

1 **TITLE PAGE**

2 **Protocol for a Feasibility study incorporating a Randomised Pilot Trial with an Embedded Process Evaluation**  
3 **and Feasibility Economic Analysis of ThinkCancer!: A primary care intervention to expedite cancer diagnosis**  
4 **in Wales**

5 *27 November 2020, Version 1.0*

6 Stefanie Disbeschl<sup>1</sup>, Alun Sursey<sup>1</sup>, Jessica L Roberts<sup>1</sup>, Annie Hendry<sup>1</sup>, Ruth Lewis<sup>1</sup>, Nia Goulden<sup>2</sup>, Zoe Hoare<sup>2</sup>,  
7 Nefyn Williams<sup>3</sup>, Bethany Fern Anthony<sup>4</sup>, Rhiannon Tudor Edwards<sup>4</sup>, Rebecca-Jane Law<sup>1</sup>, Julia Hiscock<sup>1</sup>, Andrew  
8 Carson-Stevens<sup>5</sup>, Richard D Neal<sup>6</sup> and Clare Wilkinson<sup>1</sup>

9 <sup>1</sup>North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research (NWCPCR), Bangor University, Cambrian 2, Wrexham  
10 Technology Park, Wrexham, LL13 7YP, UK

11 <sup>2</sup>North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health (NORTH), Bangor University, The Normal Site,  
12 Holyhead Road, Gwynedd, LL57 2PZ, UK

13 <sup>3</sup>Department of Primary Care and Mental Health, Institute of Population Health, University of Liverpool,  
14 Liverpool, L69 3GL, UK

15 <sup>4</sup>Centre for Health Economics and Medicines Evaluation (CHEME), Bangor University, The Normal Site,  
16 Holyhead Road, Gwynedd, LL57 2PZ, UK

17 <sup>5</sup>Division of Population Medicine, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, UHW Main Building, Heath Park,  
18 Cardiff, CF14 4XN, UK

19 <sup>6</sup>Academic Unit of Primary Care, Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, University of Leeds, Worsley Building,  
20 Leeds, LS2 9NL, UK

21 **Corresponding author:**

22 Stefanie Disbeschl [stefanie.disbeschl@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:stefanie.disbeschl@bangor.ac.uk)

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## 23 **ABSTRACT**

### 24 **Background**

25 Relative to the rest of Europe, the UK has relatively poor cancer outcomes, with late diagnosis and a slow  
 26 referral process being major contributors. General practitioners (GPs) are often faced with patients presenting  
 27 with a multitude of non-specific symptoms that could be cancer. Safety netting can be used to manage  
 28 diagnostic uncertainty by ensuring patients with vague symptoms are appropriately monitored, which is now  
 29 even more crucial due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic and its major impact on cancer referrals. The  
 30 ThinkCancer! Workshop is an educational behaviour change intervention aimed at the whole general practice  
 31 team, designed to improve primary care approaches to ensure timely diagnosis of cancer. The workshop will  
 32 consist of teaching and awareness sessions, the appointment of a Safety Netting Champion and the  
 33 development of a bespoke Safety Netting Plan, and has been adapted so it can be delivered remotely. This  
 34 study aims to assess the feasibility of the ThinkCancer! Intervention for a future definitive randomised  
 35 controlled trial.

### 36 **Methods**

37 The ThinkCancer! study is a randomised, multisite feasibility trial, with an embedded process evaluation and  
 38 feasibility economic analysis. Twenty-three to 30 general practices will be recruited across Wales, randomised  
 39 in a ratio of 2:1 of intervention versus control who will follow usual care. The workshop will be delivered by a  
 40 GP educator and will be adapted iteratively throughout the trial period. Baseline practice characteristics will be  
 41 collected via questionnaire. We will also collect Primary Care Intervals (PCI), Two Week Wait (2WW) referral  
 42 rates, conversion rates and detection rates at baseline and six months post-randomisation. Participant  
 43 feedback, researcher reflections and economic costings will be collected following each workshop. A process  
 44 evaluation will assess implementation using an adapted Normalisation Measure Development (NoMAD)

questionnaire and qualitative interviews. An economic feasibility analysis will inform a future economic evaluation.

## Discussion

This study will allow us to test and further develop a novel evidenced-based complex intervention aimed at general practice teams to expedite the diagnosis of cancer in primary care. The results from this study will inform the future design of a full-scale definitive phase III trial.

**Trial registration:** intended registry: [clinicaltrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov)

## KEYWORDS

Early cancer diagnosis, feasibility, primary care, general practitioners, safety netting, health economics, process evaluation

## INTRODUCTION

### Background

Cancer survival in the UK lags behind other western countries.<sup>1</sup> Referral rates and adherence to guidelines are lower,<sup>2,3</sup> primary care providers (PCPs) are less likely to take action on potential cancer symptoms<sup>4</sup> and cancer tends to be diagnosed at a later stage, often only after patients have presented to acute or emergency secondary care services.<sup>3</sup> Compared with the rest of Europe, the UK has relatively low one-year survival, which could be due to later diagnosis.<sup>5</sup>

Timely diagnosis is key to improving cancer outcomes<sup>6</sup> and cancer survival.<sup>7</sup> Earlier diagnosis could also reduce the proportion of cancer patients diagnosed through emergency care.<sup>7</sup> Early diagnosis is a rising priority in cancer policy,<sup>6,8</sup> because it is cost-effective<sup>1</sup> and the incidence of cancer is increasing.<sup>9</sup> Policies in Wales emphasise the

66 importance of early diagnosis, and recognise that increasing demand and a slow referral process are significant  
67 barriers to a quick cancer diagnosis.<sup>3</sup> Following the implementation of these policies, progress has been slow,  
68 with late stage diagnosis continuing to be an issue.<sup>10</sup>

69 The timely diagnosis of cancer has become even more crucial as we enter a period in which primary care and  
70 cancer management has changed dramatically due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.<sup>11-13</sup> Early figures have  
71 shown a 76% decrease in urgent cancer referrals across the UK and predict a 20% increase in excess deaths for  
72 patients with newly diagnosed cancers.<sup>14</sup> There has also been a drop in the number of patients presenting to  
73 primary care<sup>15</sup>; patients and clinicians may have concerns due to a perceived risk of contracting Covid-19 in a  
74 healthcare setting.<sup>14</sup> Some patients may also attribute symptoms that could be cancer to Covid-19 and therefore,  
75 may avoid health services altogether.<sup>11,13,16</sup> General practitioners (GPs) may also be reluctant to refer patients on  
76 to secondary care in order to minimise infection risk.<sup>15</sup> The increased use of remote consultation as a result of  
77 the pandemic will also have implications for the early diagnosis of cancer, as important consultation techniques  
78 such as the use of visual cues and physical examination may be impacted. These issues highlight the ever-  
79 important need of safety netting, and Covid-related considerations will need to be made by GPs in their safety  
80 netting approaches.<sup>11</sup>

81 Primary care providers (PCPs) play a vital role in the early diagnosis of cancer.<sup>17</sup> A key diagnostic stage is the  
82 Primary Care Interval (PCI), which is the time from first presentation to a GP with a symptom that could be cancer,  
83 to the subsequent referral to a specialist in secondary care.<sup>18</sup> However, with an ever expanding role, PCPs are  
84 presented with a plethora of non-specific symptoms, of which only a small proportion are caused by cancer, and  
85 many overlap with other diseases.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, with certain cancers, patients may not present with any alarm  
86 symptoms<sup>6,17</sup> which often results in a delayed cancer diagnosis.<sup>2</sup> In addition, guidelines to expedite early cancer  
87 diagnosis are often unclear, with great variation in strategies between different GPs.<sup>19</sup>

## 88 Rationale and previous work

89 Clinical behaviour change interventions targeting PCPs have the potential to address barriers to suspected cancer  
 90 identification and referral, and could expedite the diagnosis of cancer and improve cancer outcomes overall.<sup>20</sup>  
 91 There is some evidence that educational interventions targeted at PCPs could reduce the PCI, providing they  
 92 encompass a multidimensional, interactive and tailored approach.<sup>20-22</sup> A recent systematic review of primary care  
 93 interventions suggested that a whole-practice approach providing opportunities for peer review and feedback  
 94 could have a positive effect on referral practices, in addition to existing guidelines being revisited through training  
 95 and reinforcement.<sup>23</sup>

96 While the timely diagnosis of cancer is crucial, urgent referral can lead to over-diagnosis and over-investigation  
 97 which can be harmful to the patient.<sup>7,24</sup> This risk is especially high if the patient presents with vague symptoms.<sup>25</sup>  
 98 Safety netting, a tool used to manage diagnostic uncertainty,<sup>26</sup> can address these issues by ensuring that patients  
 99 with non-specific symptoms are not ignored.<sup>24</sup> Instead of immediate referral, patients are monitored according  
 100 to a set step-wise investigational plan, while ensuring they are referred in a timely manner as and when  
 101 required.<sup>24</sup> Although safety netting is currently recommended by national guidelines,<sup>27</sup> there are no clear  
 102 recommendations on how to do it.<sup>19,24,26</sup>

103 In summary, it is relevant and befitting to develop and test interventions aimed at improving the quality and  
 104 consistency of primary care approaches to ensure timely diagnosis of cancer in the UK. This will require  
 105 multicomponent and complex behavioural change interventions, which utilise a multidimensional, interactive,  
 106 tailored, whole-practice approach.

107 The ThinkCancer! intervention is a complex behaviour change intervention aimed at general medical practice  
 108 teams, developed as part of the Wales Interventions for Cancer Knowledge and Early Diagnosis (WICKED)  
 109 research programme, described in more detail elsewhere.<sup>28</sup> It consists of an educational workshop that includes  
 110 early diagnosis and awareness sessions, evaluation of current practice-based safety netting systems and the

111 appointment of a safety netting champion. The workshop will be led by an educational facilitator who will guide  
112 the development of a bespoke safety netting plan for each practice.

113 The aim of this study is to assess the feasibility of delivering the ThinkCancer! intervention and conducting a  
114 future, definitive randomised controlled trial (RCT) to assess effectiveness and cost-effectiveness, in order to  
115 establish whether the intervention can be rolled out in practice.

## 116 **STUDY OBJECTIVES**

117 The objectives of this study are as follows:

- 118 1) To assess the feasibility of a future definitive RCT by monitoring recruitment and retention, outcome  
119 measure completion and reasons for decline.
- 120 2) To assess the acceptability, feasibility, and utility of the ThinkCancer! intervention as a whole, and of  
121 each of its individual components, and refining the intervention as necessary.
- 122 3) To determine the most appropriate primary outcome measure for a definitive RCT and producing means  
123 and confidence intervals for calculating effect sizes for the design of a definitive trial.
- 124 4) To describe current contextual differences, and similarities, between general medical practices and their  
125 usual safety netting practices.
- 126 5) To identify and test the methods and outcome measures for a process evaluation of a future definitive  
127 RCT.
- 128 6) To undertake a feasibility analysis of the most appropriate approach for an economic evaluation  
129 alongside a future definitive trial.

## 130 **METHODS**

## 131 Study design

132 The feasibility study incorporates a pragmatic, multisite, two-armed, superiority, pilot RCT. There is an embedded  
133 process evaluation and feasibility economic analysis. The unit of randomisation is the general medical practice,  
134 and the primary clinical outcome is collected at the practice level.

135 The term ‘feasibility’ is used in accordance with the conceptual framework developed by Eldridge and  
136 colleagues,<sup>29</sup> where it is described as an umbrella term within which pilot trials are a component. Furthermore,  
137 the study has been designed in accordance with the MRC Framework for evaluating complex interventions.<sup>30</sup> The  
138 trial will be conducted according to NIHR guidance,<sup>31</sup> and recommendations for good practice in pilot studies.<sup>32</sup>

139 The process evaluation, which will be based on a mixed-methods approach, will follow the MRC guidance for  
140 process evaluations of complex interventions.<sup>33</sup> During the initial piloting or feasibility testing stage of an  
141 intervention, process evaluation has a vital role in understanding and planning the future potential  
142 implementation of the intervention and optimising its design and evaluation.<sup>33</sup>

143 The feasibility economic analysis will explore the appropriate future perspective of analysis; most appropriate  
144 methods of gathering costs; range and value of outcome measures, and undertake a feasibility budget impact  
145 analysis of the ThinkCancer! intervention developed through a range of blended methods that it is delivered  
146 online (either in a live format or pre-recorded) or face-to-face in general practices across north Wales.




147 This study protocol was developed in line with the Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional  
148 Trials (SPIRIT) guidelines<sup>34</sup>; the SPIRIT checklist (appendix 1) and the schedule of procedures can be seen in Table  
149 1. The SPIRIT checklist has been adapted in accordance with the CONSORT extension to pilot and feasibility  
150 trials.<sup>35</sup>

151

152

153

154 **Table 1:** SPIRIT protocol schedule of procedures for the ThinkCancer! study

	STUDY PERIOD					
	Pre-allocation	Baseline Assessment	Randomisation	Intervention Period	2 Month Follow-up	6 Month Follow-up
TIMEPOINT	$-t_1$	0	$t_1$	$t_2$	$f_1$	$f_2$
<b>ENROLMENT:</b>						
Eligibility screen	X					
Invitation email	X					
Practice information and consent	X					
Baseline questionnaire		X				
Allocation			X			
<b>INTERVENTION:</b>						
Control group: usual practice						
Intervention group: ThinkCancer! Workshop				X		
<b>ASSESSMENTS:</b>						
Collection of clinical outcome measures			X			X
Observation during workshops				X		
Workshop participant evaluation forms				X		
Workshop delivery staff logs				X		
Health economics data collection sheets				X		
Endline questionnaire						X
Adapted NoMAD questionnaire						
Telephone Interviews (practice staff)						



## 156 **Study setting**

157 The setting for this study is primary care. The intervention will be delivered in-practice or online to individual  
158 general medical practices and incorporates a whole-practice approach. The trial will be conducted across Wales  
159 and practices will be recruited from all seven Welsh health boards.

## 160 **Intervention**

161 The proposed intervention, the ThinkCancer! Workshop, has four chief components. The first are two  
162 educational sessions, one for all clinical staff (the 'early diagnosis' session) and one for non-clinical but patient-  
163 facing staff (the 'cancer aware' session). The early diagnosis session is delivered as a teaching seminar with  
164 learning outcomes focussed on NICE NG12 Suspected Cancer: recognition and referral guidelines<sup>27</sup>, hot topics  
165 exploring the harder to recognise cancer presentations and consultation-level safety netting. As a proposed aid  
166 to support and formalise safety netting, a new tool – the Symptom Safety Netting Action Plan (SSNAP) will be  
167 introduced. This session will also see the introduction of the ThinkCancer! Handbook, which will contain all the  
168 resources used in the workshop as well as external resources regarding early diagnosis and safety netting, such  
169 as NICE guidance and online learning resources. The cancer aware session is less formal with more convenor-led  
170 discussion around cancer red flag symptoms that non-clinical staff may encounter. The secondary aim of this  
171 session is to gauge and explore issues and norms around raising concerns within the practice team. The third  
172 session (the 'safety netting session') involves the two final components of the intervention, the co-production of  
173 a bespoke Cancer Safety Netting Plan (CSNP) and appointment of a Cancer Safety Netting Champion (CSNC). This  
174 session is attended by a combination of clinical and administrative staff who will be involved in the design and  
175 implementation of a new plan.

176 Members of the research team will deliver the intervention; the GP Educator (AS) will oversee the workshop,  
177 supported by up to two researchers. The workshop was originally designed to be delivered face-to-face in  
178 participating practices during practices' allocated protected time for educational and professional development.  
179 However, due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, the workshop has been adapted into a digital format and can

180 be delivered in one of three ways: (i) fully remote and live via online conferencing platforms; (ii) blended delivery,  
 181 where practices are offered a combination of pre-recorded versions and live remote delivery of the different  
 182 sessions; and (iii) face-to-face in the practice, as originally intended, if the situation allows. Practices that opt for  
 183 the blended delivery of the workshop can choose to receive pre-recorded videos of sessions 1 and 2, presented  
 184 by the GP Educator, allowing participants to engage with the materials in their own time. The final session, which  
 185 focuses on the Cancer Safety Netting Plan, will still need to be delivered as a live session due to its interactive  
 186 components. There will be flexibility to work with the practice to allow the bespoke design of the workshop  
 187 format to improve the reach of the intervention. Practices receiving the intervention in any of the remote forms  
 188 will be sent all of the workshop materials, including the handbook and SSNAP tool, via post. If there is the  
 189 possibility to deliver the workshop face-to-face, materials will be distributed in the practice at the beginning of  
 190 the workshop. Practices randomised to the control group may also receive the pre-recorded videos at the end  
 191 of the study period, along with the intervention materials.

192 A logic model (figure 1) has been developed to describe the intervention components and how they link to the  
 193 intended outcomes and will be adapted throughout the study period.

194 **Figure 1:** ThinkCancer! Logic model

## 195 **Outcome Measures**

196 The outcomes that will be reported in this feasibility study are as follows:

197 Recruitment will be assessed quantitatively by capturing the numbers of practices

- 198     ▪ approached,
- 199     ▪ interested in participating,
- 200     ▪ consented,
- 201     ▪ randomised

202 A description of the excluded practices will be included to help identify potential future eligibility criteria and  
203 reasons for non-participation will be sought.

204 Retention will be assessed quantitatively by the numbers of practices providing both baseline and follow up data.

205 Data on individual practice characteristics will be collected to:

- 206       ▪ describe the studied sample,
- 207       ▪ identify potential effect modifiers,
- 208       ▪ allow identification of ‘usual practice’

209 The overarching goal of the ThinkCancer! Intervention is to change GPs’ and primary care practices’ behaviours  
210 and systems, encouraging them to be more cancer-aware and act sooner on clinical presentations that could be  
211 cancer, or more effectively safety net cases where concern exists but criteria for immediate referral are not met.

212 The proposed primary clinical outcomes for the definitive RCT relate to the early referral of suspected cancer.  
213 They include the two-week wait (2WW) referral rate and the PCI. The 2WW referral rate is defined as the crude  
214 rate of 2WW referrals multiplied by 100,000 and divided by practice list size.<sup>36</sup> The PCI is defined as the time  
215 between the date of first presentation and the date of referral.<sup>18</sup>

216 Secondary clinical outcome measures include the conversion rate and the detection rate. The conversion rate is  
217 defined as the “proportion of 2WW referrals that are subsequently diagnosed with cancer”<sup>36</sup> and the detection  
218 rate consists of the “proportion of new cancer cases treated who were referred through the Two Week Wait  
219 route”,<sup>36</sup> also known as the sensitivity.<sup>37</sup> These measures will allow us to further explore potential clinical  
220 outcomes.

221 Although it is unlikely that we will detect a difference in the clinical measures in the feasibility study due to the  
222 small sample and short duration of follow-up, we do expect these outcome measures to be affected by the  
223 ongoing Covid-19 pandemic. However, the feasibility of using these outcomes will be assessed.

224 Feasibility of using potential clinical primary outcomes, 2WW referral rate, PCI, conversion rates and detection  
225 rates, will be assessed quantitatively by determining:

- 226       ▪ ability to collect/capture data from the practices, based on completion rates of data collection forms
- 227       ▪ ability to extract relevant data from routinely collected data at Health Board level and from individual
- 228             practices, based on whether we are able to obtain the data via Health Board contacts and whether these
- 229             data are comparable with those collected by individual practices
- 230       ▪ suitability and variability of the data to perform as primary outcome measures for clinical effectiveness

231 Acceptance, adherence to and fidelity of the intervention will be assessed by:

- 232       ▪ reviewing participant views, reflections and perceptions expressed via post-workshop feedback forms
- 233             and interviews
- 234       ▪ post-workshop reflections from the intervention delivery staff
- 235       ▪ the ability to organise/schedule and deliver workshops
- 236       ▪ the number of practices that actively nominate a safety netting champion
- 237       ▪ the number of practices that demonstrate the use of the safety netting plan

238 To inform the process evaluation for the future definitive trial, we will:

- 239       ▪ evaluate how to scale up for any future process evaluation,
- 240       ▪ determine the acceptability and appropriateness of the interview process
- 241       ▪ identify barriers and facilitators to successful implementation,
- 242       ▪ test measures for assessing reach, dose and fidelity of the intervention

243 For the health economics component we will:

- 244       ▪ determine the feasibility of collecting data relating to the costing of the intervention via costings forms
- 245       ▪ identify variables necessary for the design of a future economic evaluation alongside a definitive trial

- review relevant literature on the cost-effectiveness of online and mixed-methods Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programmes for health professionals in a community setting
- consult the DIRUM database<sup>38</sup> to identify the most appropriate way of capturing the costs of the ThinkCancer! Intervention (online delivery and mixed-methods delivery).

Adaptations to the intervention and logic model will also be recorded throughout the trial period.

#### *Progression criteria*

The outcome measures relating to recruitment, retention and adherence/fidelity will be assessed using RAG criteria, as defined below:

1. Confirmation of adequate recruitment for a definitive trial at practice level. Go: 20 or more general medical practices recruited; Review: 15-19 recruited; Stop: < 15 practices recruited.
2. Confirmation of adequate retention for the definitive trial at practice level. Go: 80% or more practices retained; Review: 65-79% practices retained; Stop: < 65% practices retained
3. Confirmation of adequate fidelity of the intervention. Go: 80% or more of all intervention sessions delivered, Review: 50-79% of all interventions delivered; Stop: < 50% of interventions delivered.
4. Confirmation of adequate fidelity at individual practice staff level:  
From each general practice:
  - a. at least 50% of the clinical staff should attend the workshops;
  - b. at least 50% of the administrative staff should attend the workshops, comprising at least 50% of the reception and secretarial staff as well as the practice manager.
  - c. Staff who do not attend the training should have the information cascaded to them by a member of the team who did attend the training. At least 75% of the staff should receive the training either directly or indirectly.

Progression criteria relating to obtaining data regarding completion of outcome measures will be assessed using the following progression criteria:

1. Routine data. Go: data from 70% or more practices obtained; Review: data from < 70% of practices obtained
  2. Individual data. Go: data from 70% or more of individuals of each practice obtained; Review: data from < 70% of individuals from each practice obtained
- These criteria would reflect the potential outcomes for exclusion/inclusion at a full definitive trial stage rather than prevention of the study progressing.

## Sample size

We aim to recruit 23-30 general medical practices, depending on the ease of recruitment, using a randomisation allocation ratio of 2:1 of intervention versus control. Randomising in preference to the intervention will allow us to iteratively develop the intervention more effectively.

As this is a feasibility study, there is no requirement for a formal power calculation. This study is not intended to be powered to identify a clinically meaningful difference between the intervention groups for the primary outcome measures. Rather this study aims to provide robust estimates for the likely recruitment and retention rates, and give an indication of the potential variability in the proposed outcome measures, which will in turn be used to inform the power calculation for a future definitive RCT. This is discussed further under statistical analyses.

## Recruitment and consent

### *Recruitment*

General practices will be identified through contact details publicly available via practice websites and through contact lists provided by the health boards across Wales. Practices will be invited to participate using a standardised invitation via email addressed to the practice manager, along with information about the study. Practice managers will be asked to consult with their team and indicate their interest in participating in the study

292 by responding to the email. They will also need to advise of their practice's availability for potential workshop  
293 dates.

294 If no response to the initial email is received, a reminder email will be sent followed by a telephone call. A  
295 participant flow diagram can be seen in figure 2.

## 296 **Figure 2:** Participant flow diagram

297 Practices that take part in the study will be financially reimbursed for their time. We will establish contacts within  
298 regional primary care clusters, with health board staff and with R&D departments in order to maximise potential  
299 recruitment opportunities. The recruitment methods will be continually assessed and iteratively developed to  
300 determine the most appropriate recruitment strategy for a future definitive RCT.

## 301 *Eligibility to participate*

302 As feasibility is the main objective of this study, all types of general medical practice will be eligible for inclusion.  
303 This will aid intervention refinement and allow for a better understanding of what is feasible across a range of  
304 practices, and also why some practices may not be able to take part.

## 305 *Inclusion*

306 Any general practice in Wales is eligible for inclusion. The target audience for the intervention, based on a 'whole  
307 team approach', includes all practice staff members. These may include, for example, GPs, nurse practitioners,  
308 nurses, health care support workers (HCSWs), practice managers, administrators, receptionists or any other  
309 practice staff, clinical and non-clinical. We would aim to include any new forms of primary care organisations  
310 such as managed GP practice networks, or other general medical practice amalgamations, as well as traditional  
311 GP partnerships. However, some of these may be unstable practices with no regular GP staff, and as such, they  
312 may be difficult to recruit or find it difficult to participate. Practices participating in other research are also eligible  
313 for inclusion; they will be asked to notify us of any cancer-related studies they may be participating in via the  
314 baseline questionnaire.

# 315 *Exclusion*

316 There are no exclusion criteria.

# 317 *Consent*

318 Practice managers will be sent more detailed study information in the form of a 'Research Information Sheet for  
319 Practices' (RISP) and a link to an online baseline practice questionnaire after they have expressed an interest to  
320 take part in the study. Participating practice managers will need to indicate that they have read the study  
321 information and have agreed with consent statements on the first page of the electronic questionnaire before  
322 they can proceed. Prior to the commencement of the ThinkCancer! workshop, Participant Information Sheets  
323 (PIS) will be provided by members of the research team and written consent will be obtained from all  
324 participating members of staff. This will include consent to use anonymised data recorded on paper or audio-file  
325 during workshops and workshop feedback forms. At this time point, participants will also be given the option to  
326 provide their contact details should they be happy to be contacted for a telephone interview. Those who indicate  
327 that they would like to take part will be contacted at least two months after the intervention. Participants from  
328 practices randomised to the control arm, who do not take part in a workshop, will also have the opportunity to  
329 take part in a telephone interview and will be sent an invitation letter via their practice manager. Response to  
330 interview invitations and supplying of contact details will be taken as consent to be contacted and informed  
331 consent will be obtained verbally at the time of interview.

332 *NB Although we will initially contact practice managers, and they will most likely be the person who completes*  
333 *the questionnaire, this task may be delegated to another member of the practice team with a particular interest*  
334 *in the study.*

# 335 *Pre-trial pilot*

336 A local practice, known to the research team, has agreed to participate in a ThinkCancer! pilot workshop prior to  
337 full rollout of the feasibility study. The practice is an urban, large 12,000 patient training practice in a moderately



deprived region of North East Wales. Data will not be collected or recorded for trial purposes and feedback from those participating will only be used to refine the intervention prior to its delivery across recruited practices.

## Randomisation and blinding

The general medical practice will be the unit of randomisation. Randomisation will be achieved online, through the remote randomisation centre at the North Wales Organisation for Randomisation Trials in Health (NWORTH) at Bangor University. The randomisation system will use a dynamic adaptive allocation algorithm<sup>39</sup> to achieve randomisation. ThinkCancer! is an open trial where blinding of participants, researchers and the statistician is not possible due to the nature of the intervention and 2:1 ratio for randomisation.

## Withdrawal criteria

Practices (and individuals within a practice) will be free to withdraw from the trial at any time, and their right to refuse participation will be respected throughout. We will seek to understand their reasons where possible. In terms of the primary outcome measures, as long as it is possible to collect the data, intention-to-treat analysis will be utilised, whether or not the intervention was received or adhered to.

## Data collection

The feasibility study will be used to rehearse data collection approaches and assess their ease of use. Data will be collected at time-points specific to each item and depending on the type of data. All data collected in this study will be anonymised.

## Proposed clinical effectiveness outcomes

Data relating to the proposed primary outcomes for the future definitive RCT will be collected at baseline and 6 months after randomisation. Two week wait referral data and PCI data will be collected directly from participating practices via Case Report Forms containing full instructions on how to extract the data from practice IT systems. We will work with the Practice Manager, CSNC or other delegated individuals to achieve this. It is recognised that this is likely to be too short a follow-up period for meaningful differences to be observed, but

the main purpose in this case will be to test the feasibility of collecting the data in this way. Additionally, we will explore the availability of 2WW data at health board level.

### *Practice Questionnaires*

The baseline and endline practice questionnaires will be available online to both intervention and control practices and are to be filled out by the practice manager or other designated person, ideally in collaboration with the practice team; SurveyMonkey™ will be the most likely platform. The questionnaires will consist of closed questions and some open, free-text questions, and will be used to collect data for each individual practice on the practice characteristics and current systems, and existing practice systems relating to cancer diagnosis and safety netting. The baseline data may be used to inform some workshop planning - i.e. workshop content and delivery may be tailored to some extent to suit individual practice needs and circumstances. Further process evaluation data will also be collected from the practice questionnaires as they will incorporate questions exploring contextual factors known to influence the success of quality improvement approaches used to improve health care.<sup>40</sup> The baseline questionnaire will be completed by all practices prior to randomisation. The endline questionnaire will assess any differences in practice, knowledge or systems in comparison with those measured at baseline and will be completed at 6 months post-randomisation.

Baseline measures will include the following:

- Demographic information and practice characteristics (practice size, research-accredited status, number of clinical and non-clinical staff members, whether a teaching practice, etc.)
- Practice culture (e.g. team structure, diversity of team member roles, team decision-making processes)
- Practice knowledge with regards to safety netting and cancer awareness
- Current safety netting systems in place, if any, including:
  - What systems are in place
  - How widely they are used within the practice
  - How safety netting issues are communicated:

- Between clinicians
- To the wider practice team
- To patients
- How safety netting is recorded

#### *Feasibility and piloting data*

Recruitment, retention and questionnaire completion numbers will be recorded throughout the trial. Spreadsheet systems will be put in place to record practice responses and to track their progress in the trial (e.g. number of practices approached, whether they have responded to the initial invitation, whether they have agreed to be randomised, etc.). Separate spreadsheets will also record feasibility data relating to the workshop itself, such as participant numbers.

#### *Post-workshop reflections and participant feedback*

Data specific to the intervention will be collected via participant feedback and observation and reflections of the research staff. Participant feedback forms will be distributed to practice staff; these can be completed in paper format or online. Responses will be requested using a combination of Yes/No choices, Likert scales and free-text comments. The questions will cover a number of areas including acceptability, usefulness, learning outcomes and the potential to change practice.<sup>41</sup>

Relevant *ad hoc* communications with practices throughout the study will also be collected on a spreadsheet, which may contribute to understanding the intervention in terms of what works, why and how.

The same research team members will deliver the intervention in all practices; their observations will be collected and will inform any refinements of the intervention. Observations and reflections recorded by the research team may provide valuable data on the potential effects of contextual factors, site-by-site and component-by-component measures, and the appropriateness of individual questions included in the practice questionnaires. They will also describe the cancer safety netting plan proposed by the practice and whether the SSNAP tool is used.

409 The researchers will keep a diary, which will include a record of any modifications made to the intervention and  
410 data collection methods.

#### 411 *Health economics*

412 Health economics data collection sheets will be completed by the researchers following each workshop, and  
413 costings specific to the practice will be recorded. We will also use the feedback forms to determine staff roles  
414 within the practice for costing purposes.

#### 415 *NoMAD instrument*

416 At least two months after the intervention, participants who consented to be contacted will be sent a link to  
417 complete an adapted Normalisation Measure Development (NoMAD) instrument.<sup>42</sup> This will assess the  
418 implementation of the cancer safety netting plan using Normalization Process Theory (NPT) principles, which  
419 may or may not include the SSNAP tool depending on uptake.

#### 420 *Telephone interviews*

421 We will conduct qualitative telephone interviews lasting up to 30 minutes with a purposive sample of up to 45  
422 clinical and non-clinical practice staff. Practice staff in both arms of the trial will be eligible to participate in the  
423 interviews as they will be invited to give feedback on all aspects of the trial process including the intervention  
424 where appropriate. The qualitative interviews are designed to achieve an in-depth understanding of the views  
425 and perceptions of practice staff involved in the trial. The interviews will allow participants to explain how they  
426 were able to utilise aspects of the trial and how they worked in practice. Informed consent will be obtained and  
427 interviews recorded and transcribed verbatim. The interviews will be semi-structured and will follow a pre-  
428 defined topic guide, although not every participant will be engaged with every section of the topic guide (i.e.  
429 only the specific areas of the topic guide that are relevant to an individual's role and experience will be explored).  
430 Topics may include acceptability, safety netting, data collection, uptake of the intervention and SSNAP tool and  
431 implications. These interviews will occur at least two months after the intervention has taken place; control  
432 practices will be invited two months post-randomisation.

## 433 *Adverse events*

434 A risk assessment has found this trial to be low risk. Non-serious adverse events will not be collected. However,  
435 Serious Adverse Events (SAEs) will be reported that could be related to the intervention, as decided by the Chief  
436 Investigator (CI), and in line with current ICH-GCP Standard Operating Procedures.<sup>43</sup> SAEs are defined as follows:

437 “...an untoward occurrence that (a) results in death; (b) is life-threatening; (c) requires hospitalisation;  
438 (d) results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity; (e) consists of a congenital anomaly or birth  
439 defect; or (f) is otherwise considered medically significant by the investigator”<sup>43</sup>

440 We do not expect any related SAEs for this study.

## 441 **Data analysis**

### 442 *Quantitative analysis*

443 A fully documented statistical analysis plan will be prepared by a registered trials unit and agreed by the co-  
444 investigators and approved by the trial governance structure, which will be known as the Trial Steering  
445 Committee (TSC).

446 Baseline characteristics will be summarised for all practices, the intervention group and control groups  
447 separately. Feasibility and process evaluation data such as practice recruitment rate, implementation and uptake  
448 of and adherence to the intervention, and follow-up rates will be summarised and presented as percentages.

449 Determining differences in clinical outcomes between the control and intervention is not the primary purpose  
450 of this study, therefore the focus of the results will be on the estimates of the treatment effects rather than  
451 statistical significance and as such, no hypothesis testing will be undertaken. As recommended in guidelines for  
452 good practice for the analysis of pilot studies,<sup>32</sup> summary estimates of effects will be developed along with their  
453 95% confidence intervals. Differences between the two comparison groups will be presented in the form of an  
454 unadjusted mean difference for continuous outcomes, and an odds ratio for binary outcomes. Exploratory

analysis using ANCOVA for continuous outcomes and logistic regression for binary outcomes will consider adjustment for the stratification variables in assessment of the treatment effects.

Factors associated with the ability to implement the intervention will be tentatively explored using logistic regression with the focus on identifying deterministic barriers to implementation rather than probabilistic factors. The nature of the intervention may vary, directed by real-time feedback during the course of the trial and this will need to be taken into consideration during analysis.

As this is a feasibility study, there will be no imputation of missing data over and above any scoring rules established for the outcomes. This information will be used to feed into the suitability and applicability of the chosen outcome measures.

#### *Economic Analysis*

Alongside the statistical analysis plan, a Health Economics Analysis Plan (HEAP) will be produced setting out the objectives, methods and plans for dissemination of the health economics findings.<sup>44</sup> The costing of the development of the ThinkCancer! Intervention will include researcher time, piloting, materials development, printing, publication, development of online materials, etc. Delivery costs of the ThinkCancer! Intervention will be determined based on the following:

- Online delivery format – live seminars/webinars, staff time and materials, exploration of whether health professional time should be collected in a full trial to reflect the co-production nature of CPD in own time or reflecting the opportunity cost of CPD in terms of time not spent on direct patient care activities.
- Mixed-format delivery – potential costs of a face-to-face/online delivery format across Wales in future after COVID-19.

#### *Qualitative analysis*

The transcribed telephone interviews, the free text responses from the feedback forms and the observational data, in text form, will be analysed for the process evaluation using Framework Analysis.<sup>45</sup> Framework is a five-

stage matrix-based system for analysing qualitative data which is highly appropriate for a feasibility study which is iterative in its development. Initially all transcripts and textual data will be read thoroughly by the same researcher who conducted the interviews to achieve data familiarisation and immersion. An index of emergent themes will then be created and data coded according to the index. Charts will be created according to the themes and coded data will be synthesised into the appropriate thematic charts. The completed charts will then be used for final stage which is in-depth interpretation.<sup>45</sup>

## **TRIAL MANAGEMENT**

The Sponsor is Bangor University. The study will be supported by the North Wales Organisation for Randomised Trials in Health (NWORTH), which is a fully registered Clinical Trials Unit.

There will be no on-site monitoring as there are no local research teams at sites. Therefore, the monitoring of data will have a more internal focus in the form of self-audits to ensure compliance with regulations.

### **Trial governance**

#### *Operational group*

The operational working group will be responsible for the overall conduct, supervision and progress of the study. They consist of the immediate research team, supported by a wider group of experts.

#### *Trial Management group*

The Trial Management group (TMG) will meet once a month, consisting of the operational group and a wider team of experts, including a PPI member. The group will be responsible for the overall management of the trial, and ensuring the study adheres to the protocol.

## 499 *Trial Governance Structure*

500 A Trial Steering Committee (TSC) committee will provide independent oversight for the study, ensuring it is  
501 conducted according to the standards set out by the HRA Research Governance Framework.<sup>46</sup> As the study  
502 includes an element of ongoing intervention refinement, and is deemed low risk with very minimal likelihood of  
503 stopping early due to patient safety, a Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee (DMEC) will not be required.<sup>47</sup>  
504 Meetings are expected to be biannual and the Sponsor and Funder will be updated following each meeting. The  
505 TSC will have an independent chairperson and at least three independent members including Patient and Public  
506 Involvement (PPI) representation, trial co-applicants, statisticians, health economist(s) and GPs.

## 507 **Data Management**

508 A detailed data management plan will be written by NWORDH staff. This plan will include the definition of the  
509 data quality checks that will be performed on the data throughout the life course of the trial. These will include  
510 source data validation, random data checks and timelines for data entry.

## 511 *Quality control*

512 Quality control will be maintained through adherence to the study protocol, Betsi Cadwaladr University Health  
513 Board/Bangor University Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), principles of Good Clinical Practice, research  
514 governance and clinical trial regulations.

## 515 *Data protection and participant confidentiality*

516 All investigators, trial site and research staff will comply with the requirements and regulations of the EU General  
517 Data Protection Regulation 2018 (GDPR) regarding the collection, storage, processing and disclosure of personal  
518 information and will uphold the Regulation's core principles. All research staff involved will have up to date GCP  
519 training. Research data will be retained as per the Sponsor's research data management policy. Bangor University  
520 is the data custodian.



## 521 *Data archiving*

522 As per the Sponsor's research data management policy, research data and records will be archived along with  
523 the data management policy of the Sponsor.

524 In line with legal requirements, trial documents will be archived centrally at a secure facility with appropriate  
525 environmental controls and adequate protection from fire, flood and unauthorized access. Archived material will  
526 be stored in tamper-proof archive boxes that are clearly labelled. Electronic archiving will be provided by the  
527 Sponsor for post-project deposit and retention of data.

528 Destruction of essential documents will require authorisation from the Sponsor.

## 529 **Dissemination policy**

530 On completion of the study a final report will be prepared for Cancer Research Wales.

531 Findings will be disseminated through various media, including open-access peer-reviewed publications, national  
532 and international conferences, the programme web pages, social media, and through an end-of-programme  
533 symposium for key stakeholders. Findings will also be disseminated to participating practice teams.

534 Publications arising directly from the WICKED programme and authorship on the final trial report will adhere to  
535 the BMJ guidelines on authorship and contribution, based on the International Committee of Medical Journal  
536 Editors Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical  
537 Journals (ICMJE) 2013.<sup>48</sup>

## 538 **Patient and public involvement**

539 The study team recognises that the involvement of those with lived experiences will be vital in this research.  
540 Furthermore, a lay perspective is essential in the development and undertaking of research for the promotion of  
541 equality, diversity and transparency. Two patient representatives were initially recruited to the WICKED  
542 programme, one of whom has maintained active involvement in the study design, the development of the  
543 protocol and conduct throughout. Additionally, the trial PPI has been active in providing feedback on participant-

544 facing documents. Two more PPI representatives have been recruited to the TSC through the North Wales Cancer  
545 Forum and have directly relevant experience. Their perspective as both a patient and a member of the public will  
546 inform the overall supervision of the trial.

547

## 548 **DISCUSSION**

549 This study aims to test the feasibility of the ThinkCancer! intervention. The ThinkCancer! Study comprises Work  
550 Package 4 (WP4) of a programme of research called the Wales Interventions and Cancer Knowledge about Early  
551 Diagnosis (WICKED). The intervention will consist of a workshop aimed at the entire general practice team, as  
552 previous work packages have demonstrated the value of a whole-practice approach. If the intervention is shown  
553 to be feasible, we will proceed with designing a full-scale definitive trial.

554 This trial is especially relevant due to the current ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, which has had a major negative  
555 impact on suspected cancer referrals to secondary care, and will likely delay many cancer diagnoses and  
556 treatments, leading to poorer patient outcomes. One of the key strengths of this intervention is that it can be  
557 iteratively developed throughout the study period, which will ensure the future definitive trial will adopt an  
558 optimal approach. The design process of the study is also a strength in that a strong multidisciplinary team and  
559 advisory groups have been involved throughout. Furthermore, the mixed methods approach will allow us to  
560 capture a variety of data from this complex intervention. Furthermore, the planned rigour with which the study  
561 will be conducted is also a strength.

562 We are aware that some challenges in the recruitment lay ahead, but we plan to work with the various  
563 research infrastructures in Wales to overcome this. We plan to work closely with the Primary Care Specialty  
564 Lead and Primary Care Research Managers within Health and Care Research Wales, as well as with the  
565 individual health board R&D departments in order to maximise recruitment. We will also work closely with the  
566 practices that agree to take part in order to support their participation in the study.

Although safety-netting has garnered more attention in recent years, there currently are no recommendations on how best to do it.<sup>26</sup> To our knowledge, there are no interventions targeting primary care with a focus on safety netting. In addition, involving the entire practice is a relatively novel approach, with great potential benefit. This study encompasses a multicomponent and complex behavioural change intervention comprising a multidimensional, interactive, tailored and whole-practice approach, which is timely and needed to optimise primary care approaches to the timely diagnosis of cancer.

## TRIAL STATUS

The trial is currently open for recruitment.

## ABBREVIATIONS

2WW	Two Week Wait
AE	Adverse Event
CSNC	Cancer Safety Netting Champion
CSNP	Cancer Safety Netting Plan
DMEC	Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee
GCP	Good Clinical Practice
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulations
GP	General Practitioner
HCSW	Health Care Support Worker
HEAP	Health Economics Analysis Plan
HRA	Health Research Authority
MRC	Medical Research Council

590	NIHR	National Institute for Health Research
591	NWORTH	North Wales Organisation for Randomisation Trials in Health
592	PCI	Primary Care Interval
593	PCP	Primary Care Provider
594	PIS	Participant Information Sheet
595	PPI	Patient and Public Involvement
596	R&D	Research and Development
597	RCT	Randomised Controlled Trial
598	RISP	Research Information Sheet for Practices
599	REC	Research Ethics Committee
600	SAE	Serious Adverse Event
601	SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
602	TSC	Trial Steering Committee
603	WICKED	Wales Interventions and Cancer Knowledge about Early Diagnosis
604	WP	Work Package

605

## 606 **DECLARATIONS**

### 607 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

608 This study has been approved by the Health Research Authority/Health and Care Research Wales (IRAS 256824)  
609 and Bangor University (School of Healthcare Sciences, 2019-16498). We did not seek REC Approval; this was  
610 not required as the study does not involve patients.

Participants are consented at two different time points in the study. Practice managers will consent to participate in the study on behalf of the general medical practice. If the practice has been randomised to the intervention, individual staff participants will be asked for their informed consent at the start of the workshop.

#### **Trial Sponsor**

Bangor University. The Sponsor had no role in the design of this trial and will not have any role during its execution, analyses, data interpretation or decision to submit results.

Contact: Dr Huw Roberts. School of Healthcare Sciences, The Normal Site, Holyhead Road, Gwynedd, LL57 2AS, UK; Tel: 01248 383 136; Email: [huw.roberts@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:huw.roberts@bangor.ac.uk)

#### **Consent for publication**

No participant identifiable information will be published.

#### **Availability of data and materials**

On completion of the trial, the final datasets generated and/or analysed will be available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. Access to the final datasets will be in accordance with governance policies, Good Clinical Practice (GCP) guidelines and funder arrangements.

#### **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

#### **Funding**

This article presents independent research funded by Cancer Research Wales (CRW). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of CRW. This funding source had no role in the design of this trial and will not have any role during its execution, analyses, data interpretation or decision to submit results. This research is also linked to the CanTest Collaborative, which is funded by Cancer Research UK (C8640/A23385), of which RDN is an Associate Director.

## 633 Indemnity

634 Bangor University currently has in place appropriate Clinical Trials Indemnity and Professional Indemnity  
635 insurance covering harm to participants arising from the management and/or the design of the research and  
636 member of the research team to conduct the research as per protocol. On sites that are not covered by the  
637 NHS Indemnity Scheme (e.g. GP surgeries in primary care), investigators/collaborators will need to ensure that  
638 their activity on the study is covered under their own professional indemnity. Health and Care Research Wales  
639 assisting with recruitment will have NHS contracts and will be responsible for ensuring they are appropriately  
640 insured.

## 641 Authors' contributions

642 RDN and CW are the Chief Investigators for the study. CW and RDN contributed to all aspects of this work  
643 including: conceiving and design of the study, obtaining initial and additional funding, intervention  
644 development, management of the study, obtaining approvals and writing the report.

645 SD is the Research Project Support Officer for the study. SD drafted the manuscript integrating comments from  
646 JR, AS, AH, NG, CW, RN, NW, RTE, BFA, RL, RJL, and ACS. SD was also involved in the development of the  
647 intervention and its adaptation in response to COVID-19.

648 AS was involved in the development of the intervention, its adaptation in response to COVID-19 and  
649 contributed to the protocol via the intervention description and by developing the logic model. AS also read  
650 and approved the final manuscript. The workshop materials were designed by AS, with assistance and advice  
651 from the wider ThinkCancer! team. AS is also the GP Educator and will be delivering the intervention.

652 JR is the trial manager for the study. She oversaw the writing of the protocol, facilitated gaining approvals from  
653 the seven health boards and contributed to adaptations of the methodology in response to COVID-19. JR also  
654 read and approved the final manuscript.

655 AH is the qualitative researcher for the study and contributed to the protocol via the embedded qualitative  
 656 component and design of qualitative data collection materials. AH also contributed to gaining R&D approvals  
 657 from the seven health boards. AH also read and approved the final manuscript.

658 RL was involved in the development of the intervention, the study design and the previous work packages  
 659 leading up to the ThinkCancer trial. RL contributed to the methodological components of the protocol. RL read  
 660 and approved the final manuscript.

661 NG is the Trial Statistician and contributed to the protocol via the statistical component. NG also read and  
 662 approved the final manuscript. ZH is the Principal Statistician and will oversee all statistical analysis. ZH was  
 663 involved in the design of the study and contributed to the protocol via the statistical component and the  
 664 outcome measures. ZH read and approved the manuscript.

665 RTE is Lead Health Economist. BFA is Health Economics Research Support Project Officer and drafted the health  
 666 economics analysis plan and is responsible for data analysis. RTE and BFA read and approved the manuscript.

667 RJL was involved in the intervention development and the previous work packages leading up to the  
 668 ThinkCancer trial. RJL read and approved the final manuscript.

669 JH was involved in the intervention development and the previous work packages leading up to the  
 670 ThinkCancer trial. JH read and approved the final manuscript.

671 ACS contributed to the design of the study and the development of the intervention. ACS also read and  
 672 approved the final manuscript.

## 673 **Acknowledgements**

674 The authors would like to thank Maggie Hendry for her significant contributions to the trial protocol on which  
 675 this paper is based, as well as her contributions to the development of the intervention, and Stella Wright, for  
 676 her contributions to the trial protocol and the participant-facing materials. We would also like to acknowledge  
 677 Nic Nikolic for her work on the study costings. We would like to thank Jan Rose, Brian Lewin and Rosemary

Birch, our patient representatives, for their valuable contributions to the development of the protocol and the participant-facing materials. We would also like to acknowledge the contributions from Dr Jane Heyhoe from the Yorkshire and Humber Patient Safety Translational Research Centre and Dr Caroline Green from RedWhale GPUUpdate.

## ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Additional file 1: WHO Trial Registration Data Set (Additional File 1 – WHO trial registration data.pdf)

Additional file 2: ThinkCancer! Logic Model (Additional File 2 – logic model.pdf)

Additional file 3: participant flow diagram (Additional File 3 – participant flow diagram.pdf)

Additional file 4: SPIRIT Checklist (Additional File 4 – SPIRIT.pdf)

## REFERENCES

1. CRUK. Cancer Research UK position paper: The diagnostic workforce in Wales. 2018; <https://www.bsg.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Cancer-Research-UK-position-paper-on-the-diagnostic-workforce-in-Wales.pdf?x83412>, 2019.
2. Nicholson BD, Mant D, Neal RD, Hart N, Hamilton W, Shinkins B, et al. International variation in adherence to referral guidelines for suspected cancer: a secondary analysis of survey data. *British Journal of General Practice* 2016;66(643):106-113.
3. Wales Cancer Network. Cancer Delivery Plan for Wales 2016-2020. 2016; <http://www.walescanet.wales.nhs.uk/sitesplus/documents/1113/161114cancerplanen.pdf>, 2019.
4. Rose PW, Rubin G, Perera-Salazar R, Almberg SS, Barisic A, Dawes M, et al. Explaining variation in cancer survival between 11 jurisdictions in the International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership: a primary care vignette survey. *BMJ Open* 2015;5(5):e007212.



700 5. Butler J, Foot C, Bomb M, Hiom S, Coleman M, Bryant H, et al. The International Cancer Benchmarking  
701 Partnership: an international collaboration to inform cancer policy in Australia, Canada, Denmark, Norway,  
702 Sweden and the United Kingdom. *Health Policy* 2013;112(1-2):148-155.

703 6. Rubin GP, Berendsen A, Crawford M, Dommett R, Earle C, Emery J, et al. The expanding role of primary care  
704 in cancer control. *The Lancet Oncology* 2015;16(12):1231-1272.

705 7. Hamilton W, Walter FM, Rubin G, Neal RD. Improving early diagnosis of symptomatic cancer. *Nature*  
706 *Reviews: Clinical Oncology* 2016;13(12):740-749.

707 8. Koo MM, Hamilton W, Walter FM, Rubin GP, Lyratzopoulos G. Symptom signatures and diagnostic timeliness  
708 in cancer patients: A review of current evidence. *Neoplasia* 2018;20(2):165-174.

709 9. WHO. Key statistics. 2020; <https://www.who.int/cancer/resources/keyfacts/en/>. Accessed 12th October,  
710 2020.

711 10. Weller D, Menon U, Falborg AZ, Jensen H, Barisic A, Knudsen AK, et al. Diagnostic routes and time intervals  
712 for patients with colorectal cancer in 10 international jurisdictions; findings from a cross-sectional study from  
713 the International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership (ICBP). *BMJ Open* 2018;8(11):e023870.

714 11. Jones D, Neal RD, Duffy SRG, Scott SE, Whitaker KL, Brain K. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the  
715 symptomatic diagnosis of cancer: the view from primary care. *The Lancet* 2020;21(603):748-749.

716 12. Looi M, Coombes R. Risky Business: lessons from covid-19. *BMJ* 2020;369:m2221.

717 13. Spicer J, Chamberlain C, Papa S. Provision of cancer care during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature Reviews*  
718 *Clinical Oncology* 2020;17(6):329-331.

719 14. Lai A, Pasea L, Banerjee A, Denaxas S, Katsoulis M, Chang WH, et al. [In press] Estimating excess mortality in  
720 people with cancer and multimorbidity in the COVID-19 emergency. 2020;  
721 [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340984562\\_Estimating\\_excess\\_mortality\\_in\\_people\\_with\\_cancer\\_](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340984562_Estimating_excess_mortality_in_people_with_cancer_and_multimorbidity_in_the_COVID-19_emergency/citation/download)  
722 [and\\_multimorbidity\\_in\\_the\\_COVID-19\\_emergency/citation/download](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340984562_Estimating_excess_mortality_in_people_with_cancer_and_multimorbidity_in_the_COVID-19_emergency/citation/download).

723 15. Hiom S. How coronavirus is impacting cancer services in the UK. 2020;  
724 [https://scienceblog.cancerresearchuk.org/2020/04/21/how-coronavirus-is-impacting-cancer-services-in-the-](https://scienceblog.cancerresearchuk.org/2020/04/21/how-coronavirus-is-impacting-cancer-services-in-the-uk/)  
725 [uk/](https://scienceblog.cancerresearchuk.org/2020/04/21/how-coronavirus-is-impacting-cancer-services-in-the-uk/). Accessed 20, 2020.

726 16. Wise J. Covid-19: Cancer mortality could rise at least 20% because of pandemic, study finds. BMJ  
727 2020;369:m1735.

728 17. Round T. Primary care and cancer: Facing the challenge of early diagnosis and survivorship. European  
729 Journal of Cancer Care 2017;26(3):e12703.

730 18. Weller D, Vedsted P, Rubin G, Walter FM, Emery J, Scott S, et al. The Aarhus Statement: improving design  
731 and reporting of studies on early cancer diagnosis. Br J Cancer 2012;106:1262-1267.

732 19. Evans J, Ziebland S, MacArtney JI, Bankhead CR, Rose PW, Nicholson BD. GPs' understanding and practice of  
733 safety netting for potential cancer. British Journal of General Practice 2018;68(672):505-511.

734 20. Mansell G, Shapley M, Jordan JL, Jordan K. Interventions to reduce primary care delay in cancer referral: a  
735 systematic review. British Journal of General Practice 2011;61(593):821-835.

736 21. Baskerville NB, Liddy C, Hogg W. Systematic review and meta-analysis of practice facilitation within primary  
737 care settings. Annals of Family Medicine 2012;10(1):63-74.

738 22. Schichtel M, Rose PW, Sellers C. Educational interventions for primary healthcare professionals to promote  
739 the early diagnosis of cancer: a systematic review. Education for Primary Care 2013;24(4):274-290.

- 740 23. Blank L, Baxter S, Woods HB, Goyder E, Lee A, Payne N, et al. Referral interventions from primary to  
741 specialist care: a systematic review of international evidence. British Journal of General Practice  
742 2014;64(629):765-774.
- 743 24. Nicholson BD, Mant D, Bankhead C. Can safety-netting improve cancer detection in patients with vague  
744 symptoms? BMJ Quality & Safety. BMJ Quality & Safety 2016;355:i5515.
- 745 25. Rubin GP, Saunders CL, Abel GA, McPhail S, Lyratzopoulos G, Neal RD. Impact of investigations in general  
746 practice on timeliness of referral for patients subsequently diagnosed with cancer: analysis of national primary  
747 care audit data. BJC 2015;112(4):676-687.
- 748 26. Jones D, Dunn L, Watt I, Macleod U. Safety netting for primary care: evidence from a literature review. BJGP  
749 2019;69(678):e70-e79.
- 750 27. NICE. Suspected cancer: recognition and referral (NG12). 2015; <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng12>  
751 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng12>, 2019.
- 752 28. Stanciu MA, Law RJ, Nafees S, Hendry M, Yeo ST, Hiscock J, et al. Development of an intervention to  
753 expedite early cancer diagnosis through primary care. BMJ Open 2018;2(3).
- 754 29. Eldridge S, Lancaster G, Campbell M, Thabane L, Hopewell S, Coleman C, et al. Defining feasibility and pilot  
755 studies in preparation for randomised controlled trials: development of a conceptual framework. PLoS ONE  
756 2016;11(3):e0150205.
- 757 30. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex  
758 interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. BMJ 2008;337:a1655.

759 31. NIHR. NIHR Research for Patient Benefit (RfPB) Programme Guidance on Applying for Feasibility Studies.  
760 2017; [https://www.nihr.ac.uk/funding-and-support/documents/funding-for-research-studies/research-](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/funding-and-support/documents/funding-for-research-studies/research-programmes/RfPB/Guidance%20Documents/Guidance_on_feasibility_studies.pdf)  
761 [programmes/RfPB/Guidance%20Documents/Guidance\\_on\\_feasibility\\_studies.pdf](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/funding-and-support/documents/funding-for-research-studies/research-programmes/RfPB/Guidance%20Documents/Guidance_on_feasibility_studies.pdf), 2019.

762 32. Lancaster G, Dodd S, Williamson P. Design and analysis of pilot studies: recommendations for good practice.  
763 J Eval Clin Pract 2004;10(2):307-312.

764 33. Moore G, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, et al. Process evaluation of complex  
765 interventions. UK Medical Research Council (MRC) guidance. 2015; [https://mrc.ukri.org/documents/pdf/mrc-](https://mrc.ukri.org/documents/pdf/mrc-phsrn-process-evaluation-guidance-final/)  
766 [phsrn-process-evaluation-guidance-final/](https://mrc.ukri.org/documents/pdf/mrc-phsrn-process-evaluation-guidance-final/), 2019.

767 34. Chan A, Tetzlaff JM, Altman DG, Laupacis A, Gøtzsche PC, Krleža-Jerić K, et al. SPIRIT 2013 Statement:  
768 Defining standard protocol items for clinical trials. Ann Intern Med 2013;158(3):200-207.

769 35. Eldridge SM, Chan CL, Campbell MJ, Bond CM, Hopewell S, Thabane L, et al. CONSORT 2010 statement:  
770 extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials. BMJ 2016 Oct 24,;355:i5239.

771 36. NCIN. General Practice Profiles for cancer: Meta-data for profile indicators. 2010;  
772 [https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwj8wL](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwj8wLKNhuHgAhUL4OAKHfZfBBEQFjAAegQICRAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fncin.org.uk%2Fview.aspx%3Frid%3D90&usg=AOvVaw1MczVZD_U_jHJXJtu9W2mP)  
773 [KNhuHgAhUL4OAKHfZfBBEQFjAAegQICRAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fncin.org.uk%2Fview.aspx%3Frid%3D90&usg=](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwj8wLKNhuHgAhUL4OAKHfZfBBEQFjAAegQICRAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fncin.org.uk%2Fview.aspx%3Frid%3D90&usg=AOvVaw1MczVZD_U_jHJXJtu9W2mP)  
774 [AOvVaw1MczVZD\\_U\\_jHJXJtu9W2mP](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwj8wLKNhuHgAhUL4OAKHfZfBBEQFjAAegQICRAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fncin.org.uk%2Fview.aspx%3Frid%3D90&usg=AOvVaw1MczVZD_U_jHJXJtu9W2mP), 2019.

775 37. Meechan D, Gildea C, Hollingworth L, Richards MA, Riley D, Rubin G. Variation in use of the 2-week referral  
776 pathway for suspected cancer: a cross-sectional analysis. The British journal of general practice : the journal of  
777 the Royal College of General Practitioners 2012;62(602):e590-e597.

778 38. DIRUM. Database of Instruments for Resource Use Measurement. 2019; <http://www.dirum.org/about>,  
779 2019.

780 39. Russel D, Hoare ZSJ, Whitaker R, Whitaker CJ, Russel IT. Generalized method for adaptive randomization in  
781 clinical trials. Statist Med 2011;30:922-934.

782 40. Kaplan H, Provost L, Froehle C, Margolis P. The Model for Understanding Success in Quality (MUSIQ):  
783 building a theory of context in healthcare quality improvement. BMJ Quality & Safety 2012;21(1):13-20.

784 41. Kirkpatrick Partners. The Kirkpatrick Model. 2019; [https://www.kirkpatrickpartners.com/Our-](https://www.kirkpatrickpartners.com/Our-Philosophy/The-Kirkpatrick-Model)  
785 [Philosophy/The-Kirkpatrick-Model](https://www.kirkpatrickpartners.com/Our-Philosophy/The-Kirkpatrick-Model), 2019.

786 42. May C, Rapley T, Mair FS, Treweek S, Murray E, Ballini L, et al. The Normalization Process Theory On-Line  
787 User's Manual, Toolkit and NoMAD instrument. 2015; <http://www.normalizationprocess.org>.

788 43. ICH-GCP. CH E6 Good Clinical Practice (GCP) Guideline. 2016; [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/ich-e6-r2-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/ich-e6-r2-good-clinical-practice)  
789 [good-clinical-practice](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/ich-e6-r2-good-clinical-practice), 2019.

790 44. Thorn JC, Brookes ST, Ridyard C, Riley R, Hughes DA, Wordsworth S, et al. Core Items for a Standardized  
791 Resource Use Measure: Expert Delphi Consensus Survey. Value in Health 2018;21(6):640-649.

792 45. Ritchie J, Spencer L, O'Connor W. Carrying out Qualitative Analysis. In: Ritchie J, Lewis J, editors. Qualitative  
793 Research Practice. A guide for social science students and researchers London: SAGE Publications Ltd; 2003.

794 46. HRA. UK Framework for Health and Social Care Research. 2017; [https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-](https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-improving-research/policies-standards-legislation/uk-policy-framework-health-social-care-research/)  
795 [improving-research/policies-standards-legislation/uk-policy-framework-health-social-care-research/](https://www.hra.nhs.uk/planning-and-improving-research/policies-standards-legislation/uk-policy-framework-health-social-care-research/), 2019.

796 47. EMEA. Guideline on data monitoring committees. 2005;  
797 [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-data-monitoring-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-data-monitoring-committees_en.pdf)  
798 [committees\\_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/guideline-data-monitoring-committees_en.pdf), 2019.

799 48. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE). Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting,  
800 Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals. Updated December 2019. 2013. [accessed 27  
801 Nov 2020] Available from: <http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/>

802