TITLE

Can we enhance neurorehabilitation through regional implementation of group-based telerehabilitation? A mixed methods evaluation of NeuroRehabilitation OnLine (NROL).

AUTHORS: Suzanne Ackerley (1,2), Thomas Mason (1,3), Adam Partington (2), Rosemary Peel (4), Helen Vernon (2), Louise A Connell (1,2)

AFFILIATIONS:

1. Faculty of Health & Medicine, Health Innovation Campus, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
2. Rakehead Rehabilitation Centre, East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust, Burnley General Teaching Hospital, United Kingdom
3. Faculty of Biology, Health and Medicine, University of Manchester, United Kingdom
4. Stroke Therapy Team, University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Prof. Louise A Connell, PhD

l.connell2@lancaster.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To determine whether neurorehabilitation can be enhanced through regional implementation of group-based telerehabilitation, we implemented the NeuroRehabilitation OnLine (NROL) innovation regionally and evaluated scale-up from a systems perspective.

Design: Mixed methods convergent parallel design.

Setting: Stroke and neurological rehabilitation services from four organisations across a regional healthcare system in the United Kingdom.

Participants: Therapy staff from community-based services and patients with a stroke or neurological condition receiving active community rehabilitation including NROL from April 2022 to March 2024.

Intervention: A regional multidisciplinary group-based neurological telerehabilitation innovation, NeuroRehabilitation OnLine (NROL).

Primary outcome measures: Selected Proctor's implementation outcomes, to establish system-level adoption, acceptability and sustainability of the regional NROL innovation.

Results: NROL was adopted by all intended organisations and continues as part of usual care with participation growing. It was acceptable to therapy staff and patients across the region, well-attended, with concordant positive feedback, and enabled increased therapy provision. For sustainability, the importance of continued wide stakeholder engagement, robust evaluation and alignment was highlighted. Workforce efficiencies were identified through effective collaborative regional systems working.

Conclusions: NROL was successfully embedded into real-world practice at a system-level to enhance neurorehabilitation. Looking forward, longer-term institutionalisation of this innovation will require a compelling business case and value proposition for decision-makers, addressing economic, equality, and operational efficiency considerations.

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Strengths and limitations of this study

- Within a clinical-academic partnership, robust mixed methods evaluation enabled comprehensive system-level insights into the scale up of a group-based telerehabilitation model
- Our approach was strengthened by using established implementation science outcomes and frameworks
- Use of real-world routinely collected data was pragmatic and integral to the model's embedded nature but limited the focus of insight to those who participated in NROL
- Decision-maker perspective was not captured but will be an important next step, alongside gaining opinion from those who did not participate

Keywords: NeuroRehabilitation OnLine, NROL, group-based, stroke, neurological, brain injury, rehabilitation, digital health, implementation, adoption, acceptability, sustainability

Word count: 4371 (excl. abstract, strengths/limitations, figure legends and tables)

Tables: 3

Figures: 4

INTRODUCTION

Multidisciplinary rehabilitation plays an important role in minimising disability, maximising function, and optimising quality of life for people living with long-term neurological conditions. Higher doses of neurorehabilitation improve outcomes (1-4). In England, despite agreed recommendations for therapy amount (5, 6), actual provision falls significantly below recommended levels, with variable access across providers (7); a pattern seen internationally (8, 9). Barriers to guideline adherence include workforce challenges, inefficiencies in resource allocation and lack of supporting organisational processes (10-12). Achievement of recommended targets for access and provision may remain unmet until transformative system-level change is undertaken (11, 12), however solutions need to be feasible within our existing healthcare setting.

Telerehabilitation is one solution that may help address shortfalls in therapy provision, an approach endorsed for use alongside conventional in-person therapy (5). When delivered remotely, rehabilitation interventions have been shown to be safe and equally effective as those delivered in-person including for stroke and neurological populations (13-16). Telerehabilitation can minimise barriers to access, such as reducing travel requirement and optimising resource use, whilst facilitating rehabilitation engagement (17, 18). These advantages may be especially important in areas with widely dispersed populations, a lack of local services, and/or staffing shortages. As national healthcare services face reform, strategic drivers aim to shift resources to the community, improve productivity and flow, and integrate digital transformation initiatives (19, 20). Incorporating acceptable telerehabilitation models into existing care pathways and systems may provide opportunity for enhancing rehabilitation with efficient resource use (21).

NeuroRehabilitation OnLine (NROL) is a multidisciplinary, group-based, real-time telerehabilitation innovation that was successfully adapted from a pilot version (22) and implemented at a single National Health Service (NHS) community stroke and neurological service (17). It leverages group-based therapy, which is supported by favourable evidence, benefits peer-support and offers staffing efficiencies (17, 22). As part of a hybrid model of care embedded into an established care pathway, it offered advantages to save time, energy and travel, enabling more therapy to be delivered using existing workforce (17). NROL at this single-service level was deemed appropriate for patients with various neurological conditions and acceptable to patients and therapy staff, with positive outcomes and opinions. NROL aligned with strategic priorities, including the use of data and digital technologies in healthcare (23).

NROL was acknowledged in UK and Ireland stroke guidelines as an exemplar innovation for remotely delivered rehabilitation (5). To build on these positive results, a decision was made to expand NROL into a regional innovation (24, 25).

Scale up of NROL was a 'deliberate effort to increase the impact of this successful innovation to a greater number of services across the region' (26), and aligned with statutory changes for healthcare organisations to work cross-regionally to improve population healthcare, tackle unequal outcomes and access, and enhance productivity and value for money (27). Scaling up efforts should be underpinned by key principles including systems thinking and a focus on sustainability (26, 28).

Within a clinical-academic partnership, we sought to evaluate whether our regional community neurorehabilitation services could be enhanced through system-level implementation of the group-based telerehabilitation programme, NROL. Our objectives were to implement NROL across multiple services at four healthcare organisations within our region and evaluate scale up from a system-level perspective.

METHODS

A mixed methods convergent parallel design was used and is described below, preceded by an overview of context. This approach is particularly valuable when evaluating the implementation of complex innovations, where both measurable outcomes and contextual factors matter (29).

Implementation context

The regional NROL innovation was co-produced within a collaboration between a regional healthcare system (Lancashire and South Cumbria Integrated Care System) and a clinical-academic partnership (Lancaster University and East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust (ELHT)). ELHT, the host healthcare organisation, registered the NROL project as a service evaluation. Implementation was guided by the updated Medical Research Council (MRC) framework for developing complex interventions (25, 29). Context was described using the Consolidated Framework for

Implementation Research (CFIR) (30, 31). A summary is provided below, with full details published separately (24, 25).

Inner setting (Healthcare setting)

Community-based stroke and neurological rehabilitation services from four organisations within the regional healthcare system were involved (ELHT, University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust (UHMB), Blackpool Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (BTH) and Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust (LSCFT)). These services provide multidisciplinary rehabilitation for adults with sudden onset or progressive/intermittent neurological conditions. Before NROL's scale up (April 2022), services primarily offered in-person individual therapy at patients' home, with limited onsite group and occasional online individual therapy sessions. The exception was ELHT, who have provided online group therapy via NROL at a single-service level since January 2021.

Individuals (Patients and staff)

Patients undertaking community neurorehabilitation could be referred to NROL by therapy staff as a complement to existing care. In addition to service eligibility, inclusion required English proficiency (or translator access) and willingness to participate in online group therapy, with or without carer support. Participants required access to suitable computer hardware or connectivity, though support was sought from Age UK. Existing therapy staff from all involved services delivered NROL collectively (i.e. shared care approach), coordinated by a dedicated regional NROL team (Operational manager, Technology Support, Administrator). Clinical-academics and NHS management in stroke and neurorehabilitation provided leadership.

Innovation (NROL)

NROL as a regional innovation has been comprehensively described (24). In brief, NROL delivers real-time (synchronous) group-based multidisciplinary therapy online (Microsoft Teams) over repeating six-week 'blocks.' Each block begins with an NROL entry session, followed by individualised programmes including talking and/or physical targeted therapy groups and an optional community peer-support group. Groups are delivered by therapy staff (allied health professionals, psychologists, assistant practitioners), patient volunteers and students. To facilitate

participation, patients receive set-up and ongoing assistance from a dedicated NROL Technology Support team member, who is present during all sessions.

Outer setting (External influences)

NROL aligns with NHS strategic drivers including an ambition for equitable regional service delivery, managing workforce challenges, efficient resource use, digital innovation and delivering towards net-zero (19, 20, 23, 32-34), and is endorsed in UK and Ireland stroke guidelines (5).

Design

From April 2022, a horizontal phased approach (26) scaled NROL from a single-service (ELHT) to a multi-service model, integrating three further organisations (UHMB, BTH, LSCFT).

A mixed methods convergent parallel design evaluated NROL alongside delivery (Figure 1). Service (quantitative) and survey data (quantitative and qualitative) were analysed separately. Survey data was interpreted and merged under CFIR domains (31). Implementation success was conceptualised using selected Proctor's implementation outcomes (35). These were chosen to fit the evaluation purpose, agreed with decision-makers (NHS managers and commissioners) as relevant, and within resources available. The outcomes were system-level; adoption (integration, growth, delivery, challenges and enablers), acceptability (attendance, safety, therapy provision and perception among implementation stakeholders) and sustainability (key considerations for the NROL to continue as usual care as a regional innovation).



Figure 1. NROL evaluation mixed methods convergent parallel design.
CFIR = Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research

Data collection and analysis

Service data

Service data included details of NROL integration (organisation, staff, patient participation), delivery (number of referrals, blocks, groups, sessions, capacity), attendance (staff, patient), travel (avoided driving miles, time, mileage

cost and carbon emissions), therapy provision (therapy amount received, duration in service) and patient outcome (quality of life, activity performance). Data were collected concurrently throughout delivery and reported over the total evaluation period (Total: April 2022–March 2024) and annually where relevant (R1: April 2022–March 2023, R2: April 2023–March 2024). To further assess integration and growth, data from the preceding year of single-service NROL (S) at ELHT were included (April 2021–March 2022).

All patients referred to NROL were characterised using routinely collected demographic and clinical data. Reasons for withdrawal before starting (did not start) or drop-out (after at least one targeted therapy session) were recorded. Intention to treat analysis was applied for participants who dropped-out. Descriptive statistics summarised data for NROL integration, delivery and attendance. Statistical tests (Mann-Whitney U, Chi-square and Fisher's Exact) were conducted to identify significant differences or associations between patients referred to NROL who participated ('NROL') vs. those referred to NROL but did not start ('Did not start').

For travel, informed estimates for driving mile and time avoidance (i.e. those that would have been incurred for an in-person home visit) for each NROL patient were determined using Google maps, based on staff worksite and patient residential postcode combined with session attendance. Mileage cost avoidance was calculated at 59 pence per mile, the NHS mileage rate (36). Avoided carbon emissions ($kgCO^2e$) were estimated using total avoided mileage cost and a UK conversion factor (0.517 $kgCO^2e$ per £) (37). Descriptive statistics summarised data.

For therapy provision, a small-scale comparative review was enabled using retrospective data acquired for the UK Sentinel Stroke National Audit Programme (SSNAP) from two organisations (ELHT, BTH). Records were restricted to stroke patients within the evaluation period who received more than 3 days of community therapy, ensuring patients were appropriate for rehabilitation rather than requiring assessment only. Analyses compared the total therapy amount received (minutes) and duration in service (days) between stroke patients who participated in NROL ('NROL') vs. those who did not ('Non-NROL'). These comparisons examined both the therapy provided in total across four care domains (Occupational Therapy (OT), Physiotherapy (OT), Speech and Language Therapy (SLT) and Psychological Support (Psychology)) and within each of the four care domains. As normality testing (Shapiro-Wilk test) indicated significant non-normality ($p<0.05$), nonparametric tests (Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney U) were used and medians and interquartile ranges (IQR) were reported. The SSNAP dataset also allowed review of selected

characteristics (age, sex, pre-stroke disability (mRS), admission stroke severity (NIHSS), deprivation and rurality) to identify differences or associations between stroke patients between 'NROL' vs. 'Non-NROL' patients.

For patient outcomes, two patient-reported outcome measures routinely collected on entry and exit to NROL were used to evaluate quality of life and activity performance, the EQ-5D-5L (38, 39) and the Patient Specific Functional Scale (PSFS) (40-42) respectively. As normality testing (Shapiro-Wilk test) indicated significant non-normality ($p<0.05$), nonparametric test (Wilcoxon Signed rank test) were used and medians and interquartile ranges (IQR) were reported. Mean differences are provided for comparison with minimal clinically important differences (MCIDs), defined as EQ-Index≥0.102 EQ-VAS≥10, and PSFS≥2.8 points (40, 43). The proportion of patients who improved or remained stable (change score (exit – entry) ≥0), and those who met or exceeded the MCID, are reported.

Analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel (Version 2411), StataNow/MP 18.5, and IBM SPSS Statistics version 29.0. All tests were two-tailed, and statistical significance was determined at a p-value threshold of 0.05.

Survey data

Cross-sectional surveys were undertaken to collect feedback from NROL therapy staff and patients across the region. Development was informed by the COM-B behavioural change framework (44) and related to project outcomes. The COM-B was chosen as it recognises key factors integral in changing behaviour, is widely used in public health, and aligns with the updated CFIR used for analysis. Surveys were each piloted on 2-3 people to check content, clarity, usability and time taken and minimally refined to address feedback. The surveys used a mix of multiple choice, Likert scales, and open-ended questions (see Supplementary file 1 for final versions).

Patient surveys were conducted via telephone on NROL exit as part of routine process, for patients participating between April 2022–August 2023. Patients were aware that survey administrator was not a member of the clinical team, and an honest perspective was wanted. Surveys were anonymised for analysis. Therapy staff surveys were conducted anonymously online (Microsoft forms) between June–July 2023 as part of service evaluation, with the survey link shared to all relevant service therapy staff via service management.

Analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel (Version 2411). Descriptive statistics were calculated to summarise quantitative data. Framework analysis was undertaken using the CFIR to code qualitative data deductively, with one main coder and one reviewer (SA, AP). Survey results relating to system-level key constructs were merged under relevant CFIR headings.

Mixed methods merging

A joint display (45) was used to provide structure to merge the service and survey analyses, a recommended approach for presenting mixed methods results (46), and consistent with our prior reporting (17). Aligning quantitative results with qualitative findings, enabled synergistic insights when exploring system-level adoption, acceptability and sustainability. Insights were summarised by SA and LC and discussed and agreed by the clinical authors (AP, RP, HV) and the therapy staff involved in NROL. Manuscript preparation was guided by the Good Reporting of a Mixed Methods Study (GRAMMS)(47).

Evaluator characteristics and reflexivity

This project was part of a clinical academic partnership, with LC & SA being both experienced researchers and physiotherapists in neurorehabilitation who have been involved in NROL development, implementation, evaluation, and sustainment. AP is a physiotherapist who works as the operational manager of NROL for Lancashire and South Cumbria. RP is an occupational therapist at UHMB who delivers NROL. HV is a speech and language therapist and Head of Service for Stroke and Neurorehabilitation at ELHT and provides strategic leadership for NROL. TM is an applied econometrician working as quantitative researcher focused on health and health care.

Patient and public involvement (PPI)

Stakeholder engagement is a core element in developing and evaluating complex interventions (29). Patients and carers co-designed NROL within a learning collaborative, providing vital contributions to enhance its quality and relevance as previously described with a GRIPP2 reporting checklist (24). Involvement has continued throughout

implementation, with patients providing feedback to refine content and delivery. Engagement has resulted in tangible improvements, for example a trial of a 'Vocation' group and the creation of patient video vignettes to communicate key NROL information to diverse audiences in an accessible and meaningful way.

RESULTS

Service data

NROL integration

Organisation participation

Phased integration of all four organisations was commenced across a 6-month period between April - September 2022 (see Figure 2).

Staff participation

Seventy-five existing therapy staff from across the four organisations delivered NROL groups within their existing clinical capacity during the evaluation period (April 2022 – March 2024). They were health care professionals from physiotherapy (35%), occupational therapy (33%), speech and language therapy (12%), psychology (4%) and dietetics (1%) disciplines, and therapy assistants (4%) and trainees (11%). Per NROL block, about 40 therapy staff (~30% regional community neurorehabilitation therapy workforce) delivered sessions, contributing between 1–6.5 hours each. Additionally, 167 staff registered to observe NROL.

Patient participation

A total of 438 patients were referred within the evaluation period, with 192 patients between April 2022 and March 2023 (R1) and 249 between April 23 and March 2024 (R2) (30% increase). Three patients participated in both annual periods and are included in each. The Regional NROL patient participation profile is depicted in Figure 2. NROL referrals were received from all four organisations, reflecting approximately 2– 16% of patients referred to their overall service. 339 referred patients participated in NROL, and 99 patients did not start for a variety of reasons. Withdrawal and drop-out rate across organisations ranged from 20–28% and 2-18% respectively.

Participating patient characteristics are presented in Table 1. Patients' residences were across an area circa 4480km^2, with the percent of regional NROL participants living rurally (23%) aligning with that of the region (20%) (48). Compared to patients that were referred to NROL but did not start, patients that participated in NROL were younger (Median age, y (IQR): NROL=60 (50–71) vs. Did not start=63 (55–74), $p<0.05$) and more likely to have conditions that were sudden onset ($p<0.01$) and at the subacute phase ($p<0.05$).

Small-scale review (n: NROL= 76, Non-NROL= 1,520) of selected characteristics indicated stroke patients who participated in NROL were younger (Median age (IQR): NROL=61 (54–71) vs. Non-NROL=75 (64–82), $p<0.01$). They also statistically had lower level of pre-stroke disability (Mean mRS: NROL=0.41 (1.01) vs. Non-NROL=0.87 (1.19), $p<0.01$), however both were less than 1 (where 0 indicates no symptoms and 1 indicates no significant disability and normal functioning) and the difference may be consistent with age differential.



Figure 2: Regional NROL integration and patient participation profile
Profiles of the community-based stroke and neurological rehabilitation services from four organisations within the regional healthcare system (East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust (ELHT), University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust (UHMB), Blackpool Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (BTH) and Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust (LSCFT).

Table 1: NROL patient characteristics over time

	Annual			Evaluation period
	Apr 21–Apr 22	Apr 22–Mar 23	Apr 23–Mar 24	Apr 22–Mar 24
Characteristics	Single-service (S)[a] (n=98)	Regional 1 (R1)[a] (n=155)	Regional 2 (R2)[a] (n=187)	Regional Total[b] (n=339)
Age years, median (range)	57 (19–86)	60 (20–89)	60 (19–89)	60 (19–89)
Sex, male (%)	58 (59%)	90 (58%)	100 (54%)	190 (56%)
Ethnicity				
White	73 (75%)	140 (90%)	164 (88%)	301 (89%)
Asian British or Asian	10 (10%)	8 (5%)	13 (7%)	21 (6%)
Black British or Black	-	2 (1%)	2 (1%)	4 (1%)
Other	-	3 (2%)	2 (1%)	5 (2%)
Not reported	15 (15%)	2 (1%)	6 (3%)	8 (2%)
Index multiple deprivation, median (range)	4 (1–10)	5.5 (1–10)	5 (1–10)	5 (1–10)
Rurality, rural (%)	18 (18%)	42 (27%)	38 (20%)	79 (23%)
Living alone, yes (%)	14 (14%)	26 (17%)	31 (17%)	57 (17%)
Condition				
Sudden	73 (75%)	137 (88%)	175 (94%)	310 (91%)
Stroke	45 (46%)	109 (70%)	150 (80%)	257 (76%)
Progressive/intermittent	25 (26%)	18 (12%)	12 (6%)	29 (9%)
Chronicity				
Subacute (1 week - <6m)	46 (47%)	89 (57%)	138 (74%)	225 (66%)

Single = single-service, Regional = multi-service. [a]Annual periods (S, R1, R2). [b]2-year evaluation period (Regional Total). Three patients participated in both annual reporting periods (R1 and R2) and are included in each.

NROL delivery

Twelve blocks were undertaken in the evaluation period (April 2022 – March 2024). Ten different groups were successfully run covering targeted talking (Cognitive education, Cognitive processing, Living well (adjustment/wellbeing), Fatigue, Dysarthria, Aphasia, Vocation) and physical (Balance and Mobility, Upper limb) therapy and community peer-support (Café NROL). The median number of patients participating in a block was 34 (range=27-50) (Single-service median=21). In total 511 NROL sessions were delivered, with a median of 5 patients (range=1-13) per targeted therapy session and 12 patients (range=6–21) per Café NROL session. Blocks were run at a median of 84% capacity (range=62-101%). Delivery data are summarised in Table 2, with group level data provided in Supplementary file 2. One adverse event was recorded: a minor seizure relating to a known condition during a talking session. NROL staff followed standard operating procedure, no first aid was required and the patient was able to continue participation. NROL remains part of usual care.

NROL attendance

Staff attendance

There were 1167 therapy staff contacts (therapist=869 (74%), therapy assistant=298 (26%)) during delivery of 3434 patient contacts. The proportion of therapy staff contacts from each organisation ranged from 7% to 53% (variation likely reflecting phased integration and different service sizes), however when considered relative to referral proportion differences were between -6% and 7%. Sixty-nine percent of sessions were run cross-organisationally (i.e. therapy staff from ≥ two organisations). The median staff:patient ratio across all sessions was 0.4 (0.1–2.0). Attendance (staff and patient) data are summarised in Table 2, with group level data provided in Supplementary file 2, and demonstrates that all groups were delivered with a median ratio less than or equal to 0.8. To support delivery, there were 488 NROL technology support contacts, 23 student and 19 patient-volunteer (for Café NROL) contacts.

Patient attendance

Most patients participated in 1 NROL block (79%), but some participated in 2 (18%), 3 (2%) or 4 (1%). Patients attended a median of 9 sessions (range = 1–50). There were 3434 patient contacts in total, with 2343 for targeted therapy. Overall NROL attendance rate for the targeted therapy groups was 71% (group range 60–83%), with

organisation attendance rate ranging between 65–83%. Café NROL was optional to attend, and 200 patients (59%) chose to participate. Attendance data are summarised in Table 2 and individual group data in Supplementary file 2.

NROL travel

Avoided driving miles totalled 75554 (Annual average=37777 miles) and avoided driving time 2506 hours (annual average=1253 hours). Avoided mileage cost totalled £44577 (annual average=£22289). Avoided carbon emissions totalled 23046 $kgCO^2e$ (annual average=11523 $kgCO^2e$).

Table 2: NROL delivery and attendance summary over time

	Annual			Evaluation period
	Apr 21–Apr 22	Apr 22–Mar 23	Apr 23–Mar 24	Apr 22–Mar 24
Service metric	Single-service (S)[a] (n=98)	Regional 1 (R1)[a] (n=155)	Regional 2 (R2)[a] (n=187)	Regional Total[b] (n=339)
Total **(incl. targeted therapy and all community groups and sessions)**				
Blocks delivered, n	6	6	6	12
Sessions delivered, n	198	255	256	511
Patients participated, n	97	155	187	339
Patient contacts, n	1057	1618	1816	3434
Patient session attendance rate, %	58%	58%	55%	56%
Therapy staff contacts, n	361	585	582	1167
Therapy Staff:Patient ratio, median (range)	0.4 (0.1–3.0)	0.4 (0.1–2.0)	0.3 (0.1–2.0)	0.4 (0.1–2.0)
Targeted therapy groups: Talking and Physical				
Groups delivered per block, median (range)	5 (4–6)	7 (6–7)	7 (5–8)	7 (5–8)
Sessions delivered, n	163	214	214	428
Patients participated, n	96	153	184	334
Patient contacts, n	739	1091	1252	2343
Block capacity[c], median %	73%	80%	85%	84%
Patient session attendance rate, %	67%	69%	72%	71%
Therapy staff contacts, n	293	496	466	962
Therapy Staff:Patient ratio, median (range)	0.5 (0.1–3.0)	0.5 (0.1–2.0)	0.4 (0.1–2.0)	0.4 (0.1–2.0)
Community: Café NROL only[d]				
Sessions delivered, n	29	35	36	71
Patients participated, n	64 (65%)	97 (63%)	104 (56%)	200 (59%)
Patient contacts, n	256	417	437	854
Patient session attendance rate, %[e]	41%	38%	32%	35%
Therapy staff contacts, n	54	72	99	171
Therapy Staff:Patient ratio, median (range)	0.2 (0.1–0.4)	0.2 (0.1–0.4)	0.2 (0.1–0.5)	0.2 (0.1–0.5)

Single = single-service, Regional = multi-service. [a]Annual periods (S, R1, R2). [b]2-year evaluation period (Regional Total). [c]Capacity reflects % of patient allocation opportunities filled at start of NROL block. [d]NROL entry sessions are only reflected in total. [e]Café NROL is optional attendance for all patients.

Therapy provision

NROL participants received significantly more therapy (Median therapy minutes received (IQR): NROL=1535 (1015-2860) vs. Non-NROL=335 (165-834), p<0.01). This reflected a significant increase in receipt of therapy for OT and PT domains (both p<0.01). Figure 3 illustrates the distribution of therapy provision for 'NROL' participants vs. 'Non-NROL'. Additionally, NROL participants had a longer duration in service (Median days (IQR): NROL=146 (117-168) vs. Non-NROL=59 (28-109), p<0.01); with increased duration for the allied health professions (OT p<0.01 , PT p<0.01, and SLT p=0.01).



Figure 3: Violin plots of therapy provision
Violin plots showing distributions of total days in service (A) and therapy minute received (B). Representations are for participants who received NROL (NROL) and those who did not (Non-NROL). Plots show the range, interquartile range, median, and the density (or frequency) of data points across values, with wider sections indicating more participants with data at those values.

NROL patient outcomes

Complete data sets were available for EQ-5D-5L and PSFS for 280 and 282 patients (83%), respectively. At a group level, statistically significant improvements were observed over time in both patient outcome measures. For the EQ-5D-5L, the index score increased in median from entry=0.537 (IQR=0.315–0.689) to exit=0.605 (IQR=0.434–0.728)(p< 0.001), with a mean difference of 0.070 (SD = 0.203). The EQ-VAS score also showed a significant change (p=0.009), despite identical medians at entry=60 (IQR=50–74) and exit=60 (IQR=50–75), with a mean difference of 3.03 (SD=19.02). For the PSFS, the median score increased from entry=3.33 (IQR=2.33–4.67) to exit=5.00 (IQR=3.67–6.75) (p<0.001), with a mean difference of 1.62 (SD=2.03). Large overlaps in interquartile ranges and standard deviations

were noted and no difference met the minimally clinically important difference (MCID). Overall, these results indicate a systematic positive shift in paired differences, rather than a substantial change in central tendency. At an individual level, the proportions of patients who improved or remained stable were between 64%-80% (EQ-Index: 64%; EQ-VAS: 68%; PSFS: 80%), with 30%-39% (EQ-Index: 39%; EQ-VAS:36%; PSFS: 30%) of patients meeting or exceeding the MCID.

Survey data

Surveys were completed by 49 therapy staff (estimated response rate 36% of regional community neurorehabilitation therapy workforce) and 176 NROL patient (response rate 85% of NROL participants). Respondents' characteristics (Supplementary file 1) closely reflect regional NROL staff and patient characteristics and participation profiles.

System-level key constructs identified as influencing NROL implementation are summarised in Table 3 under the relevant CFIR domains, merging quantitative (% agreement on Likert scale questions, where relevant and available) and qualitative (exemplar quotes from open-ended questions) survey data. For the 'Individuals' and 'Innovation' domains both therapy staff and patients highlighted issues related to implementation outcome measures. For the inner setting issues were highlighted by staff only, as patients tend to be less aware of constructs relating to the healthcare setting.

Table 3: System-level key constructs influencing NROL implementation

Construct		Summary	Quantitative survey data Agreement (%) (where relevant and available)	Qualitative survey data Exemplar quotes
INDIVIDUALS (STAFF AND PATIENTS)				
Motivation / Capability	Staff	Across the region, therapy staff felt positive about NROL and felt supporting delivery was acceptable, with most feeling confident to do so. Aspiration for sustainment.	82% felt positive about NROL and felt it was clear how NROL helps to improve rehabilitation delivery. 84% felt supporting the delivery of NROL in their service was acceptable, with 78% feeling confident to do so.	*UHMB: "Brilliant addition to the range of services available, time saving, cost saving and great to be able to work with others in, and network in, the region."* *BTH: "Huge - benefits clients' rehab journey, offers peer-support."* *UHMB: "It is a really great service and I think the more it is adopted it will just become the norm and a great adjunct to other services that are out there."*
	Patients	Across the region, patients felt positive about NROL as a valuable and convenient part of their rehabilitation. Some saw potential for more use.	93% thought NROL was a valuable part of their rehabilitation. 94% felt it was convenient from a time and energy point of view.	*LSCFT: "Very glad I did it, it's gave more confidence going forward."* *ELHT): "Invite more people. Roll it out across the country. Spread the word."*
Opportunity	Staff	NROL was valuable for increasing therapy provision and practice (amount and wider range of therapy, out-of-session practice).	73% felt offering NROL increased the intensity of rehabilitation for their patients.	*LSCFT: "Increases access to wider range of therapies."* *UHMB: "It's great at increasing therapy sessions to our patients and provides motivation outside of face to face sessions."* *ELHT: "Allowing patients to access additional therapy which might be difficult to deliver due to limited service provision or difficulty to deliver the intensity needed."*
	Patients	Most patients that participated felt they had the necessary resources and support.	97% had all the equipment and space they needed to take part in NROL. 98% felt they received all the support they needed to access NROL online and 96% felt the staff that ran NROL sessions paid attention to their needs.	*UHMB: "No special equipment was required."* *BTH: "I felt seen, heard, understood and safe … The work done by NROL is formidable, it has given me confidence and courage to keep trying."*
INNOVATION (NROL)				
Complexity	Staff	The effort of implementation was deemed worth the benefit.	64% felt NROL required a lot of effort to implement in their service, however 71% felt the effort to implement NROL was worth the benefits.	*ELHT: "Initial challenges balancing team priorities / staff capacity but now more established… benefits have outweighed this."* *UHMB: "I do like NROL and its ethos … It can feel time consuming to deliver but if that's related to positive patient outcomes then it's worth it!"*
	Patients	Most patients that participated felt had the necessary resources and support.	97% had all the equipment and space they needed to take part in NROL. 98% felt they received all the support they needed to access NROL online and 96% felt the staff that ran NROL sessions paid attention to their needs.	*UHMB: "No special equipment was required."* *BTH: "I felt seen, heard, understood and safe … The work done by NROL is formidable, it has given me confidence and courage to keep trying."*
Relative Advantage	Staff	Improved patient outcomes through structured targeted therapy.	73% felt NROL improves outcomes for patients.	*ELHT: "Many of my patients have improved on their outcome measures with NROL and it has helped me to provide a higher intensity of rehab particularly when staffing is short within our team."* *ELHT: "Helps patients to regain weekly routines and structure to their day..."* *ELHT: "Improved outcomes both physically, cognitively and mentally."*

		Operational, staffing and travel efficiencies.	40% reported NROL reduced the travel requirements for their team.	*LSCFT: "It is a good and efficient way of providing education and reinforcement of the rehabilitation/compensatory techniques provided by our team."* *ELHT: "Efficient way of seeing patients, cost effective, seeing patient within their own environment."* *ELHT: "Financial benefit with the reduction of travel times and costs of paying for travel."*
		Therapy staff increased technological skill and capability through NROL. Perceived overall professional development benefits.	29% reported their proficiency with digital technology increased after observation or involvement with NROL. 72% felt NROL benefitted their professional development.	*UHMB: "Maintain a dialogue with other therapists/tech support to learn from each other."*
	INNER SETTING (HEALTHCARE SETTING)			
Structural characteristics	Staff	Dedicated NROL operational team and champions deemed important.		*BTH: "The IT support and NROL team in the background really help to make it work and help reduce staff time."* *LSCFT: "It helps to have a champion to help proactively identify people who may benefit."*
		Challenge due to lack of shared regional technology infrastructure.		*ELHT: "Documenting information, as not a central system."*
Relational connections	Staff	Collective use of workforce across region fostered collaborative learning and networking.	70% felt NROL helped their networking with other staff.	*ELHT: "The chance to create therapy sessions with colleagues rather than our usual F2F alone."* *LSCFT: "It is a good way for clinicians to liaise with and learn from other rehab teams/therapists."*
	Staff	Early and wide stakeholder engagement and gaining visibility was important.		*ELHT: "Promote NROL to a wider range of therapist within a Trust to ensure the understanding and adoption of the service."* *UHMB: "Engage all staff members early on to ensure that staff understand the concept."*
Compatibility	Staff	Challenge for therapy staff in balancing with their competing priorities.	42% felt supporting the delivery of NROL easily fitted in with other priorities.	*LSCFT: "Balancing time between face to face clinical work and keeping space for NROL."* *UHMB: "Challenge to fit into timetable due to annual leave, rota'd days off, other meetings."*
		Challenge with initial reluctance, and balancing workload fairly across organisations.		*UHMB: "I have found a real struggle with getting other staff members on board … They do not seem to grasp that it will actually free more of their time after the initial time learning the new system."* *ELHT: "Trusts have at times been difficult to get as readily involved in the delivery of the sessions, often reporting reduced confidence and requests for further observation."* *BTH: "Every trust has to invest in all parts to make it work fairly."*
Access to knowledge	Staff	Opportunity for observational learning important		*UHMB: "Observe sessions to build confidence before delivering."* *LSCFT: "It helps to make shadowing a routine part of staff development so that people understand what actually happens in the groups."*

Integration

A joint display (Figure 4). Merges the analyses from service and survey analyses to explore the implementation outcomes of system-level adoption, acceptability and sustainability.



Figure 4. Joint display merging mixed methods data

DISCUSSION

This mixed methods evaluation demonstrated the successful scale-up of a telerehabilitation approach across regional healthcare organisations. It showcased efficient, collaborative system-level working, using a shared care approach to enhance neurorehabilitation. Adapted from a single-service model, NROL was adopted as a multi-service regional innovation across four healthcare organisations (NHS Trusts) and embedded within real-world practice, with growing participation. Implementation faced expected challenges due to healthcare system pressures, but the effort was seen as worthwhile. Overall, the regional NROL innovation was deemed safe and acceptable to the wide range of patients and therapy staff, across the region. It was well-attended, with concordant positive opinion from patients and staff, and enabled increased therapy provision. Ongoing stakeholder engagement was, and will remain, essential for sustainability.

A data-driven approach enabled real-time tailoring to optimise innovation-context fit, an important factor in scaling efforts (26, 49). NROL proved compatible at a system-level, with phased integration across three additional organisations over six months. This led to growth, with increased referrals in the first year (59%) followed by annual growth (30%), whilst demonstrating improved staffing efficiency over time (staff:patient ratio 0.4 to 0.3). Despite this growth, referrals accounted for a relatively small proportion of the wider caseload (2–16%), indicating potential for further participation. However, with block capacity utilisation nearing maximum (86%) broader participation may require model adjustments.

Implementation was influenced by individual and healthcare setting factors, such as initial therapy staff reluctance, competing priorities and infrastructure challenges, consistent with reported barriers to scale up, innovation implementation and sustained use in healthcare (50, 51). Nevertheless, key enablers facilitated success, in particular leadership from a dedicated operational team and innovation champions. The importance of highly committed individuals is well-recognised (50-54). The impetus to overcome barriers may have been influenced by staffs' recognition of the potential long-term benefits for patients, including improved outcomes for many and peer-support. Notably, staff valued NROL for increasing therapy and practice. Quantitative data supported their views, showing NROL patients received over than four times as many therapy minutes as non-NROL patients and were supported by community services for longer, marking significant steps toward meeting therapy targets.

Workforce limitations remain a major barrier to implementation and sustainability in healthcare systems (50, 55). We employed collective use of the regional rehabilitation therapy workforce, as a shared care approach, to help mitigate this challenge. This approach yielded several advantages. Firstly, it allowed a critical mass of patients to receive group therapy where impairment incidence was lower (e.g. speech-related groups). The cross-organisational structure (69% of sessions run cross-organisationally) reduced the need for multiple therapy staff from any one service per session, while providing opportunity for shared learning and networking. It also offered redundancy, allowing staff shortages in one service to be temporarily covered by another, minimising regional inequity. Although a concern regarding workload balance across organisations was voiced, staffing distribution aligned relatively well with referral patterns (variation -6% to 7%) suggesting a natural equilibrium or effective management. The collaborative system-level approach was enabled by the online format, which had the additional benefits of travel time, cost and emissions avoidance. Further, overall therapy staff resource use was minimised through the group-based model. Together, these advantages may help alleviate pressure on the healthcare system.

Wide stakeholder engagement fostered buy-in and short-term sustainment of the regional NROL innovation. Therapy staff and patients were integral to its successful development and implementation as shown here and seen previously (17, 24). However, regular communication with decision-makers was also crucial for scale up, though this perspective is yet to be formally captured as it was beyond the resource of this evaluation. Alignment (i.e. creating fit between elements of the inner and outer setting of an organisation or system) plays an important role for implementation success (56, 57). Decision-makers found NROL appealing due to its strategic alignment with community-based care priorities, its low operational resource use, and its contribution to broader healthcare goals, including workforce planning, performance benchmarks (e.g. SSNAP), environmental targets (e.g. Net Zero) and addressing health inequalities. However, sustained funding is essential to prevent “pilotitis” and ensure long-term viability.

Some limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the therapy provision review was small-scale and limited to stroke patients, as performance audit data was unavailable for other neurological conditions. Second, the staff survey had a 36% estimated response rate (55% respondents had delivered NROL), introducing potential nonresponse bias. This is not unexpected, as subject familiarity increases survey participation likelihood. However, it is important to note that those with less positive experience may be underrepresented. However, a

strength of a mixed-methods approach is that quantitative data can help illustrate converging or diverging factors, providing a more comprehensive view. Finally, it was difficult to capture what was not done (e.g. who was not referred). We found patients referred to NROL and went on to participate were younger, this requires further exploration. Going forward this perspective will be sought, as well as the aforementioned perspective of decision-makers.

CONCLUSION

NROL was adopted and embedded into usual care at a regional level as an adjunct to enhance neurorehabilitation. It was accepted at a system-level and increased amount of therapy provided to patients. Workforce efficiencies were identified through effective collaborative systems working, with benefits amplified as participation grew. Longer-term institutionalisation of this regional innovation will require a compelling business case and value proposition for decision-makers. Ongoing work will address broader economic factors, focus on equality, and improve operational efficiencies while supporting environmental goals. Importantly, adjustments to the model will be explored to optimise capacity and further intensify the therapy offer.

ABBREVIATIONS

BTH	Blackpool Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
CFIR	Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research
ELHT	East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust
EQ-5D-5L	EuroQol 5-Dimensions 5-Level
GRAMMS	Good Reporting for A Mixed Methods Study
GRIPP2	Guidance for Reporting Involvement of Patients and the Public
LCSFT	Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust
MCID	Minimal Clinically Important Difference
MRC	Medical Research Council

mRS	Modified Rankin Scale
NHS	National Health Service
NIHSS	National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale
NROL	NeuroRehabilitation OnLine
OT	Occupational Therapy
PSFS	Patient Specific Functional Scale
PT	Physiotherapy
R1	Regional annual period 1 (April 2022 – March 2023)
R2	Regional annual period 2 (April 2023 – March 2024)
S	Single-service period (April 2021- March 2021)
SLT	Speech and Language Therapy
UHMB	University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the following who contributed to the regional NROL innovation: Staff, patients and carers from the stroke and neurological rehabilitation services at East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust, University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust, Blackpool Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust. Ian Grimshaw and Katie McGoogan for providing technological and administrative support to staff and patients. We convey our appreciation to SameYou charity for their ongoing partnership to support the NROL programme and their generous fundraising.

FUNDING

This work was supported by a generous donation from the SameYou Charity and funding from NHS England Stroke Quality Improvement for Rehabilitation (SQuIRe) and the Lancashire and South Cumbria Integrated Care Board.

COMPETING INTERESTS

None declared.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

SA and LC made substantial contributions to the conception and design of the work; SA, AP, TM and LC made substantial contributions to the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of the data; SA and LC drafted the work. All authors provided critical input and revised the manuscript draft. All authors have read and approved the final version.

DATA SHARING

The datasets used and/or analysed during this evaluation are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

REFERENCES

1. Lohse KR, Lang CE, Boyd LA. Is more better? Using metadata to explore dose–response relationships in stroke rehabilitation. Stroke. 2014;45(7):2053-8.
2. Schneider EJ, Lannin NA, Ada L, Schmidt J. Increasing the amount of usual rehabilitation improves activity after stroke: a systematic review. Journal of physiotherapy. 2016;62(4):182-7.
3. Brady MC, Godwin J, Enderby P, Kelly H, Campbell P. Speech and language therapy for aphasia after stroke: An updated systematic review and meta-analyses. Stroke. 2016;47(10):e236-e7.
4. Teasell R, Fleet JL, Harnett A. Post Stroke Exercise Training: Intensity, Dosage, and Timing of Therapy. Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics. 2024;35(2):339-51.
5. Royal College of Physicians. National Clinical Guideline for Stroke for the United Kingdom and Ireland. 2023 [Available from: https://www.strokeguideline.org/app/uploads/2023/04/National-Clinical-Guideline-for-Stroke-2023.pdf] (Accessed 31 January 2025).
6. National Institutes for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Stroke rehabilitation in adults. NICE guideline [NG236] 2023 [Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng236] (Accessed 31 January 2025).
7. Kings College London. Stroke Sentinel National Audit Programme (SSNAP). SSNAP Annual Report 2023. 2023 [Available from: https://www.strokeaudit.org/Documents/National/Clinical/Apr2022Mar2023/Apr2022Mar2023-AnnualReport.aspx] (Accessed 31 January 2025).
8. Stroke Foundation. National Stroke Audit - Rehabilitation Services Report 2024. Melbourne, Australia. 2024 [Available from: https://informme.org.au/stroke-data/rehabilitation-audits] (Accessed 5 February 2025).
9. Ontario OAGo. Value for Money Audit Cardiac Disease and Stroke Treatment. 2021 [Available from: https://auditor.on.ca/Templates/Results_en.html?q=value+for+money+cardiac#gsc.tab=0&gsc.q=value%20for%20money%20cardiac&gsc.page=1] (Accessed 18 February 2025).
10. Cormican A, Hirani SP, McKeown E. Healthcare professionals' perceived barriers and facilitators of implementing clinical practice guidelines for stroke rehabilitation: A systematic review. Clinical rehabilitation. 2023;37(5):701-12.
11. Clarke DJ, Burton L-J, Tyson SF, Rodgers H, Drummond A, Palmer R, et al. Why do stroke survivors not receive recommended amounts of active therapy? Findings from the ReAcT study, a mixed-methods case-study evaluation in eight stroke units. Clinical rehabilitation. 2018;32(8):1119-32.
12. Lynch EA, Connell LA, Carvalho LB, Bird M-L. Do clinical guidelines guide clinical practice in stroke rehabilitation? An international survey of health professionals. Disability and rehabilitation. 2022;44(15):4118-25.
13. Raymond MJ, Christie LJ, Kramer S, Malaguti C, Mok Z, Gardner B, et al., editors. Delivery of Allied Health Interventions Using Telehealth Modalities: A Rapid Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled Trials. Healthcare; 2024: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
14. Laver KE, Adey-Wakeling Z, Crotty M, Lannin NA, George S, Sherrington C. Telerehabilitation services for stroke. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2020;1(1):CD010255.
15. Khan F, Amatya B, Kesselring J, Galea M. Telerehabilitation for persons with multiple sclerosis. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015;2015(4):CD010508.
16. Yau T, Chan J, McIntyre M, Bhogal D, Andreoli A, Leochico CFD, et al. Adverse events associated with the delivery of telerehabilitation across rehabilitation populations: A scoping review. Plos one. 2024;19(11):e0313440.
17. Ackerley S, Wilson N, Boland P, Read J, Connell L. Implementation of neurological group-based telerehabilitation within existing healthcare during the COVID-19 pandemic: a mixed methods evaluation. BMC Health Serv Res. 2023;23(1):671.
18. Cramer SC, Young BM, Schwarz A, Chang TY, Su M. Telerehabilitation following stroke. Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics. 2024;35(2):305-18.
19. NHS England. The NHS Long Term Plan. 2019 [Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/nhs-long-term-plan-version-1.2.pdf] (Accessed 10 January 2025).
20. Darzi. Independent investigation of the National Health Service in England. 2024 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/independent-investigation-of-the-nhs-in-england] (Accessed 31 January 2025).
21. Bonifacio GB, Ward NS, Emsley HC, Cooper J, Bernhardt J. Optimising rehabilitation and recovery after a stroke. Practical neurology. 2022;22(6):478-85.

22. Beare B, Doogan CE, Douglass-Kirk P, Leff AP, Ward N. Neuro-Rehabilitation OnLine (N-ROL): description and evaluation of a group-based telerehabilitation programme for acquired brain injury. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2021;92(12):1354-5.
23. NHS England. 2022/23 priorities and operational planning guidance. 2022 [Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/20211223-B1160-2022-23-priorities-and-operational-planning-guidance-v3.2.pdf] (Accessed 10 January 2025).
24. Ackerley S, Wilson N, Boland P, Peel R, Connell L. NeuroRehabilitation OnLine: Description of a regional multidisciplinary group telerehabilitation innovation for stroke and neurological conditions using the Template for Intervention Description and Replication checklist. Digit Health. 2024;10:20552076241252263.
25. Connell L, Ackerley S, Rycroft-Malone J. Applying the updated MRC Framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions with integrated implementation conceptual knowledge: An example using NeuroRehabilitation OnLine (NROL). [*Under review*]. 2024.
26. World Health Organization. Nine steps for developing a scaling-up strategy. Geneva: WHO ExpandNet. 2010 [Available from: https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/44432/9789241500319_eng.pdf] (Accessed 4 February 2025).
27. NHS Confederation. Integrated care systems (ICS): Parliamentary briefing. 2022 [Available from: https://www.nhsconfed.org/publications/integrated-care-systems-ics#c-table-of-contents__list-what-are-integrated-care-systems--2] (Accessed 13 February 2025).
28. Koorts H, Ma J, Cassar S, Bauman A, Lawrence M, Rutter H, et al. Scale-up influences and definitions of scale-up 'success': evidence from globally scaled interventions. Translational Behavioral Medicine. 2025;15(1):ibae063.
29. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, et al. A new framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions: update of Medical Research Council guidance. BMJ. 2021;374:n2061.
30. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. Implement Sci. 2009;4:50.
31. Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Widerquist MAO, Lowery J. The updated Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research based on user feedback. Implement Sci. 2022;17(1):75.
32. NHS England. NHS Long Term Workforce Plan. 2023 [Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/nhs-long-term-workforce-plan-v1.21.pdf] (Accessed 10 January 2025).
33. NHS England. 2023/24 priorities and operational planning guidance 2023 [Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/PRN00021-23-24-priorities-and-operational-planning-guidance-v1.1.pdf] (Accessed 10 January 2025).
34. NHS England. Delivering a 'Net Zero' National Health Service. 2022 [Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/greenernhs/publication/delivering-a-net-zero-national-health-service/] (Accessed 10 January 2025).
35. Proctor E, Silmere H, Raghavan R, Hovmand P, Aarons G, Bunger A, et al. Outcomes for implementation research: conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and research agenda. Adm Policy Ment Health. 2011;38(2):65-76.
36. NHS Employers. Mileage allowances FAQs. 2023 [Available from: https://www.nhsemployers.org/articles/mileage-allowances-faqs] (Accessed 5 February 2025).
37. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Carbon footprint for the UK and England to 2021. 2021 [Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/uks-carbon-footprint. (Accessed 5 Febraury 2025)
38. Euroqol. EQ-5D-5L. [Available from: https://euroqol.org/information-and-support/euroqol-instruments/eq-5d-5l/] (Accessed 27 January 2025).
39. Golicki D, Niewada M, Buczek J, Karlińska A, Kobayashi A, Janssen M, et al. Validity of EQ-5D-5L in stroke. Quality of life research. 2015;24:845-50.
40. Mathis RA, Taylor JD, Odom BH, Lairamore C. Reliability and validity of the patient-specific functional scale in community-dwelling older adults. Journal of Geriatric Physical Therapy. 2019;42(3):E67-E72.
41. Stratford P, Gill C, Westaway M, Binkley J. Assessing disability and change on individual patients: a report of a patient specific measure. Physiotherapy canada. 1995;47(4):258-63.

42. Evensen J, Soberg HL, Sveen U, Hestad KA, Bronken BA. The applicability of the patient-specific functional scale (PSFS) in rehabilitation for patients with acquired brain injury (ABI)–A cohort study. Journal of multidisciplinary healthcare. 2020:1121-32.
43. Chen P, Lin K-C, Liing R-J, Wu C-Y, Chen C-L, Chang K-C. Validity, responsiveness, and minimal clinically important difference of EQ-5D-5L in stroke patients undergoing rehabilitation. Quality of life research. 2016;25:1585-96.
44. Michie S, Van Stralen MM, West R. The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. Implementation science. 2011;6:1-12.
45. Fetters MD, Curry LA, Creswell JW. Achieving integration in mixed methods designs—principles and practices. Health services research. 2013;48(6pt2):2134-56.
46. Guetterman TC, Fetters MD, Creswell JW. Integrating quantitative and qualitative results in health science mixed methods research through joint displays. The Annals of Family Medicine. 2015;13(6):554-61.
47. O'cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. The quality of mixed methods studies in health services research. Journal of health services research & policy. 2008;13(2):92-8.
48. NHS Lancashire and South Cumbria Integrated Care Board. Our geography and population. 2024 [Available from: https://www.lancashireandsouthcumbria.icb.nhs.uk/about-us/welcome-lancashire-and-south-cumbria] (Accessed 24 February 2025).
49. Moore G, Campbell M, Copeland L, Craig P, Movsisyan A, Hoddinott P, et al. Adapting interventions to new contexts-the ADAPT guidance. BMJ. 2021;374:n1679.
50. Geerligs L, Rankin NM, Shepherd HL, Butow P. Hospital-based interventions: a systematic review of staff-reported barriers and facilitators to implementation processes. Implementation Science. 2018;13:1-17.
51. Cowie J, Nicoll A, Dimova ED, Campbell P, Duncan EA. The barriers and facilitators influencing the sustainability of hospital-based interventions: a systematic review. BMC health services research. 2020;20:1-27.
52. Norton W, Mittman B. Scaling-up health promotion/disease prevention programs in community settings: barriers, facilitators, and initial recommendations. Report Submitted to Patrick and Catherine Weldon Donaghue Medical Research Foundation. 2010.
53. Powell BJ, Waltz TJ, Chinman MJ, Damschroder LJ, Smith JL, Matthieu MM, et al. A refined compilation of implementation strategies: results from the Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change (ERIC) project. Implement Sci. 2015;10:21.
54. Shea CM. A conceptual model to guide research on the activities and effects of innovation champions. Implementation research and practice. 2021;2:2633489521990443.
55. The King's Fund. NHS workforce in a nutshell. 2024 [Available from: https://www.kingsfund.org.uk/insight-and-analysis/data-and-charts/nhs-workforce-nutshell] (Accessed 12 February 2025).
56. Lundmark R, Hasson H, Richter A, Khachatryan E, Åkesson A, Eriksson L. Alignment in implementation of evidence-based interventions: a scoping review. Implementation Science. 2021;16:1-14.
57. Milat AJ, King L, Newson R, Wolfenden L, Rissel C, Bauman A, et al. Increasing the scale and adoption of population health interventions: experiences and perspectives of policy makers, practitioners, and researchers. Health research policy and systems. 2014;12:1-11.

CHECKLIST

Good reporting of a Mixed Methods Study (GRAMMS) checklist

Article: Can we enhance neurorehabilitation through regional implementation of group-based telerehabilitation? A mixed methods evaluation of NeuroRehabilitation OnLine (NROL).

Guideline	Section: page
Describe the justification for using a mixed methods approach to the research question	Methods: 5
Describe the design in terms of the purpose, priority and sequence of methods	Methods | Design: 7, Figure 1
Describe each method in terms of sampling, data collection and analysis	Methods | Data collection and analysis: 8 – 11
Describe where integration has occurred, how it has occurred and who has participated in it	Methods | Mixed methods merging: 11, Figure 4
Describe any limitation of one method associated with the presence of the other method	N/A
Describe any insights gained from mixing or integrating methods	Discussion: 24 - 26

Reference

O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. The quality of mixed methods studies in health services research. J Health Serv Res Policy. 2008;13: 92-98

Supplementary file 1: NROL staff and patient surveys

Includes:

- NROL staff survey
- NROL patient survey
- Table of staff and patient respondent characteristics
- Figure: Visual summary of quantitative survey responses (excl. characteristics)

NROL staff survey

1. Please indicate your experience of NROL to date (tick all relevant):
   No experience
   Have referred patients to NROL
   Have observed NROL sessions
   Have helped deliver NROL sessions
   Have helped coordinate NROL

2. How would you rate your level of proficiency with digital technology before NROL observation or involvement?
   Non-existent
   Novice
   Moderate
   Expert

3. How would you rate your level of proficiency with digital technology after NROL observation or involvement?
   Non-existent
   Novice
   Moderate
   Expert

4. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
I feel positive about NROL	○	○	○	○	○
It is clear to me *how* NROL helps to improve rehabilitation delivery for patients with brain injury or stroke	○	○	○	○	○
Supporting the delivery of NROL in my service is acceptable to me	○	○	○	○	○
I feel confident to support the delivery of NROL in my service	○	○	○	○	○
Offering NROL increased the intensity of rehabilitation for our patients	○	○	○	○	○
NROL did not require a lot of effort to implement in my service	○	○	○	○	○
Supporting the delivery of NROL easily fits in with my other priorities	○	○	○	○	○
The effort to implement NROL was worth the benefits	○	○	○	○	○
NROL improves outcomes for patients with brain injury or stroke	○	○	○	○	○
Offering NROL reduced the travel requirements for my team	○	○	○	○	○
I think NROL is a fair and equitable way to provide rehabilitation to patients with brain injury or stroke	○	○	○	○	○
NROL benefitted my professional development	○	○	○	○	○
NROL helped my networking with other staff	○	○	○	○	○

5. Please tell us the NHS Trust you work for:

East Lancashire Hospitals NHS Trust
University Hospitals of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust
Blackpool Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust
Other

6. Please tell us your work role (tick all relevant):
   Administrator
   Assistant
   Service Manager
   Occupational Therapist
   Physiotherapist
   Psychologist
   Speech and Language Therapist
   Technology Support
   Other (state)

7. What is your job band?
   3
   4
   5
   6
   7
   8

8. What are the benefits of NROL?

9. What are the challenges of NROL?

10. If other regions wanted to do NROL:
    a) What are the key parts of NROL they must include?
    b) What are the key lessons you would pass on?

11. Is there any other feedback about NROL?

NROL patient survey

1. Before starting NROL how would you rate your computer and technology skills?
   Non-existent
   Novice
   Moderate
   Expert

2. How would you rate your computer and technology skills after NROL?
   Non-existent
   Novice
   Moderate
   Expert

3. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	No opinion	Agree	Strongly agree
Before starting NROL the idea of taking part appealed to me	○	○	○	○	○
I thought NROL was a valuable part of my rehabilitation	○	○	○	○	○
I liked that NROL was an online activity	○	○	○	○	○
I would prefer online rehabilitation rather than face-to-face contact	○	○	○	○	○
NROL was convenient from a time and energy point of view	○	○	○	○	○
I was able to apply what I learnt during NROL	○	○	○	○	○
The peer-support I received from fellow patients was important to me	○	○	○	○	○
The fact NROL was a group activity was important to me	○	○	○	○	○
Working in a group helped increase my confidence	○	○	○	○	○
I was able to learn from the experiences of others	○	○	○	○	○
I had all the equipment and space I needed to allow me to take part in NROL	○	○	○	○	○
I received all the support I needed to access NROL online	○	○	○	○	○
The staff that ran NROL sessions paid attention to my needs	○	○	○	○	○

4. Can you give one thing you liked about NROL?

5. Can you give one thing we can do to improve NROL?

6. Please can you tell us what you thought about being in groups with other people?

7. Any other comments.

8. Would you recommend NROL to another person? Yes / No

.

Table: Staff and patient survey respondent characteristics

	Characteristic		% responses
Staff (n = 49)	Organisation	ELHT	47%
		UHMB	22%
		BTH	10%
		LSCFT	18%
		Unspecified	2%
	Role	Occupational Therapist	29%
	(all relevant)	Physiotherapist	24%
		Psychologist	8%
		Speech and Language Therapist	10%
		Therapy Assistant	14%
		NROL Operational team	6%
		Service Manager	4%
		Unspecified	6%
	Seniority	Band 3	6%
		Band 4	12%
		Band 5	10%
		Band 6	45%
		Band 7	12%
		Band 8	12%
		Unspecified	2%
	Experience with NROL	No direct	12%
	(all relevant)	Referred	57%
		Observed	57%
		Delivered	55%
		Coordinate	24%
Patients (n = 176)	Organisation	ELHT	48%
		UHMB	26%
		BTH	11%
		LSCFT	10%
		Unspecified	6%
	Sex	Male	53%

Figure: Visual summary of quantitative survey results



Supplementary file 2:

Table. Group delivery and attendance over 12 blocks regional NROL (Apr 22 – Mar 24)

Group	Sessions delivered, n	Patients participated, n	Proportion patients in group, %	Patient contacts	Group capacity, median % (target group size)	Patient session attendance rate, %	Therapy staff contacts	Therapy Staff:patient ratio, median (range)
Total (incl. Café NROL)	511	339	100%	3434		56%	1167	0.4 (0.1 – 2.0)
Total (excl. Café NROL)	440	339	100%	2580		71%	996	0.4 (0.1 – 2.0)
Total Targeted therapy	428	334	99%	2343		71%	962	0.4 (0.1 – 2.0)
Talking	287	250	74%	1426		71%	619	0.5 (0.1 – 2.0)
Cognitive education	72	64	19%	293	92% (6)	74%	163	0.6 (0.3 – 1.5)
Cognitive processing	35	38	11%	124	83% (6)	69%	78	0.7 (0.3 – 2.0)
Living Well (adjustment/wellbeing)	32	79	23%	183	58% (12)	71%	68	0.4 (0.2 – 1.0)
Fatigue	83	136	40%	608	100% (12)	67%	173	0.3 (0.1 – 0.8)
Dysarthria	39	27	8%	119	67% (6)	81%	85	0.8 (0.3 – 2.0)
Aphasia	25	23	7%	96	83% (6)	83%	50	0.5 (0.2 – 1.0)
Vocation	1	3	1%	3	83% (6)	60%	2	0.7 (0.7 – 0.7)
Physical	141	138	41%	917		70%	343	0.4 (0.2 – 1.5)
Balance & Mobility	72	97	29%	535	88% (12)	72%	201	0.4 (0.2 – 0.8)
Upper Limb	69	80	24%	382	71% (12)	67%	142	0.4 (0.2 – 1.5)
Community	83	286	84%	1091		40%	205	0.2 (0.1 – 0.5)
NROL entry	12	236	70%	237		81%	34	0.2 (0.1 – 0.2)
Community: Café NROL (peer-support)	71	200	59%	854		35%	171	0.2 (0.1 – 0.5)

[a]Café NROL is optional attendance with all patients invited to all sessions.