has demonstrated improvement in patient
96 outcomes including remission of symptoms, readmission, recovery, premature mortality and
97 important social and vocational outcomes (8, 9). Importantly, EIP care is cost-effective relative to
98 other forms of care and management for people with psychosis, and EIP services are highly valued
99 by service users (10, 11).

100

101 Despite evidence-based standardised targets, only 30-40% of people experiencing psychotic
102 disorders make a full recovery (12), with evidence of large variation in care (13-16). Longer term
103 outcomes are equally poor, with increased rates of physical illnesses (17) and life expectancy
104 reduced by around 15 years compared with people who do not go on to develop severe mental

105 illness (18). This suggests that much work is needed to understand which elements of EIP services
106 are working, and for whom, and whether they lead to better long term outcomes (16).

107

108 Variation in outcomes may be related to regional or individual disparities in the care offered and
109 received during EIP, particularly in historically underserved communities where need is greatest,
110 but where there may be insufficient resources to offer standardised care tailored to the needs of local
111 populations. For example, recent data indicates that people with psychosis from Black African and
112 Caribbean backgrounds were 15-30% less likely to receive the equivalent level of cognitive
113 behavioural therapy for their condition compared to White British people (19). Cross-sectional
114 survey data from England and Wales has highlighted further inequalities in care, with Black service
115 users being around 44% less likely to be offered clozapine (19), the only existing medication for
116 treatment-resistant schizophrenia (13). There is also evidence for disparities in outcomes post-EIP,
117 with deprivation related to higher rates of relapse and need for continuing care in secondary mental
118 health services (20). Black and Asian racial minoritized groups are also more likely to continue in
119 secondary mental health care two years following EIP discharge (21).

120

121 Despite this, data currently being routinely collected via a patient's electronic health record does not
122 provide accessible, longitudinal, and nationally representative data to determine the magnitude,
123 causes or consequences of inequitable access to EIP care in England. Relatedly, routine data
124 collected by EIP services in England does not include measures of symptomatic recovery, usually
125 the primary outcome for understanding what treatments work for whom, thus preventing us from
126 developing a national understanding of the clinical effectiveness of treatments in the real world. In
127 turn, neither does it provide a mechanism for immediately improving clinical practice by feeding
128 back real-time actionable insights that would allow treatments to be targeted and tailored to
129 individual patient needs. For example, whilst all EIP providers send data on broad levels of service
130 use into NHS Digital's Mental Health Services Dataset, the dataset is less suited to ascertain
131 accurate estimates of the incidence of psychotic disorders in England, because current methods of
132 data collection do not differentiate between people engaging in EIP treatment for their first ever
133 episode of psychosis from those who may have existing psychosis, but engage in treatment in a new
134 EIP service for the first time. Further, Mental Health Services Dataset data does not record whether
135 those engaging with EIP treatment later fulfil diagnostic criteria for psychotic disorder. The Mental
136 Health Services Dataset also does not allow us to understand what treatments are delivered to
137 whom, and when, nor their impact on patient recovery and other downstream outcomes.
138 Furthermore, the pioneering National Clinical Audit of Psychosis (22), which has assessed service
139 fidelity annually since 2017, is a retrospective, cross-sectional manual audit of up to 100 patients

140 with first-episode psychosis in each EIP team in England (22). Although plans exist to revise the
141 data collection methodology, current practice reduces data quality, delays service improvement, and
142 diverts finite EIP resources away from frontline care. There are also no plans for the audit to
143 provide real-time feedback of data to clinical teams. These issues could be eliminated by the
144 provision of a prospectively-collected national digital psychosis registry, able to supply actionable
145 insights in real time to patients, clinical teams, service managers and policymakers via an embedded
146 clinical decision support system (CDSS).

147

148 We propose to revolutionise the use of electronic health record data to improve national, local, and
149 individual clinical decision-making and promote better patient and public health outcomes for
150 people experiencing first-episode psychosis, by carefully developing and demonstrating the utility
151 of a prospectively collected digital registry and CDSS in England, capable of being implemented
152 nationally. This would provide standardised information to understand the treated burden of
153 psychosis in the NHS; ensure equitable, responsive, local resource allocation; support reliable,
154 quick, and efficient identification and targeting of any local, regional or group-based disparities in
155 access to care; and improve patient pathways through care and downstream outcomes, including
156 recovery; and finally, enhance understanding of the relationship between interventions provided and
157 outcomes, as well as the relationship between clinical and social characteristics and outcomes.

158

159 The potential for further record linkage to other health and social domains also offers the prospect
160 of integrating prospectively collected data from other routine sources including primary care, Office
161 for National Statistics mortality, the Office for National Statistics Census, the National Pupil
162 Database, and Hospital Episode Statistics. This would provide a deeply phenotyped, longitudinal
163 database for clinical and policy decision making. It would also support gold standard research in
164 clinical psychiatry, experimental medicine, and observational epidemiology, to identify, understand,
165 and address the causes and consequences of disparities in health and patient treatment, as well as
166 improve downstream outcomes for people experiencing psychosis.

167

168 Digital registries have been deployed successfully in the UK for other disease areas such as stroke,
169 cancer, cystic fibrosis, and dementia (23-28). For example, in the UK, a national stroke registry has
170 transformed patient care and outcomes, with early recognition of different patterns of stroke
171 presentation, focused treatment on previously untreated risk factors, and targeted interventions for
172 improving cognitive impairment (27). In cancer care, tailored interventions based on risk profile
173 have extended lives for thousands of people (28). Yet there are no contemporary examples of digital
174 registries for any secondary care-treated mental health condition listed in the Health Research

175 Classification System mental health category, nor within the international literature, and no specific
176 CDSS for any mental health condition. Integration of a patient-centered digital registry and CDSS
177 for psychosis could be equally transformative and give parity of esteem to one of the most common
178 and disabling set of mental health disorders – psychosis – where there is already a well-developed
179 national infrastructure of EIP services.

180

181 To achieve this paradigmatic change in mental health care, our aim is to develop, evaluate and
182 establish a national psychosis registry and CDSS, known as EPICare (Early Psychosis Informatics
183 for Care) in three stages:

184

- 185 • Stage 1: Establish a multidisciplinary and multisector stakeholder network to co-design, de-
186 risk, and define the framework and protocols required to build and implement EPICare as a
187 successful national registry and CDSS.
- 188
- 189 • Stage 2: Build, pilot, implement, and evaluate the ability of the EPICare platform to improve
190 patient care, enhance service delivery, reduce disparities in care, and demonstrate cost-
191 effectiveness in five demonstrator NHS Trusts, serving underserved and diverse populations
192 with substantial need for EIP care in England.
- 193
- 194 • Stage 3: Subject to successful implementation and evaluation, seek NHS adoption of
195 EPICare for rollout to all EIP services in England.

196

197 **AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

198 In this paper, we report the protocol for the programme development phase of our activity (Stage 1),
199 in which we aimed to co-design and produce a framework and protocols for onward building,
200 implementation, piloting, and evaluation of a national integrated, patient-centered digital registry
201 and CDSS for psychosis.

202

203 To meet this aim, we specifically addressed the following objectives:

204

- 205 1. Establish a network with strong patient and public involvement and engagement (PPIE) and
206 other essential stakeholders to identify essential and desirable elements and minimize
207 unforeseen challenges (Work Package 1).

208

- 209 2. Address key questions on informatics architecture, infrastructure, governance, and
210 integration plans to facilitate onward development and testing of EPICare in diverse NHS
211 Trusts (Work Package 2).
212
- 213 3. Identify implementation factors from the outset to ensure they are considered in designing,
214 implementing, and sustaining the future deployment of EPICare in a measurable way (Work
215 Package 3).
216

217 **METHODS AND ANALYSIS**

218

219 **Study Design**

220 We conducted three concurrent work packages over 12 months, with reciprocal knowledge
221 exchange between work packages, coordinated via fortnightly Programme Management Group
222 meetings. Figure 1 provides a schematic of work packages. The Programme Management Group
223 contained lived experience facilitator, lived experience member, clinicians working in early
224 psychosis and academic members from epidemiology, NHS health informatics, data and
225 implementation science. The EPICare study was reviewed and granted full approval by the Health
226 Research Authority on November 8, 2021 (Ref: 306234).
227

228 *Work Package 1: Stakeholder co-design of the EPICare registry and CDSS*

229 A participatory co-design framework previously established for informatics in mental health (29)
230 was used to engage a diverse network of stakeholders in the co-design process, including clinicians,
231 academics, policymakers, and PPIE members. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, workshops were
232 convened online. Whilst this enhanced the scope for collaboration between centres in the study,
233 there were also potential drawbacks of this approach, which included PPIE needing to have access
234 to, and know-how of technology. Second, hosting face-to-face meetings on neutral ground in an
235 approachable format may have helped to removed traditional power structures. The workshops were
236 in a facilitator-led, semi-structured format, including presentations, whole-group discussions, and
237 themed breakout activities (card-sort tasks, small group discussion) with both mixed (random
238 allocation) and streamed group (by broad stakeholder type) sessions on a per-task basis. Essential
239 materials were circulated to stakeholders in advance of each meeting. We also convened additional
240 online preparatory sessions for PPIE stakeholders, led by our PPIE coordinator, to aid understanding
241 and participation in the main workshops. Registry and CDSS goals were examined by stakeholders,
242 who reviewed, refined, and identified a core set of essential and desirable measures that should be

243 collected in the integrated EPICare registry and CDSS, across four domains: sociodemographic
244 measures, treatment measures, patient-reported outcome measures, and clinician-reported outcome
245 measures (CROMS).

246

247 To facilitate this process, stakeholders were provided with a list of data already recorded in
248 electronic health records in EIP services, in addition to information on data relevant to the eight
249 nationally mandated NICE standards for EIP care (30) (Health of the Nation Outcomes Scales
250 [HoNOS] on functioning; quality of life and treatment satisfaction [DIALOG], and patient-reported
251 recovery [QPR]). This was supplemented with a minimal set of other initial measures recognized as
252 potentially relevant by the Programme Management Group based on expert knowledge, prior to the
253 first workshop. Examples included symptom ratings, duration of untreated psychosis, and
254 genotyping, amongst others. In Workshops 1 and 2, stakeholders were asked to review, refine,
255 prioritize, and suggest additions or subtractions from this list, with other data that may not currently
256 be routinely collected, but considered by stakeholders to be essential or desirable. The group also
257 explored what barriers to implementation and uptake may be encountered in EPICare (e.g., data
258 security and ownership, time for completion, digitising of routine data currently collected on paper).
259 Similarly, in Workshop 3, stakeholders identified the essential and desirable features of a CDSS to
260 provide timely actionable insights for patients and clinicians, including potential clinician prompts
261 to complete health assessments aligned to NICE standards for EIP care.

262

263 After these three initial workshops, we synthesised all information gathered via a modified Delphi
264 approach involving all stakeholders and members of the research team, to develop a consensus of
265 data priorities (what, when, by whom). We shared this with the members of Work Package 2 to
266 understand technical and governance barriers to implementation to further refine our framework to
267 identify a set of “must have” and “could have” data elements. Finally, in Workshop 4, we presented
268 our proposed framework to stakeholders, sought further feedback, and outlined our plans for Stage 2
269 of EPICare development. From our initial stakeholder network, we sought to retain a representative
270 group of stakeholders for our Stage 2 activity, who will continue to guide the pilot, testing, and
271 evaluation throughout the project, providing a reference point for rapid prototyping and end-user
272 consultation, acceptance, and build.

273

274 *Work Package 2: Informatics architecture, infrastructure and integration: framework, protocol &*
275 *toolkit*

276 Work Package 2 aimed to reduce technical and governance challenges in the future full build of
277 EPICare by addressing key questions and unknowns. Based on prior experience and knowledge, the

278 area of biggest technical risk for EPICare is the retrieval of data from electronic health records and
279 standardisation of this into a common data model, whilst ensuring compliance with information
280 governance and ethical standards. Previous work by the group involved auditing all EIP services
281 that are part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)-Mental Health Translational
282 Research Collaboration in Early Psychosis (MHTRC-Early Psychosis), to inform understanding of
283 the existing infrastructure, capacity, capabilities, and limitations around designing and developing
284 the EPICare platform for potential national implementation. This initial scoping work has
285 highlighted several different electronic health records in use as well as different ways of capturing
286 and storing relevant data in each of the Trusts.

287
288 To build on this knowledge, Health Informatics specialists within the research team contacted and
289 liaised with five NHS Trusts, including Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust,
290 Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough
291 NHS Foundation Trust, Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust and Camden and
292 Islington NHS Foundation Trust. Information Technology team leads and proposed demonstrator
293 sites were identified, gathering information to further understand what electronic health record
294 system is used by each trust; what relevant data are currently captured in the electronic health
295 record (key foci: eight NICE standards for first-episode psychosis treatment); how that data can be
296 retrieved, such as via Application Programming Interface or through regular exports; how the data
297 can, and should be secured during retrieval, complying to the highest information governance
298 standards; and the data formats used for each type of data.

299
300 Once this information was captured from all Trusts, it was then used alongside the information
301 gathered from the stakeholders in Work Package 1 to develop and document key requirements for
302 the EPICare system; software architecture for the registry and CDSS; data model design including
303 standardisation of data items into a common format; security threat model including planned
304 treatments for identified threats; proposed infrastructure to include an appropriate hosting solution,
305 such as a secure cloud environment; and an integration plan for retrieval of data from each Trust
306 electronic health record.

307
308 This was drafted into an overall framework document and set of technical infrastructure and
309 information governance protocols and toolkits to inform the future build, pilot, implementation, and
310 evaluation of the EPICare platform. With all of this in place, the technical and governance
311 challenges for the main programme grant for applied research application should be significantly
312 reduced.

313

314 *Work Package 3: Implementation evaluation framework*

315 Working in parallel and in collaboration with the members of Work Packages 1 and 2, the purpose
316 of this work package was to establish the preliminary implementation framework for the subsequent
317 testing and roll-out of EPICare. Founded on the idea that implementation research should be
318 integrated throughout all stages of innovation development rather than at ‘end-stage’, this involved
319 understanding the distinct and interconnected implementation issues within the stages of problem
320 definition; iterative evidence-building, intervention conceptualisation, development and testing; and
321 subsequent roll-out, experimentation, and embedding in different service settings. With particular
322 reference to EPICare, this involved understanding how the earlier stages of stakeholder engagement
323 contributed to intervention development and, at the same time, how stakeholders perceived
324 challenges to future adoption and use. With regards to PPIE stakeholders (Work Package 1), this
325 involved understanding views about: a) current challenges in EIP care; b) how clinical registries and
326 CDSS might influence care and service improvement; c) expectations about how interventions
327 might be utilised in standard practice, and d) participants’ experiences of the co-design process. We
328 also studied the early-stage activities of the health informatics team (Work Package 2) to understand
329 the explicit and tacit design assumptions; the contingencies presented by current technological
330 parameters; the influence of prevailing governance arrangements; and importantly, to understand
331 and evidence the interaction between the relative influence of multiple stakeholders in the co-design
332 process. This evidence will be brought together with existing implementation science frameworks,
333 such as Normalisation Process Theory (31), in conjunction with complementary insights drawn
334 from Science and Technology Studies (32, 33).

335 Normalisation Process Theory helps understand how service innovations are implemented,
336 embedded, and normalised within organisations, to the point where new practices are no longer
337 regarded as new. It is different from other implementation models because it focuses on the specific
338 ‘work’ undertaken by social actors to implement innovations into everyday practice whilst taking
339 into consideration the interplay between actions, contexts, and objects. Normalisation Process
340 Theory has four linked constructs: ‘coherence’, or the work of making sense of an innovation;
341 ‘cognitive participation’, or the work involved when engaging with an innovation; ‘collective
342 action’, or the combined work of integrating new practices into existing skills, relationships, and
343 contexts; and ‘reflexive monitoring’, or the work of continually appraising and adapting to the
344 introduction of new practices. It has been widely used to explain the factors that shape the
345 implementation of complex interventions (31).

346

347 Field researchers directly observed all four stakeholder co-design workshops and considered the
348 influence of multiple social, cultural and organisational factors on the co-design process. They also
349 observed a selection of key design meetings held between the technologists, NHS Trust partners,
350 and other stakeholder groups to map and describe the iterative development of EPICare. Each
351 researcher recorded their observations following an agreed semi-structured guide which were then
352 aggregated for analysis.

353

354 To clarify the observational data, qualitative semi-structured interviews guided by the constructs
355 from Normalisation Process Theory were then conducted with all stakeholder groups to understand
356 the factors likely to influence subsequent implementation of EPICare. An initial set of questions and
357 topics derived from the study objectives were used to systematically code interview transcripts and
358 develop themes. This was piloted on four transcripts by two researchers, before agreeing to a
359 revised set of codes, followed by further coding of remaining transcripts. Interviews focused on the
360 different cognitive-cultural perspectives of each stakeholder group, their experiences of
361 participating in the co-design process, and their perceptions about their influence on the co-design,
362 together with their recommendations for subsequent development and testing.

363

364 *Study Participants*

365 Participants were recruited between November and December 2021. We recruited forty participants
366 across all stakeholder workshops (Work Package 1). This included at least ten people with lived
367 experience of psychosis, and ideally, lived experience of early intervention, to form the PPIE
368 stakeholder group. PPIE members were recruited from the Birmingham University Youth Advisory
369 Group, Cambridgeshire & Peterborough Foundation Trust, Bristol Lived Experience Advisory
370 Panel and PPIE networks at University College London, including those associated with the
371 National Institute for Health Research Mental Health Policy Research Unit. As an
372 acknowledgement of the time and effort involved in taking part in the study, PPIE participants were
373 reimbursed in line with the INVOLVE payment policy (www.involve.org.uk), which equates to £25
374 per hour of participation.

375

376 The remaining thirty participants were recruited from the breadth of multidisciplinary care in EIP
377 services (psychiatrists, psychologists, occupational therapists, social workers, and nurses), in
378 addition to stakeholders from the charitable sector, NHS England, policymakers, and other
379 academics, for facilitated group meetings. The clinical collaborators were recruited from NHS
380 Trusts serving diverse and underserved areas with a combined population of approximately 3.73m
381 people (10.1% of the English population at risk for psychosis): Birmingham Women's and

382 Children's Trust, Manchester Health and Care NHS Foundation Trust, Camden and Islington NHS
383 Foundation Trust, Avon and Wiltshire Mental Health Partnership Trust, and Cambridgeshire &
384 Peterborough Foundation Trust. Attendance at the stakeholder group meetings was taken as consent
385 for this process and no individual written consent was required from stakeholders (including PPIE).

386

387 All stakeholders were also invited to participate in individual qualitative interviews in Work
388 Package 3 to ensure that we selected a representative subset of each stakeholder group from our
389 Work Package 1 stakeholder meetings. Written informed consent was obtained and interviewees
390 were given a unique participant identification number, which was used throughout the transcription
391 of interviews to ensure anonymity.

392

393 Given the online group format of the stakeholder workshops, individual participants attending these
394 workshops were identifiable to each other and to the authors. However, the identities of participants
395 who consented to an individual qualitative interview were known only to the interviewer, and as
396 noted above, interviewees were assigned a unique participant identification number to ensure their
397 anonymity during the transcription of their interviews.

398

399 *Analysis*

400 All interviews were recorded and transcribed. For quality control, transcript summaries were shared
401 with participants and feedback elicited as to their veracity. Observation notes of the stakeholder
402 workshops and transcripts of the individual interviews were subject to interpretative qualitative
403 analysis, guided by the Normalisation Process Theory implementation science framework.

404 Preliminary data analysis of observation notes involved producing short descriptive summaries of
405 field observations, for the purpose of summarising and sharing data with the study team. NVivo
406 software was used to organise and analyse the qualitative observational and transcribed interview
407 data. An iterative coding process was followed with data being subject to systematic close reading
408 and coding. Through sharing and deliberating preliminary codes and interpretations with the wider
409 study team and through the processes of constant comparison, secondary inductive and
410 interpretative themes were developed. At this stage, the constructs of Normalisation Process Theory
411 were used to further analyse and explain the study findings. Through discussion and disputation
412 with PPIE, clinicians, and the project team, inferences were made about how the implementation
413 science framework should be further refined.

414

415 **DISCUSSION**

416

417 The purpose of this study is to develop, implement and evaluate a national integrated, patient-
418 centered digital registry and CDSS for psychosis (EPICare) to improve national, local and
419 individual clinical decision-making and promote improved outcomes for people experiencing first-
420 episode psychosis. The EPICare registry and CDSS potentially represent a paradigmatic shift, as
421 they would be the first patient-centered digital registry and CDSS for psychosis, one of the most
422 common and disabling mental health disorders disproportionately affecting deprived and
423 disadvantaged youth. By combining routine, systematic, prospective data collection via a national
424 digital registry with real-time actionable insights delivered to patients, clinical teams, service
425 managers and policymakers via an embedded CDSS, EPICare aims to improve patient care, enhance
426 service delivery, reduce disparities in care, and further our understanding of the relationship
427 between the interventions offered to, and received by, young people receiving EIP care and
428 outcomes. A further aim of the study is to demonstrate cost-effectiveness in five demonstrator NHS
429 Trusts serving underserved and diverse populations with substantial need for EIP care in England.

430

431 In this paper, we have reported the protocol for the programme development phase of this study
432 (Stage 1), in which we aimed to co-design and produce a framework and protocols for onward
433 building, implementation, piloting, and evaluation of the EPICare registry and CDSS. Strengths of
434 this first phase of the study include the use of a participatory design to co-design a framework for
435 EPICare with input from diverse relevant stakeholders, including lived experience experts and
436 clinical, academic, technologist and organisational stakeholders. By engaging multiple stakeholders
437 in an iterative co-design process and using qualitative methods to capture and synthesise rich data
438 representing a variety of perspectives, we have succeeded in establishing a network with strong
439 patient and public involvement and engagement (PPIE) and representation from other essential
440 stakeholder groups and in collaboratively identifying essential and desirable elements of the
441 EPICare platform (Work Package 1). We have also worked to proactively identify and minimize
442 potential challenges and barriers to uptake and implementation (Work Package 3), including by
443 addressing key questions related to informatics architecture, infrastructure, governance, and
444 integration in diverse NHS Trusts (Work Package 2).

445

446 While we have achieved all of the objectives set out for the first phase of this study, it is worth
447 noting that adoption and integration of all the desirable platform elements identified by stakeholders
448 may not be feasible or pragmatic for the initial build of the data model. This will be tested in our
449 next stage.

450

451 Next steps for the EPICare study include Stage 2 building, piloting, implementation, and evaluation
452 of the EPICare platform in five demonstrator NHS Trusts serving underserved and diverse
453 populations with substantial need for EIP care in England. If successful, this will be followed by
454 Stage 3, in which we will seek NHS adoption of EPICare for rollout to all EIP services in England.

455

456 **ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION**

457 The EPICare programme has been granted full approval by the Health Research Authority (Ref:
458 306234).

459 The results will be disseminated through peer-reviewed journals, conference presentations, media
460 outlets, the internet, and various community / stakeholder engagement activities.

461

462 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS**

463 R.U. and J.B.K. are joint project leads and hold joint senior authorship. S.L.G. drafted the
464 manuscript with further input from R.U. and J.B.K., S.J., G.K.M., M.A.P., N.C., J.W., J.A., R.D.,
465 M.M., S.A., T.J.W., J.K., Y.L., T.B. and S.S. also contributed to the study as well as provided
466 comments on the manuscript. All authors approved the final version.

467

468

469

470

471

472 **REFERENCES**

- 473 1. Heiden W, Häfner H. The epidemiology of onset and course of schizophrenia 2000. 292-303 p.
- 474 2. Kirkbride JB, Errazuriz A, Croudace TJ, Morgan C, Jackson D, Boydell J, et al. Incidence of
475 schizophrenia and other psychoses in England, 1950-2009: a systematic review and meta-analyses. *PLoS*
476 *One*. 2012;7(3):e31660.
- 477 3. Jongsma HE, Turner C, Kirkbride JB, Jones PB. International incidence of psychotic disorders,
478 2002-17: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Public Health*. 2019;4(5):e229-e44.
- 479 4. March D, Hatch SL, Morgan C, Kirkbride JB, Bresnahan M, Fearon P, et al. Psychosis and place.
480 *Epidemiol Rev*. 2008;30:84-100.
- 481 5. O'Donoghue B, Roche E, Lane A. Neighbourhood level social deprivation and the risk of psychotic
482 disorders: a systematic review. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*. 2016;51(7):941-50.
- 483 6. McDonald K, Ding T, Ker H, Dliwayo TR, Osborn DPJ, Wohland P, et al. Using epidemiological
484 evidence to forecast population need for early treatment programmes in mental health: a generalisable
485 Bayesian prediction methodology applied to and validated for first-episode psychosis in England. *Br J*
486 *Psychiatry*. 2021;219(1):383-91.
- 487 7. NICE. QS80: Psychosis and schizophrenia in adults. National Institute for Health and Care
488 Excellence; 2015.
- 489 8. Bird V, Premkumar P, Kendall T, Whittington C, Mitchell J, Kuipers E. Early intervention services,
490 cognitive-behavioural therapy and family intervention in early psychosis: systematic review. *Br J Psychiatry*.
491 2010;197(5):350-6.

- 492 9. Anderson KK, Norman R, MacDougall A, Edwards J, Palaniyappan L, Lau C, et al. Effectiveness of
493 Early Psychosis Intervention: Comparison of Service Users and Nonusers in Population-Based Health
494 Administrative Data. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2018;175(5):443-52.
- 495 10. McCrone P, Craig TKJ, Power P, Garety PA. Cost-effectiveness of an early intervention service for
496 people with psychosis. *British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2010;196(5):377-82.
- 497 11. Lester H, Marshall M, Jones P, Fowler D, Amos T, Khan N, et al. Views of young people in early
498 intervention services for first-episode psychosis in England. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2011;62(8):882-7.
- 499 12. Lally J, Ajnakina O, Stubbs B, Cullinane M, Murphy KC, Gaughran F, et al. Remission and recovery
500 from first-episode psychosis in adults: systematic review and meta-analysis of long-term outcome studies.
501 *British Journal of Psychiatry*. 2017;211(6):350-8.
- 502 13. Stokes I, Griffiths SL, Jones R, Everard L, Jones PB, Fowler D, et al. Prevalence of treatment
503 resistance and clozapine use in early intervention services. *BJPsych Open*. 2020;6(5):e107.
- 504 14. Fisher HL, Johnson S, Major B, Rahaman N, Rammou A, Fisher HL, et al.
- 505 15. Marwaha S, Thompson A, Upthegrove R, Broome MR. Fifteen years on - early intervention for a
506 new generation. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2016;209(3):186-8.
- 507 16. Griffiths SL, Lalouis PA, Wood SJ, Upthegrove R. Heterogeneity in treatment outcomes and
508 incomplete recovery in first episode psychosis: does one size fit all? *Transl Psychiatry*. 2022;12(1):485.
- 509 17. Firth J, Siddiqi N, Koyanagi A, Siskind D, Rosenbaum S, Galletly C, et al. The Lancet Psychiatry
510 Commission: a blueprint for protecting physical health in people with mental illness. *The Lancet Psychiatry*.
511 2019;6(8):675-712.
- 512 18. Hjorthøj C, Stürup AE, McGrath JJ, Nordentoft M. Years of potential life lost and life expectancy in
513 schizophrenia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2017;4(4):295-301.
- 514 19. Morris RM, Sellwood W, Edge D, Colling C, Stewart R, Cupitt C, et al. Ethnicity and impact on the
515 receipt of cognitive-behavioural therapy in people with psychosis or bipolar disorder: an English cohort
516 study. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(12):e034913.
- 517 20. Puntis S, Oke J, Lennox B. Discharge pathways and relapse following treatment from early
518 intervention in psychosis services. *BJPsych Open*. 2018;4(5):368-74.
- 519 21. Griffiths SL, Bogatsu T, Longhi M, Butler E, Alexander B, Bandawar M, et al. Five-year illness
520 trajectories across racial groups in the UK following a first episode psychosis. *Social Psychiatry and*
521 *Psychiatric Epidemiology*. 2023;58(4):569-79.
- 522 22. NCAP. National Clinical Audit in Psychosis Audit 2021.
- 523 23. Heuschmann PU, Grieve AP, Toschke AM, Rudd AG, Wolfe CDA. Ethnic Group Disparities in 10-
524 Year Trends in Stroke Incidence and Vascular Risk Factors. *Stroke*. 2008;39(8):2204-10.
- 525 24. Kelsey EA, Njeru JW, Chaudhry R, Fischer KM, Schroeder DR, Croghan IT. Understanding User
526 Acceptance of Clinical Decision Support Systems to Promote Increased Cancer Screening Rates in a Primary
527 Care Practice. *Journal of Primary Care & Community Health*. 2020;11:2150132720958832.
- 528 25. Taylor-Robinson D, Archangelidi O, Carr SB, Cosgriff R, Gunn E, Keogh RH, et al. Data Resource
529 Profile: The UK Cystic Fibrosis Registry. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2017;47(1):9-10e.
- 530 26. Stephan BCM, Siervo M, Brayne C. How can population-based studies best be utilized to reduce the
531 global impact of dementia? Recommendations for researchers, funders, and policymakers. *Alzheimers*
532 *Dement*. 2020;16(10):1448-56.
- 533 27. Langhorne P, Taylor G, Murray G, Dennis M, Anderson C, Bautz-Holter E, et al. Early supported
534 discharge services for stroke patients: a meta-analysis of individual patients' data. *The Lancet*.
535 2005;365(9458):501-6.
- 536 28. Mazo C, Kearns C, Mooney C, Gallagher WM. Clinical Decision Support Systems in Breast Cancer:
537 A Systematic Review. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2020;12(2).
- 538 29. Ospina-Pinillos L, Davenport T, Mendoza Diaz A, Navarro-Mancilla A, Scott EM, Hickie IB. Using
539 Participatory Design Methodologies to Co-Design and Culturally Adapt the Spanish Version of the Mental
540 Health eClinic: Qualitative Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21(8):e14127.
- 541 30. (NICE) NifHaCE. Psychosis and Schizophrenia in Adults: Treatment and Management. London:
542 Royal College of Psychiatrists; 2014.
- 543 31. Murray E, Treweek S, Pope C, MacFarlane A, Ballini L, Dowrick C, et al. Normalisation process
544 theory: a framework for developing, evaluating and implementing complex interventions. *BMC Medicine*.
545 2010;8(1):63.

- 546 32. Robertson A, Cresswell K, Takian A, Petrakaki D, Crowe S, Cornford T, et al. Implementation and
547 adoption of nationwide electronic health records in secondary care in England: qualitative analysis of interim
548 results from a prospective national evaluation. *Bmj*. 2010;341:c4564.
- 549 33. Ainsworth J, Harper R. The PsyGrid Experience: Using Web Services in the Study of Schizophrenia.
550 2008. p. 365-86.

551

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.02.23290899>; this version posted June 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).




Figure 1. Study design.