

1 **Impact of a team-based versus individual clinician-focused training approach on primary**
2 **healthcare professionals' intention to have serious illness conversations with patients: a theory**
3 **informed process evaluation of a cluster randomized trial.**

4 Short title: Process evaluation of an cRT on training primary healthcare professionals to have serious
5 illness conversations.

6 Lucas Gomes Souza^{1,2,3}, Patrick Archambault^{2, 3, 4, 5, 6}, Dalil Asmaou Bouba^{1,2,3}, Suélène Georgina Dofara^{2, 3},
7 Sabrina Guay-Bélanger^{2,3}, Sergio Cortez Ghio^{2, 3}, Souleymane Gadio^{2, 3}, LeAnn Michaels⁷, Jean-Sébastien
8 Paquette^{2,3,4}, Shigeko (Seiko) Izumi⁸, Annette M. Totten⁹, **France Légaré**^{2, 3, 4, 10*} and The Meta-LARC ACP
9 Cluster Randomized Trial team[^].

10

11 ¹ Department of Social and Preventive Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Université Laval, Quebec, Canada

12 ² VITAM – Centre de recherche en santé durable, Quebec, Canada;

13 ³ Centre intégré universitaire de santé et de services sociaux de la Capitale-Nationale, Quebec, Canada;

14 ⁴ Centre de recherche intégrée pour un système apprenant en santé et services sociaux, Quebec, Canada;

15 ⁵ Centre intégré de santé et services sociaux de Chaudière-Appalaches, Quebec, Canada;

16 ⁶ Department of Family Medicine and Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Université Laval, Quebec,
17 Canada;

18 ⁷ Oregon Rural Practice-based Research Network, Oregon Health & Science University, Oregon, USA

19 ⁸ School of Nursing, Oregon Health & Science University, Oregon, USA

20 ⁹ Department of Medical Informatics & Clinical Epidemiology, School of Medicine, Oregon Health & Science
21 University, Oregon, USA

22 ¹⁰ Centre de recherche du CHU de Québec, Quebec, Canada;

23 * Corresponding Author:

24 E-mail: France.Legare@fmed.ulaval.ca (FL)

25

26 [^] Membership of The Meta-LARC ACP Cluster Randomized Trial team is provided in the acknowledgements

27

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

28 ABSTRACT

29 **Background:** Cluster Randomized Trials (cRTs) conducted in real-world settings face complex challenges due to
30 diverse practices and populations. Process evaluations alongside cRTs can help explain their results by exploring
31 possible causal mechanisms as the trial proceeds.

32 **Objective:** To conduct a process evaluation alongside a cRT that compared the impact of team-based vs.
33 individual clinician-focused SICP training on primary healthcare professionals' (PHCPs) intention to have serious
34 illness conversations with patients.

35 **Methods:** The cRT involved 45 primary care practices randomized into a team-based (intervention) or individual
36 clinician-focused training program (comparator) and measured primary outcomes at the patient level: days at home
37 and goal of care. Our theory-informed mixed-methods process evaluation alongside the cRT measured intention
38 to have serious illness conversations with patients among the trained PHCPs using the CPD-Reaction tool. Barriers
39 and facilitators to implementing serious illness conversations were identified through open-ended questions and
40 analyzed using the Theoretical Domains Framework. We used the COM-B framework to perform triangulation of
41 data. We reported results using the CONSORT and GRAMMS reporting guidelines.

42 **Results:** Of 535 PHCPs from 45 practices, 373 (69.7%) fully completed CPD-Reaction (30.8% between 25-34
43 years old; 78.0% women; 54.2% had a doctoral degree; 50.1% were primary care physicians). Mean intention
44 scores for the team-based (n=223) and individual clinician-focused arms (n=150) were 5.97 (Standard Error: 0.11)
45 and 6.42 (Standard Error: 0.13), respectively. Mean difference between arms was 0.0 (95% CI -0.30;0.29; p=0.99)
46 after adjusting for age, education and profession. The team-based arm reported barriers with communication,
47 workflow, and more discomfort in having serious illness conversations with patients.

48 **Conclusions:** Team-based training did not outperform individual clinician-focused in influencing PHCPs' intention
49 to have serious illness conversations. Future team-based interventions could foster behaviour adoption by focusing
50 on interprofessional communication, better organized workflows, and better support and training for non-clinician
51 team members.

52 **Registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov (ID: NCT03577002).

54 INTRODUCTION

55 Cluster Randomized Trials (cRTs) using a pragmatic approach aim to evaluate the effectiveness of
56 interventions in real-world clinical settings, providing advantages such as enhanced generalizability and relevance
57 to routine care (1). However, these cRTs present unique challenges, particularly in terms of implementation.
58 Implementing and maintaining interventions in cRTs within the complex environment of routine clinical care proves
59 difficult due to variations in clinical practices, healthcare systems, and participant populations (2). Therefore,
60 process evaluations alongside cRTs are an essential tool and are increasingly used to shed light on the 'black box'
61 of complex interventions and to provide information to interpret outcome results and aid moving them into practice
62 (3, 4).

63 In 2017, the Meta-Network Learning and Research Center Advanced Care Planning (Meta-LARC ACP)
64 cRT team designed a comparative effectiveness cRT to assess two training approaches for the serious illness care
65 program (SICP) developed by Ariadne Labs (5, 6). The cRT compared a team-based training approach to
66 conducting SICP (intervention) with the traditional clinician-based training approach (comparator) (7). The rationale
67 for this cRT stemmed from the initial assumption in the design of the SICP which presumed that only individual
68 clinicians, such as physicians, nurse practitioners, or physician assistants, would be responsible alone for having
69 serious illness conversations with patients. However, insights drawn from studies on team approaches to chronic
70 and complex care suggest that adopting a team-based approach could facilitate the implementation of serious
71 illness conversations within clinical practice (8, 9).

72 In recognition of the pivotal role played by primary care teams in patient care, the cRT explored a training
73 approach that integrated task-sharing strategies. These strategies encompassed patient identification,
74 conversation preparation, discussion initiation, and follow-up (8, 10). This training approach aligned with systematic
75 reviews which identified time constraints as a significant barrier to implementing these discussions in primary care
76 settings. The involvement of multiple primary healthcare professionals (PHCPs) - primary care clinicians and other
77 primary care team members - could potentially alleviate this burden by reducing the time commitment required
78 from each individual, thereby facilitating effective implementation (11, 12). Despite the promising potential of a
79 team-based SICP training approach, evidence supporting its efficacy and implementation in primary care was

80 limited at the time of the cRT's conception (13). This underscored the need for its evaluation in a real-world primary
81 care setting.

82 To gain a more in-depth understanding of the intervention implementation process, which was the team-
83 based SICP training approach, we conducted a process evaluation alongside the parent cRT by comparing the
84 intervention's impact on PHCPs' instead of patients, and specifically, on their intention to have serious illness
85 conversations with patients. Process evaluations alongside cRTs aim to provide insights into how an intervention
86 was delivered, how participants received it, and whether it was implemented as intended. Our process evaluation
87 aimed to help us understand PHCP uptake of the training and their intention to have serious illness conversations
88 with patients. This process evaluation was also intended to identify factors influencing PHCPs' intention to have
89 serious illness conversation with patients, such as the modifiable psychosocial factors influencing their intention
90 and the perceived barriers and facilitators to adopting the target behaviour. In order to achieve these aims, we
91 incorporated established theories of behaviour change into our process evaluation (14). These theoretical
92 frameworks played a key role in identifying and addressing specific implementation challenges, enhancing our
93 understanding of the intervention, and suggesting modifications to optimize its impact in future interventions (15).
94 Our process evaluation is particularly informed by a set of social cognitive theories. First, the integrated model of
95 behaviour change in healthcare professionals, informed by a systematic review of 76 studies, identifies intention
96 as a mediator of behaviour and influenced by six factors: capability, consequence, moral norm, social influence,
97 role/identity, and healthcare professional characteristics (16). The Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) expands
98 on this by identifying additional factors influencing healthcare professionals' behaviour related to implementing
99 recommendations (17). Finally, the COM-B model maps these factors onto specific behavior change techniques
100 to guide future intervention development (18).

101 We hypothesized, based on our previous theory-informed studies on interprofessional interventions (19,
102 20), that team-based training would outperform individual clinician-focused training in influencing PHCPs intention
103 to have serious illness conversations with their patients. These studies demonstrated that our interprofessional
104 model effectively promoted positive intentions. Furthermore, the research elucidated the modifiable psychosocial
105 factors that positively correlate with intention within an interprofessional context (19, 20). Therefore, we performed
106 a theory-based process evaluation alongside our parent cRT to assess the effect of the two SICP training

107 approaches on PHCPs' intention to have serious illness conversations with patients and to identify potential
108 facilitators and barriers to the adoption of this behaviour.

109 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

110 **Study design and setting**

111 To assess the implementation of a team-based SICIP training approach compared to an individual clinician-focused
112 SICIP training approach, we conducted a process evaluation alongside a parent cRT that used a comparative
113 effectiveness design (21, 22). This process evaluation employed a mixed-methods concurrent embedded design
114 (23), utilizing secondary post-intervention qualitative and quantitative data from the parent cRT. Process
115 evaluations often employ mixed-methods designs due to their ability to provide a more comprehensive and
116 multifaceted understanding of intervention implementation, encompassing both quantitative and qualitative
117 data(15, 24). We used Godin et al. integrative model of behavior prediction in healthcare professionals for our
118 quantitative analysis (16, 25, 26), the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) for our qualitative analysis (17, 27),
119 and the Capability, Opportunity, Motivation and Behaviour (COM-B) model to triangulate findings (28). We reported
120 this paper following the extension of Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) for cRTs (S1
121 Checklist) and followed the Good Reporting of a Mixed Methods Study (GRAMMS) checklist (S2 Checklist) (29,
122 30). The parent cRT and object of our process evaluation is registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (ID: NCT03577002).
123 The protocol is published elsewhere (7) and the results for the primary outcomes at the patient level (days spent
124 at home and goal concordant care) are under review.

125 The parent Meta-LARC ACP cRT was conducted in community-based primary care practices in five US states
126 (Colorado, Iowa, North Carolina, Oregon, Wisconsin) and two Canadian provinces (Quebec and Ontario) recruited
127 through Meta-LARC, a consortium of practice-based research networks (PBRNs) (7). A cRT design was selected
128 as the knowledge learned in the SICIP trainings was to be implemented at a practice level.

129

130 For our process evaluation study, we used the Medical Research Council framework (24) to delve into the context
131 and mechanisms of impact of our intervention, which are key functions of a process evaluation according to this

132 framework. We did that by primarily assessing what influenced PHCPs' intention to adopt the target behaviour,
133 which was defined as *having serious illness conversations with patients*. A previous study focused on the
134 development of the intervention (31). A subsequent study will explore the contextual factors that influenced the
135 sustainability of the intervention one year and two years after the training, particularly in the context of the COVID-
136 19 pandemic. This approach will allow us to address all the different aspects of process evaluations as suggested
137 by Moore et al. (24)

138 **Ethical approval:**

139 The parent META-LARC ACP cRT was approved by the Trial Innovation Network Single IRB at Vanderbilt
140 University Medical Center (IRB#181084) for the U.S. sites; by the Research Ethics Board of the Centre Intégré
141 Universitaire de Santé et de services sociaux (CIUSSS) de la Capitale-Nationale in Quebec City, Canada (ethics
142 number #MP-13-2019-1526), for the sites in Quebec and by the Health Sciences Research Ethics Board of the
143 University of Toronto (protocol number 36631), for the sites in Ontario. The process evaluation's data and
144 outcomes were included in the approval. All subjects willingly agreed to take part in the study, and their consent
145 (verbal or written) was obtained and registered by PBRNs in accordance with the regulations of the Institutional
146 Review Board or Research Ethics Board in effect.

147 **Participants and eligibility**

148 To participate in the parent cRT a practice had to a) be willing and able to be randomized to either the team-based
149 or individual-clinician-based SICP approach, b) have sufficient staff to participate in the team-based arm, and c)
150 not be engaged in another standardized ACP program. Detailed criteria for practice eligibility are published
151 elsewhere (7). In this process evaluation, we analyzed a secondary outcome, the impact of the intervention on
152 PHCPs' behavioural intention, and therefore participants for this process evaluation were the PHCPs (primary care
153 clinicians and other primary care team members) working in the primary care practices enrolled in the parent cRT.
154 PHCPs from participating eligible practices were invited to participate in the training and to answer the after-training
155 questionnaires, but not required to participate.

156 **Randomization**

157 The units of randomization were the primary care practices stratified by PBRN. To assure allocation concealment,
158 involvement in randomization was limited to statisticians not involved in other aspects of the project. Staff at the
159 PBRNs, practices, and the Meta-LARC coordinating center were not involved in the randomization. Statisticians
160 completing the analysis were blinded to allocation until the parent cRT primary outcomes analysis was completed.
161 Investigators, PBRN leadership, practices, and research staff were not blinded to the assignment. Practices and
162 participating PHCPs could not be blinded to which approach they were assigned, as they needed to actively to be
163 trained and implement the intervention or comparator. More details regarding randomization are published
164 elsewhere (7).

165 **Intervention and comparator arms**

166 The SICP developed by Ariadne Labs was adapted to be used by interprofessional teams of PHCPs (5). Training
167 lasted three hours per arm: a 1.5-hour online module (Part A), and a 1.5-hour in-person role-play session (Part B)
168 (Fig 1). Training materials are available at <https://primarycareacp.org>, including the Serious Illness Conversations
169 Guide (SICG), a tool designed by the original developers of the SICP to facilitate communication with patients with
170 serious illnesses(5).

171 **Fig 1. Study design and data collection**

172

173 Training took place between October 2018 and November 2019. A train-the-trainer model was used whereby 1 to
174 3 trainers were identified by each PBRN and trained simultaneously by the core trainers. Trainers from each PBRN
175 then trained PHCPs in their local practices. The intervention proceeded as described in the study protocol (7).

176 **Intervention arm**

177 The intervention arm received an SICP training session adapted to a team-based approach, whereby primary care
178 clinicians (i.e., primary care physicians, physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and medical residents) and all
179 other primary care team members, such as medical assistants, nurses, dieticians and social workers were invited
180 to complete the training. The adapted team-based approach was based on an interprofessional shared decision-
181 making model and workshop (32, 33) that has been used in a variety of contexts (34) and showed a positive impact

182 on behavioural intention (35). In this training, the team received guidance on establishing a common understanding
183 of the processes and goals of serious illness conversations, dividing and sharing tasks, recognizing each member's
184 contributions, promoting continuous communication in the team, and recognizing the organizational or functional
185 constraints of each profession (31).

186 **Comparator arm**

187 The comparator arm received the individual clinician-focused approach as designed by Ariadne Labs (5). It focuses
188 only on primary care clinicians (i.e., primary care physicians, physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and medical
189 residents). Other primary care team members, such as medical assistants, nurses, dietitians and social workers
190 did not participate in the training. The individual clinician-focused approach assumes that primary care clinicians
191 alone are responsible for selecting patients, conducting, and documenting serious illness conversations.

192 **Outcomes and measurements**

193 The outcome of interest for this process evaluation was to measure the impact of our training intervention on
194 PHCPs' intention to have serious illness conversations with patients. This focus on intention was based on its
195 established role as a proxy for behaviour, with a demonstrated predictive capacity for behavior change up to six
196 months following training interventions (16, 26, 36, 37). Additionally, measuring intention allowed for a targeted
197 assessment of the intervention's influence on PHCPs, the primary implementers of the intervention in the parent
198 cRT. Moreover, it facilitated the identification of modifiable psychosocial factors within the real-world practice
199 context that could be targeted to promote the adoption of the desired behaviour (16, 26, 36). Similarly, tools that
200 measure the intention as a proxy to predict clinical behaviour are valuable for evaluating the efficacy of professional
201 development training interventions (36). They facilitate the immediate evaluation of an intervention's impact since
202 evaluating behaviour in a real clinical context can be complex and costly (38). This information provides crucial
203 data for our process evaluation, enabling the identification of intervention strengths and weaknesses related to
204 behaviour change. By understanding these mechanisms of action, we can contribute to a cumulative
205 implementation science knowledge base and inform the interpretation and adaptation of future SICIP interventions
206 (15).

207 We used the CPD-Reaction tool to measure PHCPs' behavioural intention to have serious illness conversations
208 with patients. CPD-Reaction is a self-administered, theory-informed, validated tool that assesses five constructs
209 (intention, beliefs about capabilities, beliefs about consequences, moral norm, and social influences) using a 12-
210 item self-administered questionnaire (36, 39). Most items are measured using a Likert scale of 1–7, where 1
211 represents “strongly disagree” and 7 represents “strongly agree.” One item, the social influences construct, ranges
212 from 1 to 5.(25) Even though variables measured using a Likert scale are categorical, intention can be analyzed
213 as a continuous variable with no harm to the analysis (40).

214 However, as proposed by Lou, Atkins and West (17), behaviours are a part of an intricate system, they do not
215 occur in isolation. Consequently by incorporating and systematically expanding the range of relevant behaviours
216 measured, while maintaining appropriate selectivity, we were able to increase both the depth and breadth of our
217 analysis (18). Therefore, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the intervention's potential impact, we
218 decided to measure not only PHCPs intention to have serious illness conversations with patients (the primary
219 outcome), but also their likelihood to engage in ACP and use the SICG as additional outcomes for this process
220 evaluation. We chose likelihood questions for these additional outcomes because they are simple, straightforward,
221 and are a widely used tool in the literature to capture intentions and consequently the concurrent behaviours we
222 wanted to measure (41). The choice of a simpler one-item type of question had the aim to optimize participant
223 engagement and data completeness and to minimize survey fatigue among PHCPs. Thus, after Part A of the
224 training session, we asked PHCPs about what their likelihood to engage in ACP was, both before and after Part
225 A, using a retrospective pretest-posttest evaluation design (42). Then, after Part B, we also asked how likely they
226 were to use the SICG in their practices. Face and content validity of the likelihood measures were established
227 based on studies on similar training programs with PHCPs (43, 44). These questions also used a Likert scale of 1-
228 10 where 1 represented “extremely unlikely”, 5 represented “moderate” and 10 “extremely likely”. In S1 Fig, we
229 present a diagram illustrating the interactions among the behaviours we measured, offering a structured
230 perspective on their interplay.

231 Finally, using two open-ended questions we evaluated the facilitators and barriers to PHCPs incorporating the
232 knowledge acquired in their practices and to have serious illness conversations with patients. We mapped these
233 facilitators and barriers onto the TDF. The TDF was developed through a consensus of experts who consolidated

234 33 psychosocial theories of behaviour change to generate 14 domains (45). Fig 1. details all the process evaluation
235 measurements and outcomes sought throughout the different steps of the intervention.

236

237 **Data collection**

238 Data collection took place between October 2018 and November 2019. Before randomization, sociodemographic
239 data were collected as well as additional data directly from practices (e.g., country and practice environment) (Fig.
240 1). This analysis uses the data collected through questionnaires administered immediately after training was
241 completed in each practice, as we were interested in PHCPs' immediate evaluation after the training. This helped
242 us understand if the team-based SICP training approach was effective in impacting PHCPs' intention compared to
243 the individual clinician-focused SICP training and consequently their behavior, thus helping us understand the
244 mechanisms of impact of our intervention (24). To optimize the assessment and maximize the time of participating
245 PHCPs, we employed self-administered questionnaires in the study. We also opted for open-ended questions
246 instead of conducting semi-structured interviews or focus groups to explore barriers and facilitators. These
247 decisions streamlined data collection, enhancing both efficiency and participant convenience.

248 **Sample size**

249 The sample size calculation for the parent study is available in the published protocol (7). A sample size estimate
250 for PHCPs involved in our process evaluation study was not calculated as their responses were not the primary
251 outcome of the parent cRT A total of 535 PHCPs attended the trainings, 326 in the team-based and 209 in the
252 individual clinician-focused arms. We analyzed data from 373 PHCPs (223 team-based and 150 individual
253 clinician-focused) who attended the training and completed the intention construct in the CPD-Reaction tool. For
254 these 373 PHCPs, we obtained a post-hoc power of 0.75 based on an unadjusted mixed linear regression model.

255 **Analysis**

256 **Quantitative analysis**

257 We used descriptive statistics to report our variables including practice and participant characteristics. Categorical
258 variables were described with absolute (n) and relative (%) frequencies; and continuous variables with their central
259 tendency measures (mean) and dispersion (standard deviation).

260 Then, we used a mixed linear model to compare mean scores between study arms for PHCPs' intention
261 to have serious illness conversations with patients. To account for clustering, we used the practice identifier as a
262 random factor when fitting the models.

263 Next, we fit a bivariate mixed linear model for each sociodemographic variable of interest to examine its
264 effect on PHCPs' intention to have serious illness conversations with patients. We subsequently fit a multivariable
265 mixed linear model including all variables for which we detected a potential effect ($p < 0.20$) on PHCPs' intention in
266 the bivariate analyses. We then conducted manual backward stepwise selection based on variable significance for
267 a final adjusted model. The arm variable was kept in the model regardless of significance as our objective was to
268 compare the impact of training approaches.

269 Finally, we fit mixed linear models to evaluate how likely participants considered they were to engage
270 patients in ACP (i.e. before, reported retrospectively, and then after training), and how likely they were to use the
271 SICG in their practice after both parts of the training sessions. We compared the mean difference between the
272 likelihood to engage in ACP measured before and after Part A of the training between each arm, and also regarding
273 their likelihood to use the SIC Guide, also measured between each arm. We used the practice identifier as a
274 random factor in all models. All analyses were performed with SAS (Statistical Analysis Software) 9.4.

275 **Qualitative analysis**

276 To further explore intention, using the TDF as a guide, we performed a descriptive analysis of the answers to the
277 two open-ended questions (17, 46). Two researchers (SGD, LGS) used an inductive approach to develop the
278 codes that were used in the thematic analysis (47). Then, two researchers (LGS, DAB) conducted a thematic
279 analysis of the answers, and any disagreements between the researchers were resolved by consensus. If the
280 disagreement remained a third senior researcher was consulted (FL). Data were then deductively classified into
281 TDF domains. We calculated the frequency of each barrier and facilitator by recording the number of times it was
282 mentioned in the answers.

283 **Triangulating qualitative and quantitative data**

284 Our process evaluation equally intended to propose practical theory-driven recommendations to improve the
285 intervention. To inform these recommendations, we triangulated qualitative and quantitative data to grasp a
286 broader understanding of the psychosocial factors influencing our targeted behaviour (48). We conducted a
287 comparison between the five psychosocial determinants assessed in the CPD-Reaction questionnaire and the
288 domains outlined in the TDF (LGS and SGD). Our analysis involved identifying points of convergence and
289 divergence between quantitative and qualitative data, exploring instances where both types of data provided
290 additional insights into the same constructs. Subsequently, recommendations were formulated utilizing the COM-
291 B model of behaviour, which posits three criteria—capacity, opportunity, motivation—for the occurrence of a
292 behavior (18, 49). These criteria and their subcategories were linked to the TDF domains, along with their
293 associated barriers or facilitators (S2 Fig)(50). The COM-B model further proposes nine intervention functions,
294 aligned with TDF domains, that are capable of promoting behaviour change, namely education, persuasion,
295 incentivization, coercion, training, restriction, environmental restructuring, modeling, and enablement (18, 28, 51,
296 52). By discerning which intervention functions corresponded to our results, we identified and selected behaviour
297 change techniques associated with the relevant functions to derive our recommendations (18). The proposed
298 recommendations were reviewed by all authors.

299 **RESULTS**

300 **Practice and PHCP characteristics and flow diagram**

301 As the parent trial is a cRT in table 1 we provide a comprehensive description of the characteristics of practices
302 randomized Indicating that the randomization of clinics was adequate.

303 **Table 1:** Participating primary care practices characteristics.

	Total	Team-based arm	Individual clinician- focused arm

Number of practices	45	23	22
Country, n (%)			
United States	33 (73.3)	17 (73.9)	16 (72.7)
Canada	12 (26.7)	6 (26.1)	6 (27.3)
Size (# of Primary healthcare professionals), n (%)			
Small (2-5)	8 (17.8)	6 (26.1)	2 (9.0)
Medium (6-12)	19 (42.2)	9 (39.1)	10 (45.5)
Large (13-85)	18 (40.0)	8 (34.8)	10 (45.5)
Geographic Setting, n (%)			
Rural	20 (44.4)	12 (52.2)	8 (36.4)
Suburban	8 (17.8)	3 (13.0)	5 (22.7)
Urban	17 (37.8)	8 (34.8)	9 (40.9)
Ownership, n (%)			
Hospital/health system	31 (68.9%)	13 (56.6)	18 (82.8)
Physician or physician group	11 (24.4)	7 (30.4)	4 (18.2)
Federally qualified health centre	3 (6.7%)	3 (13.0)	-
Specialty, n (%)			
Family Medicine	34 (75.5)	15 (68.2)	19 (82.6)
Internal Medicine	8 (17.8)	5 (22.7)	3 (13.)

Both family and internal medicine	3 (6.7)	2 (9.1)	1 (4.4)
Size of primary healthcare professionals, median (min to max)	10 (3 to 46)	8 (4 to 46)	12 (3 to 40)

304

305 Fig. 2 illustrates the flow of practices and PHCPs in this process evaluation study alongside the Meta-LARC ACP
 306 cRT. Thirty-eight practices participated (19 in each arm), a participation rate of 84.4% (38/45). A total of 373
 307 (69.7%) PHCPs fully completed the intention construct in CPD-Reaction. The sociodemographic characteristics of
 308 the participating PHCPs are detailed in Table 2.

309 Fig. 2: Flowchart of Primary Healthcare professionals (PHCPs)

310 **Table 2:** Characteristics of participating PHCPs by arm.

	Total	Team-based arm	Individual clinician-focused arm
Number of professionals	373	223	150
Country, N (%)			
USA	216 (57.9)	143 (64.1)	73 (48.7)
Canada	157(42.1)	80 (35.9)	77 (51.3)
Age, N (%)			
Missing data	12 (3.2)	10 (4.5)	2 (1.3)
18-24	11 (2.9)	8 (3.6)	3 (2.0)
25-34	115 (30.8)	64 (28.7)	51 (34.0)
35-44	113 (30.3)	63 (28.2)	50 (33.3)

45-54	64 (17.2)	38 (17.0)	26 (17.3)
55-64	42 (11.3)	30 (13.5)	12 (8.0)
> 65	12 (3.2)	10 (4.5)	2 (1.3)
Prefer not to answer	4 (1.0)	-	4 (2.7)
Sex, N (%)			
Missing data	3 (0.8)	3 (1.3)	-
Male	79 (21.2)	35 (15.7)	44 (29.3)
Female	291 (78.0)	185 (83.0)	106 (70.7)
Ethnicity, N (%)			
Missing data	7 (1.9)	6 (2.7)	1 (0.7)
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	13 (3.5)	9 (4.0)	4 (2.7)
No, not Hispanic or Latino	347 (93.0)	205 (92.0)	142 (94.7)
Prefer not to answer	6 (1.6)	3 (1.3)	3 (2.0)
Race, N (%)			
Missing data	6 (1.6)	5 (2.2)	1 (0.7)
White	320 (85.8)	192 (86.1)	128 (85.3)
Asian	20 (5.4)	13 (5.8)	7 (4.7)
American Indian or Alaska native	2 (0.5)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.7)
Black or African American	14 (3.7)	9 (4.0)	1 (0.7)
Hawaiian Native or Pacific Islander	1 (0.3)	1 (0.4)	-

Others	2 (0.5)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.7)
Prefer not to answer	8 (2.1)	1 (0.4)	7 (4.7)
Education level, N (%)			
Missing data	4 (1.0)	3 (1.4)	1 (0.7)
Doctoral degree	202 (54.2)	91 (40.8)	111 (74.0)
Master's degree	65 (17.4)	34 (15.2)	31 (20.7)
Bachelor's degree	40 (10.7)	40 (17.9)	-
High school	9 (2.4)	9 (4.0)	-
Others	53 (14.2)	46 (20.6)	7 (4.7)
Profession, N (%)			
Missing data	-	-	-
Primary care physician	187 (50.1)	86 (38.6)	101 (67.3)
Nurse practitioner	35 (9.4)	16 (7.2)	19 (12.7)
Nurse	54 (14.5)	54 (24.2)	-
Physician assistant	16 (4.3)	7 (3.1)	9 (6.0)
Social worker	6 (1.6)	6 (2.7)	-
Medical assistant	33 (8.9)	33 (14.9)	-
Resident	29 (7.8)	8 (3.6)	21 (14.0)
Others (Psychologist, Dietician, etc.)	13 (3.5)	13 (5.8)	-

311

312 **Quantitative results**

313 Behavioural intention

314 Table 3 shows the scores for behavioural intention and its psychosocial determinants. On a scale of 1–7, the mean
 315 intention score was 5.97 (Standard error: 0.11) for the team-based arm (intervention) and 6.42 (Standard error:
 316 0.13) for the individual clinician-focused arm (comparator). The difference in mean intention scores and 95%
 317 confidence interval (95% CI) between arms was -0.45 (-0.79 to -0.11), with a P-value of 0.01 (Table 4). There was
 318 no statistically significant difference in the other CPD-Reaction constructs between arms.

319 **Table 3:** Comparison of intention scores and and its psychosocial determinants measured with the CPD-
 320 Reaction questionnaire after the training.

Intention and psychosocial determinants– Score Range (1 to 7) ^a	Team-based arm		Individual clinician-focused arm		Estimate difference (95% CI) ^b	P-Value
	N	Mean (SE)	N	Mean (SE)		
Beliefs about capabilities	223	5.40 (0.08)	150	5.60 (0.09)	-0.20 (-0.45; 0.05)	0.11
Social Influences	217	4.69 (0.13)	147	4.83 (0.15)	-0.13 (-0.53; 0.26)	0.50
Beliefs about consequences	223	6.36 (0.07)	150	6.56 (0.09)	-0.21 (-0.43; 0.02)	0.08
Moral Norm	223	6.71 (0.04)	150	6.81 (0.05)	-0.10 (-0.23; 0.02)	0.10
Intention	223	5.97 (0.11)	150	6.42 (0.13)	-0.45 (-0.79; -0.11)	0.01

321 Analyzed using a Linear mixed model

322 P-value < 0.05 – statistically significant (T-test);

323 95% CI, confidence interval at 95%; SE, standard error of the mean

324 ^aThe social influences construct is the only construct that has one item with a Likert-scale that ranges from 1 to 5.

325 ^b Least squares mean

326 However, after adjusting for education and profession, the difference in intention between the two groups was no
 327 longer statistically significant: 0.00 (95% CI: -0.30 to 0.29), with a P-value of 0.99 (Table 4).

328 **Table 4:** Comparison of the intention to have serious illness conversations with patients between the team-based
 329 arm and the individual clinician-focused arm.

	Unadjusted Model		Adjusted model^b	
	Mean difference (95% CI) ^c	P-Value ^a	Mean difference (95% CI) ^c	P-Value ^a
Individual clinician-focused arm	Reference		Reference	
Team-based arm	-0.45 (-0.79; -0.11)	0.01	0.00 (-0.30;0.29)	0.99

330 Analyzed using a Linear mixed model

331 ^a P-value < 0.05 – statistically significant (T-test)

332 ^b Adjusted for age, profession and education level,

333 ^c95% CI, confidence interval at 95%.

334

335 **Likelihood to engage in ACP and to use the SICG**

336 The mean difference in scores between the two arms for “How likely were you to engage patients in ACP before
 337 training?” was -1.16; P<0.01, and for “How likely are you to engage patients in ACP after training?” was -0.68
 338 (P=0.01) (S1 Table). Mean difference between pre- and post-training likelihood to engage in ACP was 2.95
 339 (P<0.001) in the team-based arm and 2.60 (P<0.001) in the individual clinician-focused arm (**Table 5**), the
 340 difference between arms was not statistically significant (P=0.31). Likewise, mean difference between PHCPs’ self-
 341 reported likelihood to use the SICG in their practice after Part A and after Part B was 0.46 (P=0.01) in the team-
 342 based arm and 0.50 (P=0.02) in the individual clinician-focused arm, the difference between arms was also not
 343 statistically significant (P=0.88) (**Table 5**).

344 **Table 5:** Differences in the likelihood questions about engaging patients in ACP before and after training and using
 345 the SICG.

	Mean (SE)		Estimate differences ^b	95% CI	P-Value
Arms	How likely were you to engage patients in ACP before training?	How likely are you to engage patients in ACP after training?			
Team-based arm	5.03 (0.26)	7.95 (0.18)	2.95	2.5; 3.42	<0.001
Individual clinician-focused arm	6.11 (0.31)	8.71 (0.21)	2.60	2.06; 3.13	<0.001
Arms comparison ^a			0.35	-0.35; 1.07	0.31
	Mean (SEM)		Estimate [†]	95% CI	P-Value
How likely are you to use the Serious Illness Conversations Guide (SICG) in your practice?	Part A^c	Part B^d			
Team-based arm	8.05 (0.26)	8.45 (0.15)	0.46	0.12; 0.80	0.01
Individual clinician-focused arm	8.19 (0.29)	8.68 (0.17)	0.50	0.10; 0.90	0.02
Arms comparison ^a			-0.04	-0.57; 0.48	0.88

346 Analyzed using a Linear mixed model

347 P-value < 0.05 – statistically significant (T-test)

348 95% CI, confidence interval at 95%; SE, standard error of the mean

349 ^a Arms comparison: [In team based arm (Mean Part B-Mean Part A)] – [In individual Clinician-focused (Mean Part
350 B- Mean part A)] or [In team based arm (Mean After-Mean Before)] – [In individual Clinician-focused (Mean After-
351 Mean Before)]

352 ^b Least squares mean

353 ^c Part A was the on-line module

354 ^d Part B was the role-play session

355 **Qualitative results**

356 Fourteen facilitators were identified across seven of the 14 TDF domains, while 15 barriers were mapped onto nine
357 of the TDF domains. The predominant barriers and facilitators were consistently associated with *environmental*
358 *contexts and resources* domain, with five barriers and six facilitators falling under this category. Furthermore, the
359 second most prevalent facilitator was linked to *skills* domain, while the second most common barrier was attributed
360 to *social influences* domain. Looking more in depth into the themes that emerged, the most common theme among
361 the barriers and facilitators in both arms was having enough time to have serious illness conversations. Having an
362 organized workflow appeared to be an important facilitator in the team-based arm, but not in the individual clinician-
363 focused arm. Similarly, communication issues with patients and their own discomfort with serious illness
364 conversations were more frequent barriers with participants in the team-based arm than in the clinician-based arm.
365 At the same time, the team-based approach seems to have added barriers related to interprofessional coordination
366 and interprofessional communication that were not an issue in the individual clinician-focused arm (Table 6).

367

368 **Table 6:** Mapping facilitators and barriers to the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) with illustrative quotes and frequencies by arms

Facilitators, illustrative quotes and frequencies			
TDF Domain	What would help you have serious illness conversations and incorporate what you learned in this training in your practice?	Team-based arm (n=223)	Individual clinician-focused arm (n=150)
Knowledge	PHCPs knowing their patients and more able to identify those who needs serious illness conversations. <i>“More information on their illness, prior to discussion”</i>	8	5
	More practice, including standardized patients <i>“More practice...”</i>	33	30
Skills	More information, training, and practice scenarios (e.g., reference guide, videos etc.) <i>“More knowledge and training”</i>	9	7
	Guidance on how to document serious illness conversations. <i>“Structured documentation”</i>	6	2
	Being reminded to have serious illness conversations. <i>“Reminder sheets”</i>	7	10
Reinforcements	Ongoing support <i>“Follow-up of this training with the trainers in a few months”</i>	3	2
	Billing <i>“... billing...”</i>	2	0

Social Influences	All team members understand the relevance of serious illness conversations and help each other. <i>"...support and cooperation with other team members"</i>	28	0
	Patients who are receptive and prepared to have serious illness conversations. <i>"Patient responsiveness"</i>	5	3
Behavioural Regulation	Holding multiple conversations <i>"Breaking the conversation into multiple sessions makes so much sense"</i>	4	0
Environmental context and resources	Having the Serious Illness Conversations Guide (SICG). <i>"The guide is extremely helpful"</i>	23	31
	Scheduled time designated for serious illness conversations. <i>"Working toward scheduling dedicated visits to have serious illness conversations"</i>	21	12
	Brief cheatsheet/buzzwords (instead of/in addition to the SICG) <i>"A cheatsheet of phrases – buzzwords instead of a conversation guide"</i>	11	4
	Having a clear workflow <i>"Workflow to see how we can fit this into our primary care practice"</i>	26	4
	Guides and templates are embedded in Electronic Health Records (EHRs) <i>"Setting up templates in our EHR"</i>	8	5
	More time to have these discussions. <i>"Longer appointment times"</i>	37	26

Beliefs about capabilities	Develop more confidence and experience to have serious illness conversations. <i>“Having some help and gaining more experience in the field so I can feel more comfortable and confident”</i>	7	4
Others	Unable to code ^a	11	10
	No answer	44	31
Barriers, illustrative quotes and frequencies			
	What barriers do you anticipate to incorporating what you learned in this training into your practice?	Team-based arm (n=223)	Individual clinician-focused arm (n=150)
Knowledge	Not knowing the patient well and the difficulty in identifying the patients who would benefit. <i>“Patients often don't see their primary care physician, we work with many patients we don't have a relationship with.”</i>	11	10
Beliefs about consequences	Patient's response <i>“Patient being upset...”</i>	13	6
Emotion	Discomfort with ACP and its emotional burden. <i>“Having the conversation is out of my comfort zone.”</i>	14	6
Social / professional role and identity	Scope of practice <i>“I don't have as much direct patient care opportunity in my practice”</i>	7	2
Skills	Lack of experience and practice <i>“The inexperience”</i>	13	7
Environmental	Workflow adjustments	18	3

context and resources	<i>“Changing workflow to incorporate these interventions into practice”</i>		
	Documenting conversations <i>“Once the conversation is done, what do we do with the answers”</i>	7	2
	Unspecified barriers related to time <i>“Time...”</i>	103	68
	Fitting ACP into clinical schedule <i>“Busy schedule. Making time for it because it is important”</i>	13	23
	Difficulty to adapt the intervention to clinical routine. <i>“Following script and checking all the boxes”</i>	10	16
Social Influences	Involving and coordinating multiple personnel in the process <i>“Lack of team concept at our practice.”</i>	18	0
	Lack of interprofessional communication about SICIP <i>“Communication with team”</i>	9	0
	Communication issues with patients <i>“Patients willing to have the conversation”</i>	23	14
Reinforcements	Billing <i>“... payment...”</i>	3	1
Goals	Reaching out to patients <i>“Starting to approach patients to invite them to have this conversation”</i>	6	0
Others	Unable to code ^a	8	3

	No answer	35	26
--	-----------	----	----

369 ^a We regrouped under the 'Unable to Code' category all quotes where we could not understand what was written or were not clear enough to be coded (e.g., “not sure”, “none”, etc)

370

371 **Triangulation**

372 The psychosocial factors associated with CPD-Reaction matched with the TDF domains of beliefs about
373 capabilities, beliefs about consequences and social influences. Within the TDF, we identified 8 additional
374 psychosocial variables: knowledge, skills, reinforcements, behavioural regulation, environmental context and
375 resources, emotion, social/professional role and identity, and goals. The most frequent barrier and facilitator in
376 both arms (environmental context and resources) was classed into the “opportunity” component of COM-B.
377 Concurrently, comparative analysis of the arms using the COM-B revealed a large portion of the barriers for the
378 team-based arm derived from the domains of “opportunity” (social influences) and “motivation” (emotion and
379 social/professional role and identity). Triangulating the results led to comprehensive recommendations (S2 Table).
380 To enhance the intervention, suggestions were grounded in behaviour change techniques linked to functions such
381 as Education, Modelling, Enablement, Environmental Restructuring, Training, and Persuasion. Notably,
382 Environmental Restructuring (n=7) and Education (n=5) emerged as the most frequently recommended functions
383 (S2 Table)

384 **DISCUSSION**

385 We conducted a mixed-methods theory-driven process evaluation alongside a cRT that compared the impact on
386 patients of a team-based SICP training approach for PHCPs with the impact of an individual clinician-focused SICP
387 training approach, with post-intervention measures only. Our process evaluation explored the causal mechanisms
388 in operation, specifically relating to the PHCPs taking the training, that may have influenced the success or not of
389 the intervention, more specifically their intention to have serious illness conversations with patients. Contrary to
390 our hypothesis, we found that intention was lower in the team-based (intervention) arm than in the individual
391 clinician-focused arm, but after adjusting for age, profession and education this difference was not statistically
392 significant. We also found that likelihood to engage in ACP before training (assessed retrospectively) was lower in
393 the team-based arm than in the individual clinician-focused arm. Both arms assessed likelihood to engage patients
394 in ACP and to use the SICG as higher after training than before, but the mean difference between the likelihood
395 before and after the training was no higher in the team-based arm than in the individual clinician-focused arm.
396 Environmental context and resources were the most common TDF domains that emerged from the barrier and

397 facilitators questions. Lack of time was a major barrier in both arms, while organized workflow was a key potential
398 facilitator in the team-based arm. Additionally, the team-based arm reported more emotional discomfort and
399 concerns about patients' reactions to serious illness conversations, as well as challenges coordinating multiple
400 personnel and communicating interprofessionally, that mapped onto the *social influence* TDF domain. The latter
401 correlates with the lower mean on the team-based arm in the social influences CPD-Reaction construct. By
402 triangulating results using the COM-B framework, we found that most barriers and potential facilitators for both
403 arms related to the *opportunity* domain. The COM-B model informed our theory-based recommendations, leading
404 to the identification of areas for improvement in future interprofessional SICIP interventions. These
405 recommendations primarily focused on environmental restructuring. These results lead us to the make the following
406 observations:

407 First, contrary to our main hypothesis, the team-based arm had a lower level of intention to have serious
408 illness conversations with patients than those in the individual clinician-focused arm. However, the difference was
409 no longer statistically significant when adjusted for age, profession and education. To the best of our knowledge,
410 this study is the first study to measure PHCPs' intention to have serious illness conversations with patients.
411 Therefore, we cannot directly compare our results with those of other studies. Yet, related evidence on ACP
412 programs tends to favor team-based approaches (13, 53). The differences in the professions found in each arm of
413 the parent cRT may explain these findings. Our process evaluation also suggested that the other primary care
414 team members participating in the team-based arm may not, in their practices or healthcare systems, have had
415 the deontological responsibility or the expectations to have this type of discussion. Qualitative data support this
416 assumption since it showed that in the team-based arm more PHCPs perceived serious illness conversations as
417 outside their scope of practice. Practices vary between countries, states, and provinces regarding integrating
418 palliative care practices into primary care, and especially regarding who should initiate serious illness
419 conversations (11, 54, 55). For some of the other primary care team members this may have been the first time
420 they considered engaging in such conversations (56). In a survey of interprofessional healthcare professionals in
421 Colorado, most agreed that it was exclusively the physician's role to discuss ACP with patients and family (57).
422 Future initiatives to improve the training should focus on integrating a more comprehensive approach, fostering
423 consistent support from managers or team leaders and using the expertise and assistance from more experienced

424 PHCPs as an effective strategy to improve the sense of ownership regarding conversations and consequently
425 bolster the intention of those less experienced to have serious illness conversations with their patients (54, 55).

426 Second, PHCPs in both arms assessed their likelihood to engage in ACP before training as low, and the team-
427 based arm rated it even lower than the individual clinician-focused arm. This could indicate that at study outset,
428 baseline intention was low in the team-based arm, supporting our assumption that the lack of experience of some
429 of the other primary care team members of the team-based arm may have affected results. However, in both arms
430 the training appeared to increase the likelihood of engaging in ACP and using the SICG, suggesting an overall
431 positive impact of the SICP training sessions using either approach. A 2019 literature review on ACP in multiple
432 settings also showed an overall positive effect of training on healthcare professionals' comfort with discussing end-
433 of-life decisions (58). Similarly, equipping PHCPs with the tools to have end-of-life discussions, such as the SICG,
434 proved to be positive, as shown by the likelihood to use the SICG. Still, as evidenced by our qualitative data, there
435 is a great interest in other types of tools such as cheatsheets and EHR embedded tools. The findings are further
436 corroborated by research conducted in other settings, where tools supplementing the SICG (e.g., SIC reminders,
437 behavioural nudges) emerged as crucial elements in facilitating successful implementation (59-62). Consequently,
438 future interventions adapting the SICP to a primary care context should prioritize equipping PHCPs with a wider
439 range of tools beyond the SICG. These additional tools should be readily embeddable within their existing clinical
440 practice routines, thereby enhancing their capacity to have effective serious illness conversations.

441 Third, most frequent barriers and facilitators raised by PHCP's were related to the environmental context.
442 For example, time emerged as both a barrier and a facilitator in both arms. We expected a team-based approach
443 would reduce the time PHCPs need for discussions by promoting the sharing of tasks. It is possible that team-
444 based SICP still lacks a better method of sharing tasks to be effective. A study that adapted SICP to other contexts
445 indicated that a well-organized division of tasks and workflow is an essential element for implementation of team-
446 based approaches (61, 63). Our study validated this: participants indicated that team-based training needed to
447 better help teams organize their workflow and clarify and recognize the role of each professional. It is also possible
448 that the lack of effect observed on the intention in the team-based approach could also be attributed to the
449 additional time and burden required for coordination, and communication among team members, as seen in our
450 qualitative data. This should be taken into consideration in future studies. Future adaptations of the team-based

451 SICP should prioritize on building more relevant skills and designating tasks across roles. In addition, participants
452 in the team-based arm expressed more discomfort about discussing serious illness conversations and had greater
453 concerns about patients' readiness for such discussions, compared to participants in the individual clinician-
454 focused arm. This finding supports our assumption that despite the training provided to healthcare professionals,
455 there remains a gap in their understanding and preparedness for engaging in serious illness conversations,
456 particularly among the other primary care team members of the team-based arm. This suggests that to ensure
457 effective serious illness conversations, further efforts are needed to adapt the training to address their discomfort,
458 fears of negative reactions and concerns about patients' preparedness.

459 Fourth, the CPD-reaction construct "social influences" exhibited the lowest mean score among the
460 psychosocial factors influencing intention measured. This finding aligns with qualitative results from the team-
461 based arm, where relevant barriers such as interprofessional team coordination and communication difficulties
462 were associated with the corresponding TDF domain. "Social influence" is defined as the perception of approval
463 or disapproval from significant peers or social referents regarding the adoption of a specific behavior (36). Based
464 on this definition, one might expect PHCPs participating in team-based training to report higher levels of social
465 influence compared to those in individual training. However, our study did not find this to be the case. Still, this
466 finding aligns with existing research on the relationship between social influence and behavioural intention. A
467 systematic review of 52 studies revealed that social influence had the lowest average score range among the four
468 psychosocial factors influencing intention (64). Similarly, a qualitative study using an interprofessional approach
469 mapped social influences onto relevant barriers to behaviour adoption(65) Nevertheless, Michie et al. established
470 the social influence domain as a crucial target for health intervention planning (45), further supported by a
471 systematic review analyzing 277 articles about behaviour change techniques (66). Therefore, despite the
472 interprofessional design of our intervention, enhancing social support measures remains essential. This could
473 include providing more information about the level of peer approval, facilitating understanding and trust through
474 social comparison, and incorporating additional social support/social change strategies (18, 26). Thus, refining
475 implementation strategies related to social influence will potentially increase the success of the team-based
476 training.

477 Lastly, our data triangulation revealed that the majority of barriers and facilitators to behavior adoption,
478 especially on the team-based arm, stem from the “opportunity” domain of the COM-B framework. This finding aligns
479 with the framework’s conceptual model, which suggests that opportunity influences capacity (encompassing
480 intention), which in turn influences behavior (S2 Fig) (18, 49). Therefore, there remain upstream barriers and
481 potential facilitators, particularly in the environmental context and resources domains, that limit behaviour change.
482 Consequently, in line with the COM-B framework, modifications targeting environmental changes are a way to
483 improve the success of the intervention (28). These findings suggest that more than training, structural adjustments
484 within the clinical setting are crucial for facilitating such conversations. Incorporating these changes and mention
485 them in team-based SICP training itself could offer significant value. However, the wider scope of our study, which
486 encompassed primary care settings in two countries, precluded the use of targeted environmental changes into
487 practices. The context of the practices varied greatly, making it impossible, for example, to integrate a “one-size-
488 fits-all” workflow into the training or incorporate an EHR reminder into all practices. This finding highlights a critical
489 obstacle to large scale interventions: balancing the need for standardized content across diverse clinical contexts
490 with the need to ensure adaptability to each practice’s specific needs (67-69). However, this limitation, combined
491 with a process evaluation, enabled the identification of key SICP components critical for maintaining and replicating
492 its effectiveness (5, 6, 59, 60). As Konnyu et al. emphasize, mapping the potential for adaptation and intervention
493 based on behavior change techniques is crucial for identifying potential gaps and optimizing interventions
494 accordingly (70). Our findings, therefore, support the significance of environmental context modifications as
495 effective tools for behavior change in future SICP implementations, be it in research settings or healthcare policies.

496 **Limitations**

497 A true pre-intervention measure of baseline intention to engage in serious illness conversations with patients would
498 have been preferable, but pragmatic considerations precluded this. It is difficult to show differences in comparative
499 effectiveness studies in real-world clinical practice, particularly when interventions are similar. (71) Second, this
500 study is a process evaluation alongside a cRT in which randomization units were the clinical practices and not the
501 PHCPs. Although characteristics of the clinical practices were balanced between arms, PHCPs’ characteristics
502 were not balanced as involving different professions was part of the design, therefore the comparison between
503 arms for our main outcome, intention, could be limited. However, we controlled for these variables in the

504 multivariable analysis, and we conducted subgroup analyses of similar professions and, our finding that intention
505 increased more in the individual clinician-focused arm was no longer significant. This study analyzes team and
506 clinician outcomes of a cRT for which the sample size and statistical power were calculated for patient outcomes,
507 as these were the primary outcomes. Participation of PHCPs was encouraged but the main focus was on patient
508 recruitment and the number of practices, not the number of PHCPs. Thus, our results should be interpreted with
509 caution, as their lack of significance may be secondary to lack of statistical power, reducing the precision of our
510 results. Future studies evaluating a team-based approach should therefore increase the number of team
511 participants. Finally, the study's qualitative data collection method, relying solely on post-training open-ended
512 questions, represents a limitation. While these questions provided valuable insights, the absence of semi-
513 structured interviews or focus groups restricted the data's depth and complexity. This restriction stems from time
514 constraints in real-world implementation projects. The 3-hour training session had already consumed a substantial
515 portion of this allocated time, precluding the inclusion of more elaborate qualitative data collection methods.
516 Despite this limitation, the open-ended question findings correlated with quantitative data, supporting the study's
517 conclusions.

518 **CONCLUSION**

519 Our theory-based process evaluation alongside a cRT showed that when an individual clinician-focused
520 SICIP training approach was compared with a team-based training approach, the latter had no more impact on
521 increasing PHCPs' intention to have serious illness conversations with patients. However, both training programs
522 were useful for increasing PHCPs' likelihood of engaging in ACP discussions and to use the SICG guide. A team-
523 based approach requires further focus on training the other primary care team members to feel empowered and
524 responsible to have serious illness conversations and to address their fears of negative reactions, and their
525 concerns about patients' preparedness. Our findings suggest that future adaptations of the team-based SICIP
526 training approach should prioritize on building more relevant skills and designating tasks across roles. Finally, our
527 data triangulation revealed that the majority of barriers and facilitators to behavior adoption stem from the
528 "opportunity" domain of the COM-B framework. This suggests that more than training, structural adjustments within
529 the clinical setting are crucial for facilitating serious illness conversations. Overall, our study provides valuable

530 insights into the challenges and opportunities for implementing team-based SICP training in primary care. By
531 addressing these findings, future interventions can improve the effectiveness of SICP training and support PHCPs
532 in having more meaningful, high-quality and timely serious illness conversations with their patients.

533 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:**

534 We acknowledge the precious work of Louisa Blair for her editorial help with the manuscript and Stéphane Turcotte
535 for his vital insights in the statistical analysis. We also thank the members of the Meta-LARC ACP cRT team for
536 their involvement in this project.

537 **COLLABORATORS META-LARC ACP TRIAL TEAM:**

538 Angela K. Combe, Oregon Health & Science University

539 Annette M. Totten, Oregon Health & Science University

540 Barcey T. Levy, University of Iowa

541 Cat Halliwell, University of Colorado

542 David A. Dorr, Oregon Health & Science University

543 David Nowels, University of Colorado

544 Deb Constien, Patient-partner

545 Deborah Dokken, Patient-partner

546 Donald E. Nease, Jr., University of Colorado

547 Dr. B. Angeloe Burch Sr., Patient-partner

548 Elizabeth Fernley, Oregon Health & Science University

549 France Légaré, Université Laval - VITAM - Centre de recherche en Santé durable

550 Gail Drey, Patient-partner

551 Gurnoor Kaur Brar, University of Toronto

552 Jacqueline D. Alikhaani, Patient-partner

553 James Pantelas Patient-partner

- 554 Jean-Sebastien Paquette, Université Laval - VITAM - Centre de recherche en Santé durable
- 555 Jeanette M. Daly, University of Iowa
- 556 Jessica E. Ma, Duke University
- 557 Jodi Lapidus, Oregon Health & Science University - Portland State University School of Public Health
- 558 Judy Katz, Patient-partner
- 559 Kate Hanrahan, University of Iowa
- 560 Kathy Kastner, Patient-partner
- 561 Katrina Ramsey, Oregon Health & Science University
- 562 Keith Provin, Patient-partner
- 563 Kirsten Wentlandt, University Health Network
- 564 Kylie Lanman, Oregon Health & Science University
- 565 LeAnn C Michaels, Oregon Health & Science University
- 566 Lyle J. Fagnan, Oregon Health & Science University
- 567 Mary F. Henningfield, PhD, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- 568 Mary M. Minniti, Patient-partner
- 569 Matthew Howard, Oregon Health & Science University
- 570 Megan Schmidt, University of Iowa
- 571 Meredith K. Warman, University of Colorado
- 572 Michelle Greiver, University of Toronto
- 573 Olga Petrova, Patient-partner

- 574 Patrick M. Archambault, Université Laval - VITAM - Centre de recherche en Santé durable and Centre intégré de
575 santé et de services sociaux de Chaudière-Appalaches
- 576 Peter Kim, University of Iowa
- 577 Rowena J. Dolor, Duke University
- 578 Sabrina Guay-Bélanger, VITAM - Centre de recherche en santé durable
- 579 Sarah Bumatay, Oregon Health & Science University
- 580 Sarina Schrage, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- 581 Sean Rice, Oregon Health & Science University-Portland State University School of Public Health
- 582 Sharon E. Straus, University of Toronto
- 583 Shelbey Hagen
- 584 Shigeko (Seiko) Izumi, Oregon Health & Science University
- 585 Souleymane Gadio, VITAM - Centre de recherche en santé durable
- 586 Suélène Georgina Dofara, VITAM - Centre de recherche en santé durable
- 587 Susan Lowe, Oregon Community Health Information Network - Columbia Gorge Health Council
- 588 Taryn Bogdewiecz, University of Colorado
- 589

590 References

- 591 1. Patsopoulos NA. A pragmatic view on pragmatic trials. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci.*
592 2011;13(2):217-24.
- 593 2. Wallis KA, Elley CR. Trial and error: challenges conducting pragmatic trials in general practice.
594 *Br J Gen Pract.* 2022;72(715):54-5.
- 595 3. Saarijärvi M, Wallin L, Bratt E-L. Process evaluation of complex cardiovascular interventions:
596 How to interpret the results of my trial? *European Journal of Cardiovascular Nursing.* 2020;19(3):269-
597 74.
- 598 4. French C, Pinnock H, Forbes G, Skene I, Taylor SJ. Process evaluation within pragmatic
599 randomised controlled trials: what is it, why is it done, and can we find it?—a systematic review. *Trials.*
600 2020;21(1):1-16.
- 601 5. Bernacki R, Hutchings M, Vick J, Smith G, Paladino J, Lipsitz S, et al. Development of the Serious
602 Illness Care Program: a randomised controlled trial of a palliative care communication intervention.
603 *BMJ open.* 2015;5(10).
- 604 6. Bernacki R, Paladino J, Neville BA, Hutchings M, Kavanagh J, Geerse OP, et al. Effect of the
605 serious illness care program in outpatient oncology: a cluster randomized clinical trial. *JAMA internal*
606 *medicine.* 2019;179(6):751-9.
- 607 7. Totten AL, France; Michaels, LeAnn; Dorr, David; Izumi, Seiko; Nowels, David; Archambault,
608 Patrick, Guay-Bélanger, Sabrina; Georgina Dofara, Suélène; Barcey, Jeanette; . A Cluster Randomized
609 Trial Comparing Team-based to Clinician Focused Advance Care Planning (ACP) in Primary Care for
610 People with Serious Illness: The Meta-LARC ACP Trial. 2022.
- 611 8. Hui D, Hannon BL, Zimmermann C, Bruera E. Improving patient and caregiver outcomes in
612 oncology: Team-based, timely, and targeted palliative care. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians.*
613 2018;68(5):356-76.
- 614 9. Fortin G, Dumont S. Goals of Care Conversations at the End-of-Life: Perceived Impact of an
615 Interprofessional Training Session on Professional Practices. *Journal of Social Work in End-of-Life &*
616 *Palliative Care.* 2021;17(4):296-316.
- 617 10. Brighton LJ, Selman LE, Gough N, Nadicksbernd J, Bristowe K, Millington-Sanders C, et al.
618 'Difficult Conversations': evaluation of multiprofessional training. *BMJ supportive & palliative care.*
619 2018;8(1):45-8.
- 620 11. De Vleminck A, Houttekier D, Pardon K, Deschepper R, Van Audenhove C, Vander Stichele R,
621 et al. Barriers and facilitators for general practitioners to engage in advance care planning: a
622 systematic review. *Scandinavian journal of primary health care.* 2013;31(4):215-26.
- 623 12. Rosa WE, Izumi S, Sullivan DR, Lakin J, Rosenberg AR, Creutzfeldt CJ, et al. Advance Care
624 Planning in Serious Illness: A Narrative Review. *J Pain Symptom Manage.* 2023;65(1):e63-e78.
- 625 13. Lakin JR, Benotti E, Paladino J, Henrich N, Sanders J. Interprofessional Work in Serious Illness
626 Communication in Primary Care: A Qualitative Study. *J Palliat Med.* 2019;22(7):751-63.
- 627 14. Davis R, Campbell R, Hildon Z, Hobbs L, Michie S. Theories of behaviour and behaviour change
628 across the social and behavioural sciences: a scoping review. *Health Psychology Review.*
629 2015;9(3):323-44.
- 630 15. Grimshaw JM, Pesseau J, Tetroe J, Eccles MP, Francis JJ, Godin G, et al. Looking inside the
631 black box: results of a theory-based process evaluation exploring the results of a randomized
632 controlled trial of printed educational messages to increase primary care physicians' diabetic
633 retinopathy referrals [Trial registration number ISRCTN72772651]. *Implement Sci.* 2014;9:86.
- 634 16. Godin G, Bélanger-Gravel A, Eccles M, Grimshaw J. Healthcare professionals' intentions and
635 behaviours: a systematic review of studies based on social cognitive theories. *Implementation science.*
636 2008;3(1):1-12.

- 637 17. Atkins L, Francis J, Islam R, O'Connor D, Patey A, Ivers N, et al. A guide to using the Theoretical
638 Domains Framework of behaviour change to investigate implementation problems. *Implementation*
639 *Science*. 2017;12(1):77.
- 640 18. Michie S, Atkins L, West R. The behaviour change wheel. A guide to designing interventions
641 1st ed Great Britain: Silverback Publishing. 2014;1003:1010.
- 642 19. Adekpedjou R, Haesebaert J, Stacey D, Brière N, Freitas A, Rivest L-P, et al. Variations in factors
643 associated with healthcare providers' intention to engage in interprofessional shared decision making
644 in home care: results of two cross-sectional surveys. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2020;20(1):203.
- 645 20. Légaré F, Stacey D, Briere N, Fraser K, Desroches S, Dumont S, et al. Healthcare providers'
646 intentions to engage in an interprofessional approach to shared decision-making in home care
647 programs: a mixed methods study. *Journal of interprofessional care*. 2013;27(3):214-22.
- 648 21. Lockwood I, Walker RM, Latimer S, Chaboyer W, Cooke M, Gillespie BM. Process evaluations
649 undertaken alongside randomised controlled trials in the hospital setting: A scoping review. *Contemp*
650 *Clin Trials Commun*. 2022;26:100894.
- 651 22. Liu H, Mohammed A, Shanthosh J, News M, Laba TL, Hackett ML, et al. Process evaluations of
652 primary care interventions addressing chronic disease: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*.
653 2019;9(8):e025127.
- 654 23. Creswell JW, Clark VP. *Mixed methods research*: SAGE Publications.; 2011.
- 655 24. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, et al. Process evaluation of
656 complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *Bmj*. 2015;350:h1258.
- 657 25. Légaré F, Borduas F, Freitas A, Turcotte S. User manual—The Continuing Professional
658 Development (CPD) Reaction Questionnaire. Online] Laval: Canada[Cited on August 20, 2017]
659 Available at: [http://www](http://www.decision.chaire.fmed.ulaval.ca/en/research/projects/cpd/)
660 26. Godin G. *Les comportements dans le domaine de la santé: Les presses de l'Université de*
661 *Montréal*; 2013.
- 662 27. Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S. Validation of the theoretical domains framework for use in
663 behaviour change and implementation research. *Implementation Science*. 2012;7(1):37.
- 664 28. Michie S, Van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a new method for
665 characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. *Implementation science*. 2011;6(1):1-
666 12.
- 667 29. Campbell MK, Piaggio G, Elbourne DR, Altman DG. Consort 2010 statement: extension to
668 cluster randomised trials. *Bmj*. 2012;345.
- 669 30. O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. The quality of mixed methods studies in health services
670 research. *J Health Serv Res Policy*. 2008;13(2):92-8.
- 671 31. Izumi SS, Caron D, Guay-Bélanger S, Archambault P, Michaels L, Heinlein J, et al. Development
672 and Evaluation of Serious Illness Conversation Training for Interprofessional Primary Care Teams. *J*
673 *Palliat Med*. 2023.
- 674 32. Adekpedjou R, Stacey D, Brière N, Freitas A, Garvelink MM, Dogba MJ, et al. Engaging
675 caregivers in health-related housing decisions for older adults with cognitive impairment: a cluster
676 randomized trial. *The Gerontologist*. 2020;60(5):947-57.
- 677 33. Stacey D, Légaré F, Pouliot S, Kryworuchko J, Dunn S. Shared decision making models to inform
678 an interprofessional perspective on decision making: a theory analysis. *Patient education and*
679 *counseling*. 2010;80(2):164-72.
- 680 34. Dogba MJ, Menear M, Stacey D, Brière N, Légaré F. The evolution of an interprofessional
681 shared decision-making research program: reflective case study of an emerging paradigm.
682 *International Journal of Integrated Care*. 2016;16(3).
- 683 35. Légaré F, Stacey D, Brière N, Fraser K, Desroches S, Dumont S, et al. Healthcare providers'
684 intentions to engage in an interprofessional approach to shared decision-making in home care
685 programs: a mixed methods study. *J Interprof Care*. 2013;27(3):214-22.

- 686 36. Légaré F, Borduas F, Freitas A, Jacques A, Godin G, Luconi F, et al. Development of a simple
687 12-item theory-based instrument to assess the impact of continuing professional development on
688 clinical behavioral intentions. *PloS one*. 2014;9(3):e91013.
- 689 37. Bakwa Kanyinga F, Gogovor A, Dofara SG, Gadio S, Tremblay M, Daniel SJ, et al. Evaluating the
690 impact of continuing professional development courses on physician behavioral intention: a pre-post
691 study with follow-up at six months. *BMC Medical Education*. 2023;23(1):629.
- 692 38. Hrisos S, Eccles MP, Francis JJ, Dickinson HO, Kaner EFS, Beyer F, et al. Are there valid proxy
693 measures of clinical behaviour? a systematic review. *Implementation Science*. 2009;4(1):37.
- 694 39. Légaré F, Freitas A, Turcotte S, Borduas F, Jacques A, Luconi F, et al. Responsiveness of a simple
695 tool for assessing change in behavioral intention after continuing professional development activities.
696 *PLoS One*. 2017;12(5):e0176678.
- 697 40. Sullivan GM, Artino Jr AR. Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type scales. *Journal of*
698 *graduate medical education*. 2013;5(4):541-2.
- 699 41. Fishman J, Lushin V, Mandell DS. Predicting implementation: comparing validated measures
700 of intention and assessing the role of motivation when designing behavioral interventions.
701 *Implementation Science Communications*. 2020;1(1):81.
- 702 42. Little TD, Chang R, Gorrall BK, Waggenspack L, Fukuda E, Allen PJ, et al. The retrospective
703 pretest–posttest design redux: On its validity as an alternative to traditional pretest–posttest
704 measurement. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. 2020;44(2):175-83.
- 705 43. Adisso EL, Borde V, Saint-Hilaire M-È, Robitaille H, Archambault P, Blais J, et al. Can patients
706 be trained to expect shared decision making in clinical consultations? Feasibility study of a public
707 library program to raise patient awareness. *PloS one*. 2018;13(12):e0208449.
- 708 44. Stacey D, Briere N, Robitaille H, Fraser K, Desroches S, Légaré F. A systematic process for
709 creating and appraising clinical vignettes to illustrate interprofessional shared decision making.
710 *Journal of Interprofessional Care*. 2014;28(5):453-9.
- 711 45. Michie S, Johnston M, Abraham C, Lawton R, Parker D, Walker A. Making psychological theory
712 useful for implementing evidence based practice: a consensus approach. *Qual Saf Health Care*.
713 2005;14(1):26-33.
- 714 46. Kim H, Sefcik JS, Bradway C. Characteristics of qualitative descriptive studies: A systematic
715 review. *Research in nursing & health*. 2017;40(1):23-42.
- 716 47. Nowell LS, Norris JM, White DE, Moules NJ. Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the
717 trustworthiness criteria. *International journal of qualitative methods*. 2017;16(1):1609406917733847.
- 718 48. O’Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. Three techniques for integrating data in mixed methods
719 studies. *Bmj*. 2010;341:c4587.
- 720 49. West R, Michie S. A brief introduction to the COM-B Model of behaviour and the PRIME Theory
721 of motivation. *Qeios*.
- 722 50. McDonagh LK, Saunders JM, Cassell J, Curtis T, Bastaki H, Hartney T, et al. Application of the
723 COM-B model to barriers and facilitators to chlamydia testing in general practice for young people and
724 primary care practitioners: a systematic review. *Implementation Science*. 2018;13(1):130.
- 725 51. Tardif AD, Gogovor A, Guay-Bélanger S, Audet D, Parent N, Gaudreau A, et al. Integration of
726 sex and gender in a continuing professional development course on diabetes and depression: a mixed
727 methods feasibility study. *BMJ open*. 2022;12(4):e050890.
- 728 52. Agbadjé TT, Menear M, Dugas M, Gagnon M-P, Rahimi SA, Robitaille H, et al. Pregnant
729 women’s views on how to promote the use of a decision aid for Down syndrome prenatal screening:
730 a theory-informed qualitative study. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2018;18(1):1-15.
- 731 53. Beck BM, Coda C, Gerges J, Allen J, Agarwal A, Mutchie HL, et al. Advance care planning: An
732 interprofessional approach to resident education. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*.
733 2020;68(11):E66.
- 734 54. Dixon J, Knapp M. Whose job? The staffing of advance care planning support in twelve
735 international healthcare organizations: a qualitative interview study. *BMC Palliat Care*. 2018;17(1):78.

- 736 55. Buchman S, Evans JM, Mackinnon M, Gradin S, Wright FC. Bridging silos: Delivering integrated
737 care to patients with cancer in Ontario, Canada. *Psychooncology*. 2018;27(12):2673-6.
- 738 56. Patel MI, Khateeb S, Coker T. Lay Health Workers' Perspectives on Delivery of Advance Care
739 Planning and Symptom Screening Among Adults With Cancer: A Qualitative Study. *American Journal*
740 *of Hospice & Palliative Medicine*. 2021;38(10):1202-11.
- 741 57. Arnett K, Sudore RL, Nowels D, Feng CX, Levy CR, Lum HD. Advance care planning:
742 understanding clinical routines and experiences of interprofessional team members in diverse health
743 care settings. *American Journal of Hospice and Palliative Medicine*[®]. 2017;34(10):946-53.
- 744 58. Chan CWH, Ng NHY, Chan HY, Wong MM, Chow K. A systematic review of the effects of
745 advance care planning facilitators training programs. *BMC health services research*. 2019;19(1):1-14.
- 746 59. Manz CR, Zhang Y, Chen K, Long Q, Small DS, Evans CN, et al. Long-term Effect of Machine
747 Learning–Triggered Behavioral Nudges on Serious Illness Conversations and End-of-Life Outcomes
748 Among Patients With Cancer: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Oncology*. 2023;9(3):414-8.
- 749 60. Karim S, Levine O, Simon J. The Serious Illness Care Program in Oncology: Evidence, Real-World
750 Implementation and Ongoing Barriers. *Curr Oncol*. 2022;29(3):1527-36.
- 751 61. Paladino J, Sanders J, Kilpatrick LB, Prabhakar R, Kumar P, O'Connor N, et al. Serious Illness
752 Care Programme—contextual factors and implementation strategies: a qualitative study. *BMJ*
753 *Supportive & Palliative Care*. 2022.
- 754 62. Kumar P, Paladino J, Gabriel PE, Ferrell WJ, Jones J, Schuchter LM, et al. The Serious Illness
755 Care Program: Implementing a Key Element of High-Quality Oncology Care. *NEJM Catalyst Innovations*
756 *in Care Delivery*. 2023;4(2):CAT. 22.0309.
- 757 63. Lakin JR, Benotti E, Paladino J, Henrich N, Sanders J. Interprofessional work in serious illness
758 communication in primary care: a qualitative study. *Journal of Palliative Medicine*. 2019;22(7):751-63.
- 759 64. Ayivi-Vinz G, Kanyinga FB, Bergeron L, Décary S, Adisso ÉL, Zomahoun HTV, et al. Use of the
760 CPD-REACTION Questionnaire to Evaluate Continuing Professional Development Activities for Health
761 Professionals: Systematic Review. *JMIR Medical Education*. 2022;8(2):e36948.
- 762 65. Boland L, Lawson ML, Graham ID, Légaré F, Dorrance K, Shephard A, et al. Post-training Shared
763 Decision Making Barriers and Facilitators for Pediatric Healthcare Providers: A Mixed-Methods Study.
764 *Academic Pediatrics*. 2019;19(1):118-29.
- 765 66. Carey RN, Connell LE, Johnston M, Rothman AJ, de Bruin M, Kelly MP, et al. Behavior Change
766 Techniques and Their Mechanisms of Action: A Synthesis of Links Described in Published Intervention
767 Literature. *Ann Behav Med*. 2019;53(8):693-707.
- 768 67. Aarons GA, Sklar M, Mustanski B, Benbow N, Brown CH. “Scaling-out” evidence-based
769 interventions to new populations or new health care delivery systems. *Implementation Science*.
770 2017;12(1):111.
- 771 68. Jessica P, Brynne G, Frédérique V, Elaine T, Hasheem M, Eilish M. Adapting health
772 interventions for local fit when scaling-up: a realist review protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(1):e022084.
- 773 69. Plaisance A, Witteman HO, LeBlanc A, Kryworuchko J, Heyland DK, Ebell MH, et al.
774 Development of a decision aid for cardiopulmonary resuscitation and invasive mechanical ventilation
775 in the intensive care unit employing user-centered design and a wiki platform for rapid prototyping.
776 *PLOS ONE*. 2018;13(2):e0191844.
- 777 70. Konnyu KJ, McCleary N, Presseau J, Ivers NM, Grimshaw JM. Behavior Change Techniques in
778 Continuing Professional Development. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*.
779 2020;40(4):268-73.
- 780 71. Dang A, Kaur K. Comparative effectiveness research and its utility in In-clinic practice.
781 *Perspectives in Clinical Research*. 2016;7(1):9.

782

783

784 **Supporting Information**

785 **S1 Fig. Diagram of the measured behaviours and their interaction**

786 **S2 Fig. The COM-B model and its correlation with the TDF domains**

787 **S1 Table. ACP engagement scores before and after training**

788 **S2 Table. Recommendations to improve the training based on barriers and facilitators, using the COM-B**
789 **model, the Theoretical Domains Framework and the CPD-Reaction questionnaire.**

790 **S1 Checklist. CONSORT**

791 **S2 Checklist. GRAMMS**




Figure 1




Figure 2