

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

1 **Full title:** Wellbeing Impact Study of High-Speed 2 (WISH2): Protocol for a mixed-methods
2 examination of the impact of major transport infrastructure development on mental health and
3 wellbeing

4 **Short title:** Wellbeing Impact Study of High-Speed 2 (WISH2): Study protocol

5 **Authors:**

6 Katherine I. Morley*

7 *Roles:* Conceptualization, Data Curation, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Methodology,
8 Supervision, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing

9 *Affiliation:* Health and Wellbeing Research Group, RAND Europe, Cambridge, United Kingdom
10 (UK)

11

12 Lucy Hocking

13 *Roles:* Investigation, Project Administration, Resources, Writing – Original Draft Preparation,
14 Writing – Review & Editing

15 *Affiliation:* Health and Wellbeing Research Group, RAND Europe, Cambridge, UK

16

17 Catherine L. Saunders

18 *Roles:* Conceptualization, Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Funding Acquisition, Investigation,
19 Methodology, Supervision, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review &
20 Editing

21 *Affiliation:* Primary Care Unit, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of
22 Cambridge

23

24 Jennifer W. Bousfield

25 *Roles:* Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing

26 *Affiliation:* Health and Wellbeing Research Group, RAND Europe, Cambridge, UK

27

28 Jennifer Bostock

29 *Roles:* *Public involvement and ethics, reviewing and drafting*

30 *Affiliation:* Independent

31

32 James Brimicombe

33 *Roles:* Data Curation, Investigation, Software, Resources, Project Administration

34 *Affiliation:* Primary Care Unit, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of
35 Cambridge

36

37 Thomas Burgoine

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

38 *Roles:* Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Methodology,
39 Resources, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & editing

40 *Affiliation:*

41

42 Jessica Dawney

43 *Roles:* Investigation, Project Administration, Writing – Reviewing & Editing

44 *Affiliation:* Health and Wellbeing Research Group, RAND Europe, Cambridge, UK

45

46 Joanna Hofman

47 *Roles:* Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing

48 *Affiliation:* Home Affairs and Social Policy Research Group, RAND Europe, Cambridge, UK

49

50 Daniel Lee

51 *Roles:* Data curation, Formal analysis, Software, Visualization, Investigation, and Writing – Review
52 & Editing.

53 *Affiliation:* Health and Wellbeing Research Group, RAND Europe, Cambridge, UK

54

55 Roger Mackett

56 *Roles:* Conceptualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing

57 *Affiliation:* Centre for Transport Studies, University College London, London, UK

58

59 William Phillips

60 *Roles:* Investigation, Project Administration, Writing – Review & Editing

61 *Affiliation:* Health and Wellbeing Research Group, RAND Europe, Cambridge, UK

62

63 Jon Sussex

64 *Roles:* Conceptualisation, methodology, supervision, writing – review and editing.

65 *Affiliation:* Health and Wellbeing Research Group, RAND Europe, Cambridge, UK

66

67 Stephen Morris

68 *Roles:* Conceptualization, Data Curation, Funding Acquisition, Investigation, Methodology,
69 Supervision, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing

70 *Affiliation:* Primary Care Unit, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of
71 Cambridge

72

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

73 * Corresponding author

74 kmorley@randeurope.org (Katherine Morley)

75

76 **Funding**

77 This research is funded by The Department for Transport and High Speed 2 Ltd and is independently
78 managed by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR132761). The views expressed
79 are those of the authors and not necessarily those of The Department for Transport, High Speed 2 Ltd,
80 or the National Institute for Health and Care Research.

81 **Competing interests**

82 Roger Mackett is a member of Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee which advises the
83 government on the transport needs of disabled people.

84

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

85 **Abstract**

86 Although research has demonstrated that transport infrastructure development can have positive and
87 negative health-related impacts, most of this research has not considered mental health and wellbeing
88 separately from physical health. There is also limited understanding of whether and how any effects
89 might be experienced differently across population groups, whether this differs according to the stage
90 of development (e.g. planning, construction), and how changes to planned infrastructure may affect
91 mental health and wellbeing. This paper presents a protocol for the Wellbeing Impact Study of HS2
92 (WISH2), which seeks to address these questions using a high-speed rail development in the UK as an
93 applied example. WISH2 is a 10-year, integrated, longitudinal, mixed-methods project using general
94 practices (primary medical care providers in the UK) as an avenue for participant recruitment and for
95 providing a geographically defined population for which aggregated data on mental health indicators
96 are available. The research comprises: (i) a combined longitudinal and repeated cross-sectional cohort
97 study involving multiple waves of survey data collection and data from medical records; (ii)
98 longitudinal, semi-structured interviews and focus groups with residents and community stakeholders
99 from exposed areas; (iii) analysis of administrative data aggregated at the general practice population
100 level; and (iv) health economic analysis of mental health and wellbeing impacts. The study findings
101 will support the development of strategies to reduce negative impacts and/or enhance positive mental
102 health and wellbeing impacts of high-speed rail developments and other large-scale infrastructure
103 projects.

104 **Introduction**

105 High-speed rail infrastructure has been developed in many countries, such as China, France, Japan,
106 and Germany. Its implementation in the United Kingdom (UK), and elsewhere, has been surrounded
107 by lively debate about the balance between investment costs and likely benefits [1]. A recent meta-
108 analysis found that the majority of studies investigating the impact of high-speed rail system
109 developments have focused on changes in accessibility, modes of transport, the environment, tourism,

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

110 housing or land, labour market, and economic performance [1]. Very limited consideration has been
111 given to health impacts, particularly impacts on mental health and wellbeing [1,2].

112 Transport infrastructure, such as railways, can create physical or psychological barriers in the local
113 community that impact health and wellbeing by disrupting social connectedness, reducing
114 opportunities for exercise, and reducing accessibility to local health services and supermarkets with
115 healthy food options [3–6]. Communities can also be cut-off from the surrounding area which can
116 cause problems such as less commercial activity for local businesses [3,4], or poor integration of new
117 and existing transport systems [4].

118 The potential for differential impacts of transport infrastructure on mental health and wellbeing to
119 contribute to social exclusion is recognised [7]. Impacts may be experienced differently according to
120 life-stage, health status, proximity, employment status, and social support [3,4,8–12]. A 2021
121 systematic review found mixed evidence of the wellbeing impacts of urban design interventions in
122 vulnerable groups. While some infrastructure changes (e.g. green infrastructure, improved
123 walking/cycle paths and urban regeneration in general) led to improved psychological outcomes for
124 low-income residents and women, others (including motorway development) did not [12].

125 In addition to limited examination of health impacts, current literature has focused primarily on
126 completed infrastructure projects and their users; there is little research on the impacts of planning and
127 construction stages, or how these are experienced by those who do not use the transport, despite
128 acknowledgement that the social impacts of infrastructure mean local communities are stakeholders
129 regardless of use [4,8,13–17]. Frameworks for measuring the social costs of pre-operational phases of
130 large-scale projects have often been restricted to factors such as pollution, traffic, noise, and safety
131 without explicit consideration of mental health and wellbeing [14,17]. Nieuwenhuijsen & Kreis
132 [17,18] developed a framework focused on differential health impacts of transport infrastructure that
133 explicitly includes mental health and wellbeing consequences. However, it is primarily focused on
134 operational effects and although it considers some pre-operational factors (e.g. land acquisition), not
135 all factors relevant to mental health and wellbeing are captured (e.g. uncertainty over project scale,
136 fears of forced relocation) [16].

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

137 Thus, there is a need for more research on the impact of transport infrastructure projects on health,
138 particularly mental health and wellbeing. Although research has demonstrated transport infrastructure
139 can have positive and negative health-related impacts, most of this research has not considered mental
140 health and wellbeing separately from physical health. There is also limited understanding of whether
141 and how any effects might be experienced differently across population groups, whether this differs
142 according to the stage of development (e.g. planning, construction), and how changes to planned
143 infrastructure (e.g. cancellation of parts of a project) may affect mental health and wellbeing. The
144 Wellbeing Impact Study of HS2 (WISH2) seeks to address these questions, using a high-speed rail
145 development in the UK as an applied example.

146 **Context to the research study**

147 High Speed Two (HS2) is a new high-speed railway being implemented by the UK Government,
148 intended to improve connections between London and major cities in the midlands and north of
149 England. The proposal for HS2 was originally put forward in 2009 [19], with a Y-shaped route
150 connecting London, Birmingham, Manchester and Leeds proposed in 2010 [20] (**Fig 1**). Splitting the
151 route into two phases was first proposed in 2011, with Phase 1 running from London to Birmingham
152 and Phase 2 running from Birmingham to Manchester and Leeds [21]. Phase 2 was then split into two
153 parts – Phase 2a, running from the West Midlands (Birmingham) to Crewe, and Phase 2b involving
154 the route from Crewe to Manchester (“Western leg”), and Birmingham to Leeds (“Eastern leg”) [22].
155 This research project is focused on the Phase 2 sections of the route.

156

157 **Fig 1. Simplified diagram of HS2 route.** Image credit: adapted from image by User:Cnrb, CC BY-
158 SA 3.0, via Wikimedia Commons.

159

160 The necessary legislation to proceed with HS2 was introduced in three parts, aligned to Phase 1,
161 Phase 2a, and Phase 2b sections of the route (see **Fig 2**). In 2013 the UK Government published the
162 High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill; it received Royal Assent in 2017 [23]. Construction

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

163 on Phase 1 officially began in 2020, although enabling works at Euston station in London began in
164 2019 [22].

165

166 **Fig 2. Timeline of major milestones for High-Speed Two development.**

167

168 The High Speed Rail (West Midlands-Crewe) Bill, covering the Phase 2a section of the route, was
169 introduced in 2017 and received Royal Assent in February 2021 [24]. While some initial work started
170 on Phase 2a following Royal Assent, at the time of writing (mid-2023) construction of the Phase 2a
171 route has been paused until the end of the UK government's current public spending review period in
172 March 2025 [25]. In November 2021, while Phase 2b was still in the planning stage and six months
173 after this research project commenced, the UK government announced that the HS2 Phase 2b route
174 would not proceed as originally planned. The eastern leg of the Phase 2b route, from East Midlands
175 Parkway to Leeds, and a small section of the route between Warrington and Manchester, will not go
176 ahead as part of HS2. The eastern leg of the Phase 2b route has been replaced with the Integrated Rail
177 Plan (IRP) [26]. The IRP commits to building the Eastern Leg to the East Midlands to serve
178 Nottingham, Derby and Sheffield. The IRP also commits Government to spending £100m on work to
179 look at how best to take HS2 trains to Leeds. While the impact of the IRP is not specifically within the
180 scope of this research, the change of plans means there is still uncertainty for residents and
181 communities on the Eastern Leg of the Phase 2b HS2 following the IRP announcement. The Bill for
182 Phase 2b West, High Speed Rail (Crewe-Manchester) Bill was published in January 2022 and is
183 currently at the Committee stage [27]. No bill for the eastern leg of HS2 Phase 2b has been published
184 as yet.

185 The Bills for HS2 are hybrid bills, which means that in addition to the standard parliamentary
186 processes, individuals and businesses who are affected by the Bill and its Additional Provisions are
187 able to petition Parliament and the Committee reviewing the Bill [22]. There were many petitions
188 regarding the High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Bill relating to effects the HS2 development
189 was having, or was predicted to have, on the mental health and wellbeing of people living along the

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

190 route [28]. The impact of HS2 on mental health and wellbeing was also highlighted by the House of
191 Commons Select Committee for the High Speed Rail (West Midlands-Crewe) Bill [29]. The
192 Committee directed HS2 Ltd to commission epidemiological research on the impact of HS2 on
193 community mental health and wellbeing. This paper describes the protocol for the commissioned
194 research study, planned to take place over a 10-year period, starting in mid-2021, accounting for the
195 revisions to the plans that were announced in November 2021. This protocol will be amended if
196 further changes to the project are needed as a result of government policy decisions.

197 **Design**

198 **Aim**

199 The overarching aim of this research is to investigate the extent to which individuals and communities
200 exposed to the planning, construction and operation of HS2 experience positive or negative mental
201 health and wellbeing impacts, focused specifically on anxiety, depression, and general wellbeing. It
202 will address the following research questions:

- 203 1. What are the positive and negative mental health and wellbeing impacts of HS2?
- 204 2. Do these impacts change over time and what explains them?
- 205 3. Are impacts felt differently across groups within a community?
- 206 4. What are the health economic implications of the mental health and wellbeing impacts of
207 HS2?

208 Due to changes to the HS2 development plan, particularly regarding the Phase 2b East route, the
209 scope of the project was changed during the planning stage to encompass the impacts that may occur
210 when changes are made late in the planning stage. This means that the geographical scope of the study
211 is based on the planned HS2 route as of June 2021 i.e. all parts of the Phase 2a and Phase 2b route
212 shown in **Fig 1**, even those no longer going ahead as planned.

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

213 **Overview and framework**

214 Government policy implementation is usually considered a complex intervention due to the number
215 of components involved, intervention variation over time, and the range of population subgroups
216 affected [30]. The updated Medical Research Council guidance emphasises the importance of mixed
217 methods approaches to intervention research in public health settings [30]. Consequently, for this
218 research we have designed an integrated longitudinal, mixed-methods approach, using general
219 practices as an avenue for participant recruitment and for providing a geographically defined
220 population for which aggregated data on mental health indicators are available. The core data
221 collection elements of the research study are:

- 222 • Combined longitudinal and repeated cross-sectional cohort study involving multiple waves of
223 survey data collection and data from medical records (cohort data)
- 224 • Semi-structured interviews and focus groups with residents from exposed areas and
225 community stakeholders using the same combined longitudinal and repeated cross-sectional
226 design as the cohort data (qualitative data)
- 227 • Analysis of administrative data aggregated at the practice population level (administrative
228 data)
- 229 • Health economic analysis of mental health and wellbeing impacts (health economics).

230 Three waves of data collection and analysis will be undertaken over the 10-year project. These three
231 data collection periods were originally designed to align to the planning, construction, and operation
232 phases of HS2, but this may change if the timeline for the HS2 development is altered. How these
233 data collection activities map back to the research questions is shown in **Table 1**.

234

235

236

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

237 **Table 1. Mapping of research questions to research elements.**

Research Question	Study elements that will address the research question			
	Cohort data	Qualitative data	Administrative data	Health economics
RQ1: What are the positive and negative MHW impacts of HS2?	✓	✓	✓	
RQ2: Do these impacts change over time and what explains them?	✓	✓	✓	
RQ3: Are impacts felt differently across groups within a community?	✓	✓		
RQ4: What are the health economic implications of the MHW impacts of HS2?	✓	✓	✓	✓

238

239 To ensure these elements of the research are integrated from the design stage onwards, we developed
 240 a logic model to characterise the outcomes and impacts of the HS2 development and develop a
 241 framework for all data collection components. We drew on previous transport frameworks and
 242 incorporated concepts from the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) [31–
 243 33]. The CFIR assesses implementation barriers, obstacles, enablers, and facilitators with
 244 consideration explicitly given to the context(s) of an intervention [33–36]. The logic model combines
 245 a conventional logic model with the CFIR, describing how the implementation determinants,
 246 implementation strategies and the mechanisms of action they engender, and implementation and
 247 clinical outcomes are inter-related [37]. It provides a framework for structured consideration of
 248 multiple “context-mechanism-outcome” scenarios as recommended by current guidance [30,38,39],
 249 and can be extended to consider both short- and long-term outcomes or impacts.

250 We developed an initial logic model based on reviewing the academic and grey literature and holding
 251 a workshop with people living along the HS2 route. The logic model was refined further through an
 252 internal team workshop and review and feedback from the WISH2 Public Advisory Group (PAG: see
 253 next section). The current version of the logic model is shown in **Fig 3**, mapping out activities,
 254 outputs, outcomes and impacts for the three stages of the HS2 Phase 2 development, as well as
 255 modifiers and contextual factors. It articulates, from a theoretical perspective, how HS2 may impact
 256 mental health and wellbeing. Below, we briefly explain the current model:

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

- 257 • **Outer setting:** This describes wider context within which HS2 Phase 2 is being implemented,
258 including political, economic and environmental situations and challenges. These include
259 major societal events, such as COVID-19.
- 260 • **Inner setting:** This relates to the local area or neighbourhood. It covers high-level
261 descriptions of a region including geographical characteristics, services, and the local
262 economy, and communications between HS2 Ltd and individuals and communities.
- 263 • **Individual domain:** This defines and describes the people involved in decision-making and
264 implementation of HS2 Phase 2, as well as the deliverers and recipients of it.
- 265 • **Process:** This covers the activities, outputs and outcomes required to deliver the HS2 Phase 2
266 development. The process of implementing HS2 spans three stages - planning or changes to
267 plans, construction, and operation – each of which may affect mental health and wellbeing via
268 different mechanisms. This central section of the diagram can be read from top-to-bottom
269 (moving through the stages of the development) and left-to-right (moving through activities,
270 outputs and outcomes for each development stage).
- 271 • **Modifiers:** *Intrinsic and extrinsic modifiers* influence the extent to which outcomes lead to
272 impacts. These may relate to an individual’s demographic or psychological characteristics and
273 traits (intrinsic modifier(s)) or the profile of the local area an individual lives in (extrinsic
274 modifier(s)). *Intervention modifiers* relate to the ways in which HS2 is implemented as this
275 may affect the extent to which HS2 activities impact mental health and wellbeing.
- 276 • **Impacts:** This domain encompasses potential impacts related to mental health and wellbeing
277 at the individual and at the community level. The constructs included are distinct but
278 overlapping and inter-related. There is an anticipated secondary impact of lowered mental
279 health or wellbeing on health and mental health service utilisation.

280 Domains interact with each other, particularly the inner and outer settings. The model does not specify
281 the route of activities through to impacts but this will be developed through the research.

282

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

283 **Fig 3. Logic model for HS2 development.**

284

285 This version of the logic model was used as a framework for the development of the cohort survey,
286 interview and focus group guides for the qualitative research, and the selection of outcomes for the
287 administrative data research for the first wave of the study. Once data are collected, we will use the
288 logic model and underlying CFIR constructs to guide analysis and interpretation. In turn, these
289 findings will be used to update the logic model. We anticipate that as the HS2 development
290 progresses, we will need to develop a separate logic model for the sections of the route that are no
291 longer proceeding as planned due to divergence in relevant activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts.

292 **Public involvement**

293 Public involvement is a key part of this study. The research team includes a patient and public
294 involvement Lead who lives on the route of HS1 (Jennifer Bostock) as well as a lay advisor who lives
295 near the HS2 Phase 1 route. The public and patient involvement Lead and lay advisor have convened
296 a Public Advisory Group with six representatives from the general public, including from local
297 communities near the HS2 route. The members are diverse in age, socio-economic status and health
298 and disability status. All members are independent of both the project team and have no links to the
299 transport industry or government. However, some have direct exposure to the construction route. The
300 Public Advisory Group (Lead, lay advisor, and six representatives) is involved in study design,
301 analysis and interpretation and dissemination. The Public Advisory Group meetings are planned for
302 approximately every six months of the study, although meetings may occur more frequently if needed
303 to support the research. This group has already significantly contributed to the design of the study. For
304 example, the group has reviewed draft data collection instruments, consent forms and participant
305 information sheets, providing feedback on how to improve these, particularly the information
306 conveyed and its readability. The Public Advisory Group will advise on and review any changes made
307 to research tools in future study waves. In order to maximise the impact of the study the Public
308 Advisory Group will aid creative dissemination methods and has already been pivotal in the
309 representations of the study on the project website.

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

310 **Methods**

311 **Participants and setting**

312 This research involves three groups of participants:

- 313 1. Members of the general population, aged 18 and over and registered with a general practice in
314 England;
- 315 2. Clinical staff from general practices (General Medical Practitioners (GPs) and Nursing staff);
- 316 3. Representatives of community organisations including local government, public health
317 representatives, charities and other support groups, business groups, environmental
318 organisations, and transport organisations.

319 Participants in group 1 and group 2 will be recruited via general practices, with clinical staff only
320 recruited from practices that are considered “exposed” to the HS2 development (see next section).

321 Participants in group 3 will be drawn from local organisations based in, or that serve the population
322 of, areas in close geographic proximity to the HS2 development. Where necessary to gain a
323 comprehensive understanding of potential impact, organisations with a regional or national
324 perspective will be recruited.

325 **Exposure definition**

326 For complex, geographically-defined interventions, identifying regions exposed to the intervention
327 and measuring the starting point and degree of exposure are not straightforward; exposure definition
328 is an area of ongoing research. For this research, we use postcodes to determine the geographical
329 proximity of the residential address of individual participants and of general practices to the HS2
330 development. Individuals are defined as “exposed” to HS2 if their postcode of residence is within
331 5km of the HS2 Phase 2 route. General practices are defined as “exposed” to HS2 if their postcode is
332 within 5km of the HS2 Phase 2 route *and* at least 50% of the population within the practice catchment
333 live 5km or less from the HS2 route. This geographical area is substantially larger than the area
334 eligible for the HS2 homeowner compensation scheme (<1km from the route) [40], but was chosen to

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

335 ensure capture of broader impacts such as changes to greenspace or road infrastructure. Unexposed
336 general practices are those with a postcode more than 5km away from the entire HS2 route (including
337 Phase 1) *and* with no-one within their catchment living 5km or less from the HS2 route (i.e. no
338 patients who would be considered “exposed” to any part of HS2). Unexposed participants are
339 recruited from these unexposed practices. General practices not meeting “exposed” or “unexposed”
340 definitions were excluded (e.g. any practices with a postcode within 5km of HS2 Phase 2 but with less
341 than 50% of patients meeting the exposure criteria are excluded, or practices with a postcode more
342 than 5km away from the route but with any patients on the practice list living 5km or less from the
343 route).

344 **Outcomes**

345 The outcomes for the data collection elements of this research have been selected to support
346 integration of findings from the different data sources. Integration is supported in two main ways:
347 first, where possible, mental health indicators measured in the cohort surveys and medical record data
348 reflect those available in national administrative data aggregated at the general practice level. Second,
349 findings from earlier data collection activities will directly inform subsequent activities. This will
350 occur within each of the three planned data collection waves, with preliminary results from the survey
351 potentially informing changes to data collection instruments for the qualitative research. It will also
352 occur across data collection waves, as data collection instruments for the second and third waves of
353 the study will be directly informed by the findings from previous waves.

354 **Cohort data**

355 The primary outcome will be mental wellbeing as measured by the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental
356 Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS). The WEMWBS scoring range is 14-70. As it approximates a normal
357 distribution it is designed to be analysed using parametric approaches. The minimally important level
358 of change is between 3 and 8 points [41,42]. We will analyse the following secondary mental health
359 outcomes, most of which will also be included in the analysis of administrative data:

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

- 360 • Anxiety and depression incidence. This will be measured via a review of general practice
361 notes using the general practice Quality and Outcomes Framework (QOF;
362 [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-tools-and-services/data-services/general-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-tools-and-services/data-services/general-practice-data-hub/quality-outcomes-framework-qof)
363 [practice-data-hub/quality-outcomes-framework-qof](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-tools-and-services/data-services/general-practice-data-hub/quality-outcomes-framework-qof)) Systematized Nomenclature of Medicine
364 (SNOMED) Clinical Terms codelists;
- 365 • Use of community-provided psychological therapy services. This will be measured using data
366 from the Improving Access to Psychological Therapies national data set (IAPT;
367 [https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-collections-and-data-sets/data-](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-collections-and-data-sets/data-sets/improving-access-to-psychological-therapies-data-set)
368 [sets/improving-access-to-psychological-therapies-data-set](https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/data-collections-and-data-sets/data-sets/improving-access-to-psychological-therapies-data-set));
- 369 • Prescribing of antidepressants and anxiolytics. This will be via review of general practice
370 prescribing records;
- 371 • Prevalence of long-term mental health problems. This will be measured via a question from
372 the GP Practice Survey (GPPS; <https://gp-patient.co.uk/>) that will be included in the study
373 survey.
- 374 Other potential secondary outcomes include alcohol use, and social support (measured via survey
375 questions). We will also collect health and social care service utilisation data (primary and secondary
376 care, personal social services, medications) for the health economic analysis.

377 **Qualitative data**

378 While qualitative research does not define “outcomes” in the same way as quantitative research, the
379 topics included in the guides for the interviews and focus groups are informed by the logic model
380 framework (see Design section), the outcomes used in the cohort and administrative data research,
381 and findings from the survey. In addition to standard focus group and interview approaches we will
382 use an adapted version of the Most Significant Change technique [43,44] to collect stories of change
383 to answer RQ2. This technique is well suited to interventions where anticipating all changes in
384 advance is difficult. The method involves defining domains of change (e.g. quality of life, mental
385 health, wellbeing), collecting significant stories of change and selecting the most significant of these.

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

386 **Administrative data**

387 Mental health will be indexed via four related measures:

- 388 • Prevalence of self-reported long term mental health problem (GPPS)
- 389 • Incidence of new depression diagnoses in people age 18+ (QOF)
- 390 • Prevalence of depression in the GP practice population in people age 18+ (QOF)
- 391 • Rate (per 1,000 people in the practice population per month) of antidepressant medication
392 prescriptions (from OpenPrescribing; <https://openprescribing.net/>)

393 The main outcome will be prevalence of long-term mental health conditions from GPPS. This
394 measure has the advantage of capturing mental health conditions even if a diagnosis has not been
395 entered in the primary care record (e.g. because of self-referred to IAPT). These data are available at
396 least yearly (although during the COVID-19 pandemic recording of some data, particularly QOF, was
397 suspended).

398 **Sampling and eligibility**

399 We will use a nested sampling design, recruiting general practices and then recruiting participants
400 from those practice populations. A review of GP patient lists by the Office for National Statistics
401 found them to be a reliable population register [45], making this sampling approach broadly
402 equivalent to a traditional address-based sampling approach.

403 To define “exposed” and “unexposed” general practices we will use geocoded practice postcodes and
404 practice boundary files to identify practices with addresses within 5km of the route of HS2, and
405 practices with boundaries wholly outside 5km of the proposed route. We will also calculate the
406 percentage of each practice population living within 5km of the route of HS2 using the mid-2020
407 population estimates for Lower layer Super Output Areas (a administratively-defined geographical
408 area consisting of between 400 and 1,200 households; equivalent to a resident population of 1,000 to
409 3,000 people) [46]. We will exclude practices with less than 750 registered patients to ensure it is
410 feasible to recruit sufficient participants; this is in line with the criteria the Office for Health
411 Improvement & Disparities applies to determine whether practices are included in public health

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

412 surveillance data sets (<https://fingertips.phe.org.uk/profile/general-practice>; accessed 17/06/2022). We
413 will also apply an additional criterion for the “unexposed” practices by aiming to recruit those with
414 similar practice population profiles to the “exposed” practices. For each “exposed” practice we will
415 identify a set of “unexposed” practices with similar practice population characteristics using
416 propensity score matching and aim recruit one of the sets to the study. Within “exposed” or
417 “unexposed” practices, adult patients (aged 18 and over) whose registered residential address falls
418 within the “exposed” or “unexposed” geographical regions, respectively, will be eligible for
419 participation in the cohort data collection.

420 For the qualitative data collection, GP clinical staff will be recruited from “exposed” practices
421 participating in the study. Other community stakeholders will be identified based on the geographical
422 area served by their organisation and/or its physical proximity to the HS2 route. Local residents will
423 be drawn from cohort participants. The survey data will be used to implement a maximum variation
424 sampling approach to select a diverse set of participants. This approach is suggested for mixed-
425 methods studies where breadth of sampling will complement a quantitative analysis [47]. We will
426 ensure participant diversity on factors including gender, age, ethnicity, employment, education,
427 general practice, distance of their residence from HS2 route, and mental health status.

428 For the cohort surveys and the qualitative research with local residents, we will aim to engage with
429 the same participants at each of the three planned waves of data collection. However, as this will
430 occur over a 10-year period, we anticipate that there will be loss to follow-up. To mitigate this, we
431 will used a combined longitudinal and repeated cross-sectional approach, which has been used in
432 long-term studies of infrastructure project health impacts to manage participant attrition [48]. This
433 approach is illustrated for two waves in Fig 4. Wave 1 participants will initially be directly invited to
434 participate at subsequent waves, but we will recruit new participants from GP practices to make up for
435 any reduction in cohort size over time.

436

437 **Figure 4. Overview of sampling approach, simplified to illustrate case/control matching of**
438 **general practice (GP) and patient (P) recruitment for a single exposed practice over two waves**

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

439 **of data collection.** White circles indicate drop-out at wave 2; squares indicates new patients recruited
440 at wave 2.

441

442 **Sample size**

443 **Cohort data**

444 We aim to survey 6,000 people per wave in four groups (Table 2). General practices through which
445 potential participants will be contacted will be recruited via the National Institute of Health and Care
446 Research Clinical Research Network (CRN).

447 **Table 2 Number of GP practices and participants to be recruited per HS2 route segment and by**
448 **exposure status.**

Route segment		Number of general practices	Number of participants per practice (minimum)	Total number of participants
Phase 2a	Exposed	12	100	1,200
	Unexposed	12	100	1,200
Phase 2b West	Exposed	6	100	600
	Unexposed	6	100	600
Phase 2b East	Exposed	6	100	600
	Unexposed	6	100	600
Phase 2b amended route	Exposed	6	100	600
	Unexposed	6	100	600
Grand total		60	-	6,000

449

450 Inclusion criteria are: participants must be age 18 or older and, for “exposed” participants, have a
451 registered address within 5km of the HS2 route. We will ask general practices to exclude patients who
452 are resident in a care home, terminally ill or receiving palliative care, and practices will also have the
453 discretion to exclude patients for other reasons (e.g. because they have requested not to be contacted
454 about anything not directly related to their care, or because they do not have capacity to consent).

455 **Qualitative data**

456 For local residents we will conduct eight focus groups per data collection wave, two from each part of
457 the Phase 2 route (Phase 2a Phase 2b West, Phase 2b East, and the section of Phase 2b East that is not
458 proceeding as originally planned), offering one virtual and one in-person focus group to participants
459 from each route section. Each focus group will include a maximum of 10 participants. We will also

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

460 conduct 3-4 interviews for each route segment. We will conduct up to 53 interviews per data
461 collection wave with clinical staff from participating exposed GP practices and community
462 stakeholder representatives. These sample sizes have been determined in collaboration with the funder
463 and should be sufficient to reach thematic saturation.

464 **Administrative data**

465 We will include all general practices in England that have at least 750 registered patients for at least
466 one year during the study period, including those that were active from 2013 onwards. This will result
467 in a total sample of approximately 8,000 practices (in 2013), about 1,000 of which meet the criteria
468 for being “exposed” to the HS2 development. These numbers are approximate because the exact
469 number of practices changes each year as practices close down or merge with others, and new
470 practices open.

471 **Data collection**

472 **Cohort data**

473 Potential participants will be contacted via their general practices using a secure mailing service that
474 is commonly used by practices for mailouts. This approach ensures that the research team will not
475 have access to any personal identifying information before individuals have consented to participate
476 in the study. Potential participants will receive a cover letter, participant information sheet, consent
477 form, refusal slip, paper survey booklet, and pre-paid reply envelope in the post. Participants will have
478 the option to complete the refusal slip or consent form and survey using the paper forms or using an
479 online platform (Qualtrics). If preferred, participants will be able to schedule a telephone interview
480 with the research team in which they will go through the survey over the telephone and the staff
481 member enters their responses into the online survey for them. Recruitment for each practice will be
482 open for at least two months, therefore participants have this length of time to decide whether they
483 would like to participate. If required due to low participation rates, one reminder will be sent via text
484 message containing a greeting, a personalised link to the survey.

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

485 Survey questions for wave 1 have been selected to reflect the outcomes and potential explanatory
486 factors highlighted in the WISH2 logic model. Where possible, we have used questions from national
487 surveys as this will enable us to compare our data with national estimates. An overview of the topics
488 to be covered and question sources is provided in Table 3.

489 *Table 3 Overview of topics covered in the WISH2 survey and sources of questions used*

Area	Topics covered	Question sources
Impact of HS2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of HS2 development • Perspectives on individual and community impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WISH2 team – developed in collaboration with the PAG
Health, wellbeing and healthcare use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mental wellbeing • Physical and mental health conditions • Health and social care service use • Sleep quality • Alcohol use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS) [49] • EuroQol-5D [50] • General Practice Patient Survey [51] • Social and Community Opportunities Profile [13,17,18] • National Health Sleep Awareness Project [52] • Alcohol Use Disorders Test [53]
Community and social inclusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social networks • Financial wellbeing and employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social and Community Opportunities Profile [13,17,18]
Socio-demographic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment • Caring responsibilities • Transport use • Ethnicity • Household size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding Society [54] • Social and Community Opportunities Profile [13,17,18] • NatCen National Transport Survey [55] • General Practice Patient Survey [51] <p>Note: Age, gender, and address will be available from GP records so have not been included here to reduce participant burden.</p>

490
491 Consent for access to medical record data (practice data and IAPT data) will be sought from
492 participants at baseline, as well as consent to re-contact for study updates and follow-up. Participants
493 will also be asked to indicate whether they would be willing to participate in interviews or focus
494 groups as part of the study.

495 **Qualitative data**

496 Participants selected from the study cohort will be invited to participate in a focus group or interview
497 via telephone, email, or post (for survey participants, based on indicated communication preferences
498 in their survey consent form). Other potential participants (clinical staff and community stakeholders)

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

499 will be invited by email or telephone. Participants will receive an information sheet and consent form
500 in advance and a list of dates and local venues (for focus groups) or tailored arrangements (for
501 interviews). Each focus group will take up to 120 minutes and interviews up to 60 minutes. In
502 addition to standard focus group and interview approaches, we will use an adapted version of the
503 Most Significant Change technique [43,44]. Focus groups and interviews will be used to collect
504 stories of change. Stories may be recorded with participants' consent and transcribed verbatim.
505 Recordings will be deleted once transcripts have been finalised. a combination of direct (interviewee's
506 experience) and indirect (interviewee relating stories of others' experiences).

507 **Administrative data**

508 Area-level administrative data for general practices will be matched via postcodes within a
509 geographical area defined by the practice catchment using publicly available mapping files [56].
510 These mapping files are updated regularly by practices, which will enable us to account for changes in
511 practice catchments over time (e.g. due to practices merging or a change in catchment population). All
512 data required are drawn from publicly available sources.

513 We will use the same sampling approach as described above, but all potential "exposed" and
514 "unexposed" practices will be included, and not just those that are recruiting survey participants. For
515 our initial analyses, general practices in the area of the route that is not proceeding as planned will not
516 be treated separately as the data we are using in the first wave pre-dates the cancellation
517 announcement for the first wave. For subsequent waves, we will treat the general practices from these
518 regions separately from those in areas where the HS2 route is proceeding as planned. We will include
519 a sample of general practices from other areas of England as a second "control" group.

520 **Analysis plans**

521 We will pre-register an analysis protocol for each wave of data collection, for each data source (cohort
522 surveys, interviews and focus groups, and administrative data) on the Open Science Framework
523 (DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/HQGDT).

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

524 **Cohort data**

525 To examine the impact of HS2 on outcomes over time, we will use difference-in-differences (DiD)
526 analysis [57]. This quasi-experimental design compares outcomes between groups over time to assess
527 the impact of a policy or environmental intervention. It is an established approach for analysing data
528 from natural experiments where exposure to the intervention is outside control of the researcher, as is
529 the case with the HS2 development [58,59]. The main impact analysis will be conducted separately
530 for Phase 2a, Phase 2b, and the part of the route not proceeding as planned. We will estimate the
531 overall intervention effect and investigate the differences across key subgroups, such as age or
532 housing status, via exploratory subgroup analyses. We will use appropriate univariable and
533 multivariable models, depending on the outcome, and will adjust for baseline characteristics and
534 sampling.

535 We will explore the impact of exposure in two different ways: area-based and individually computed
536 distance [60]. Our primary analyses will use the area-based definition to enable comparison between
537 individuals living in unexposed areas and individuals living in the exposed areas, which will
538 necessarily treat all individuals as equally exposed. However, as proximity to the HS2 route is likely
539 to be an important factor for mental health and wellbeing outcomes, for our secondary analyses we
540 will focus on those living in exposed areas and define exposure using individually computed distance
541 from the route i.e. creating a gradient of exposure.

542 We considered the sample sizes needed for 90% power based on a 0.05 significance level for a two-
543 sided test. All calculations were conducted using Stata version 15.0. We examined this for our three
544 main analytical approaches:

545 **1. Cross-sectional (within-wave) primary outcome analyses:** Data from 2011 estimated the mean
546 WEMWBS for adults in England as 51.6 (standard deviation 8.7) [61,62]. Based on this, a sample
547 size of 178 per group (356 in total for each HS2 Phase) is required to detect a minimally important
548 difference of 3 points in the WEMWBS between intervention (n=178) and control (n=178) groups.
549 Our target sample sizes far exceed this.

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

550 2. **Longitudinal (across-wave) primary outcome analyses:** The DiD approach used for the main
551 analysis is a test of an interaction, rather than the test of main effect (simple difference in means);
552 sample size requirements for tests of interactions are four times those required to test a main effect
553 of the same size [63]. Therefore, 356 responses would be needed from both intervention and
554 control cohorts at each of two time points for the same power from this analysis framework. As the
555 recruitment target is 1,200 participants per group per HS2 Phase (n = 4,800 in total), and 600
556 participants per group for the part of the route not proceeding as planned (1,200 in total) the study
557 will be well-powered to detect a meaningful difference in the primary outcome using a DiD
558 framework, and separate analyses for Phases 2a and 2b will be feasible.

559 3. **Longitudinal subgroup analyses:** Differential impacts of HS2 on particular groups in the
560 population will be approached analytically as a “triple difference” (difference in difference in
561 difference) analysis (a three-way interaction). It would require a further fourfold increase in
562 sample size for a differential impact of the same size as the main effect meaning an overall sample
563 size of 5,696 would be required (or possibly greater if the groups being compared are not of equal
564 size). Using all three waves of data collection or combining both Phase 2a and Phase 2b sites we
565 would achieve this sample size. However, we will not have sufficient power to undertake subgroup
566 analyses for the section of the route which is not proceeding as planned.

567 **Qualitative data**

568 Interview and focus group transcripts will be analysed using MAXQDA. A coding framework
569 developed from the topic guides and WISH2 framework will be used to systematically and
570 deductively code and analyse data. The framework will allow flexibility to capture issues from the
571 data and from the project over time and provide a basis for mapping the evidence from qualitative
572 data analysis against research questions.

573 To interrogate and interpret the qualitative data from focus groups and interviews we will use
574 thematic analysis. Data from local residents and stakeholders will be analysed separately, so we can
575 explore similarities and differences between the two groups. Thematic analysis categorises data and
576 then examines the relationships and meanings in the categories to identify themes [64,65]. We will

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

577 conduct a cross-sectional analysis of focus groups and interview transcripts to examine the data across
578 each data set, and the thematic analysis to generate and explore themes or patterns of meaning within
579 these two data sets. This will: (i) enable understanding of what transcripts contain; and (ii) identify
580 recurring themes. We will identify recurring themes that reflect specific patterns or meaning found in
581 the data and categorise these by applying codes to portions of data. These codes will describe a range
582 of factors, attitudes, behaviours, allowing us to explore in more detail if and how HS2 affected
583 people's health and wellbeing and what factors and strategies could facilitate the process of adapting
584 to change [66].

585 To select the stories for the Most Significant Change analysis, the researchers will read all the stories
586 elicited from interviews, organise them by theme and select 10 that represent different themes and
587 include impacts at the planning, construction, and operation stages, if available. For each of these
588 stories, an anonymous summary will be written that is no longer than a page in length. A workshop
589 will be held with Public Advisory Group members, with facilitation from the research team, to discuss
590 the stories and between them select the three that they feel represent the most significant changes to
591 mental health and wellbeing and/or the process of adapting to change.

592 **Administrative data**

593 The main analysis will use a multivariable regression framework, which will compare exposed and
594 unexposed practice populations and look at the difference in differences over time in the four
595 administrative mental health outcomes. For the outcomes that are proportions or counts, we will
596 disaggregate the practice level measures and use a person level modelling framework (with practice
597 level covariates). Models used will depend on the characteristics of the outcome variables, but we
598 anticipate using mixed or fixed linear, logistic and Poisson models.

599 We will adjust for age, gender, calendar month and index of multiple deprivation an aggregate
600 measure of the degree to which people living in a particular area of the UK have the income, health,
601 education, housing or other resources required to meet their needs
602 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019>). We will additionally

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

603 adjust for pre- and post-intervention trends in the outcomes to explore whether these are differential
604 among exposed and unexposed practices. We will weight the contribution of exposed practices based
605 on the percentage of the practice population that live within 5km of the proposed route. Where
606 appropriate, we will assess the parallel trend assumption of the difference-in-difference approach
607 through visual inspection of plots for each outcome. We will evaluate it analytically by conducting
608 sensitivity analyses using the Omitted Variable Framework by Cinelli & Hazlett for regression models
609 and extended by Landon & Zimmerman for DiD analyses [67,68].

610 **Health economic analysis**

611 **Change in costs of health and social care use**

612 In the cohort survey, we will collect participant-level data on health and social care service utilisation
613 (primary and secondary care, personal social services, medications) during the previous three months
614 and analyse this using a difference-in-difference approach. For the economic analysis we will apply
615 unit costs to these utilisation measures from published sources [69–71], and repeat the difference-in-
616 difference approach. This will give the participant-level change in costs of health and care service use
617 over the previous three-month period associated with each wave of the HS2 development (including,
618 separately, the Phase 2b sections not proceeding as planned).

619 We will repeat these analyses for population subgroups (e.g. based on combinations of socioeconomic
620 status, age, gender and urban/rural status). Selection of specific groups will be informed by the cohort
621 surveys and interview and focus group results. The participant-level change in costs for each subgroup
622 will then be extrapolated pro rata to the actual duration of each wave of the development, and the
623 analysis will be repeated for each wave of the development separately for Phase 2a and 2b. This will
624 result in a dataset of changes in health and social care costs per person for each wave of the HS2
625 development that varies by population subgroup. We will then multiply these cost changes by the
626 number of people in each population subgroup potentially affected by different phases of the HS2
627 development based on Office for National Statistics and National Health data, as defined according to
628 our sampling strategy for the cohort surveys, to compute the total change in health and social care
629 costs at the population level associated with the HS2 development by phase and wave. This will

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

630 require data on the total number of people in each subgroup living within 5km of the route, which will
631 be obtained from the sources used for the administrative data analysis. We will undertake extensive,
632 deterministic sensitivity analyses around our central estimates of these potential impacts, varying the
633 difference-in-differences, unit costs, durations and population sizes.

634 **Monetised impacts on quality of life**

635 In the survey, we will collect participant-level data on health related quality of life using EQ-5D-5L
636 [72]. We will use the EQ-5D-5L data to compute utility scores for each participant using the
637 Crosswalk Index Value Calculator [73]. We will repeat the difference-in-difference approach
638 described for the survey data using EQ-5D-5L utility scores as the outcome, which will give the
639 participant-level change in utility scores associated with each wave of the HS2 development.

640 As above, we will repeat this analysis for population subgroups. The participant-level change in utility
641 scores for each subgroup will then be extrapolated pro rata to the actual duration of each wave of the
642 development to compute the change in quality-adjusted life years (QALYs), resulting in a dataset of
643 QALY changes per person for each wave of the HS2 development that varies by population subgroup.
644 We will then multiply these changes by the number of people in each population subgroup potentially
645 affected by different phases the HS2 development (as above) to compute the total QALY changes at
646 the population level, by phase and wave. These values will be monetised by multiplying the total
647 QALY changes by the prevailing values for a QALY, which currently range from £15,000 per QALY
648 on the basis of the opportunity cost to the NHS to £60,000 per QALY on the basis of willingness-to-
649 pay [74–76]. These will also be subject to extensive sensitivity analyses, varying the DiDs, durations,
650 and population sizes as well as the QALY valuations.

651 **Triangulation of results and incorporation of stakeholder feedback**

652 The analysis integration plan for the study is informed and driven by the WISH2 framework and the
653 Pillar Integration Process developed by Johnson, Grove and Clarke [77]. The Pillar Integration
654 Process is a structured mixed methods analysis framework that guides the way in which quantitative
655 and qualitative data are integrated [77]. It enables the systematic visualisation of the analysis process

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

656 in a way that integrated findings can be traced back to their original sources, enhancing transparency
657 and replicability [77]. Value beyond what is brought by the individual methods comes from the
658 additional thinking and processing of data required to bring together and organise findings into the
659 joint display and populate the ‘pillar building’ column, thus increasing the quality of the integration
660 [77]. This process also encourages researchers to reflect on the limitations of each data source, for
661 instance, the appropriateness of the research questions and comprehensiveness of the research tools.
662 The logic model and research questions will provide a framework for the integration of findings. We
663 will create a joint display for each research question. Theoretically, joint displays are used to present
664 quantitative and qualitative data from the same ‘case’, which can mean the same participant or similar
665 themes/topics, phenomena or settings [78]. For this evaluation, data will primarily be integrated at the
666 level of themes, with labels added to the joint displays so that data organisation is aligned with the
667 WISH2 framework. We will not integrate data at a participant-level, but to support the exploration of
668 health inequalities we may produce separate joint displays that bring together data across sources
669 (survey, administrative data analyses, interviews, and focus groups) for particular groups. The
670 findings from each wave will be used to update the WISH2 framework iteratively and inform the data
671 collection tools and approaches for the next wave.

672 After wave 2 and wave 3, we will obtain feedback from local stakeholders and the WISH2 Public
673 Advisory Group, including exploration of any gaps identified. Workshop results will be included with
674 other study data in the final synthesis for each wave. Two workshops per wave (4 in total) will be held
675 with local stakeholders in areas from which participants have been recruited and will act as a forum
676 for stakeholders to provide feedback on study results prior to publication.

677 **Data management**

678 The study has been pre-registered (ISRCTN58916738; <https://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN58916738>).
679 We will pre-register analysis protocols for each WP and each wave of data collection using the Open
680 Science Framework (<https://osf.io/hqgdt>).

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

681 The paper forms used for consent and collection of quantitative interview data, and all personal
682 identifying information of participants will be securely destroyed 12 months after the completion of
683 the study, once linkage between the quantitative survey data and medical records have been
684 completed and data have been checked to ensure that no reference to the original data collection
685 instruments is necessary.

686 It is a stipulation of the funding for this project that all the data it generates are made publicly
687 available to other researchers in de-identified form. We will share de-identified versions of the data
688 from the surveys, interviews, and focus groups. In the case of the survey data this will consist of the
689 survey responses, age at survey, gender, and distance from any part of the HS2 route but not name,
690 date of birth, address or NHS number. In the case of interviews and focus groups only the anonymised
691 transcripts of these will be shared, not the recordings to preserve privacy. We will share these data
692 using the UK Data Service (<https://ukdataservice.ac.uk/>). This means only people registered and
693 approved by the UK Data Service will access to information from this study, and we will know who
694 has been given access and for what reason.

695 **Ethical considerations and declarations**

696 This study has been reviewed and approved by the East of England (Cambridgeshire and
697 Hertfordshire) Research Ethics Committee (22/EE/0292) and the Health Research Authority
698 (IRAS302856). During the data collection phase of the study, participants will be free to withdraw at
699 any time, without giving a reason. Their sensitive personal data will be destroyed and the participant
700 will not be contacted again by the research team for any future waves of data collection. Data already
701 collected as part of the study will be retained. We are aware that some of our participants may find
702 issues that arise during data collection sensitive and potentially upsetting and hence we are being
703 guided by our Public Advisory Group and our Public and Patient Involvement Lead to advise prior to
704 approvals and amendments being sought.

705 Any amendments to the study protocol related to survey, qualitative interviews, or focus groups will
706 be submitted to the Health Research Authority and Research Ethics Committee for necessary

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

707 approvals. Other significant amendments will be recorded in the ISRCTN registry entry for the study
708 (www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN58916738) and/or relevant pre-registrations and analysis plans available on
709 OSF (<https://osf.io/hqgdt>).

710 **Dissemination**

711 We are iteratively developing a dissemination strategy in collaboration with our Public Advisory
712 Group. However, we anticipate that it will include:

- 713 • Tools for disseminating results for each wave including: funder reports, academic papers and
714 conference attendance, infographic summaries, plain English leaflets, message-led policy
715 briefings, blogs and podcasts/videos.
- 716 • Public Advisory Group involvement may include co-authorship, co-presentation and bespoke
717 dissemination for targeted public audiences.
- 718 • A public website that tracks progress and provides access to these dissemination tools (this is
719 already in place and has been refined following Public Advisory Group input -
720 www.wish2.org – and will expand as the research progresses).
- 721 • Tailored dissemination approaches for different stakeholder groups using different
722 combinations of dissemination tools.
- 723 • After wave 2 and wave 3, workshops to obtain feedback from the stakeholder groups. .

724 **Publication policy**

725 Due to the large-scale nature of the project, we will publish more detailed protocols for different
726 components of the research on the Open Science Framework as it progresses (<https://osf.io/hqgdt/>). In
727 addition to this protocol paper, the research team are committed to publishing findings from each
728 wave of the study in Open Access journals.

729 **Status and timeline**

730 This study is intended to last for 10 years (June 2021 – May 2031) and encompass the planning,
731 construction, and potentially operation of HS2 Phase 2 development. The study will include three data

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

732 collection waves, each involving an approximately 18-month period of revising and implementing
733 protocols, analysis and reporting. Precise timing depends on HS2 progress, but the study approach has
734 been designed so changes to HS2 timelines can be accommodated. Research commenced in June 2021
735 and ethical approval was received in January 2023. Recruitment of GP practices started in March
736 2023 and the first survey packs were mailed to participants on the 18th of May 2023.

737 **Limitations**

738 As discussed in the Introduction, the planning stage of HS2 began in 2009/2010, while this research
739 began in 2021; this means that the study cannot capture a true “baseline” measure of mental health
740 and wellbeing in communities along the route of HS2. Our analysis of administrative data partially
741 mitigates this, but cannot provide the level of detail on mental health and wellbeing that would have
742 been captured by a survey, interviews, or focus groups.

743 Defining exposure to the HS2 development is not straightforward. While we set a 5km boundary
744 around the Phase 2 HS2 route to define our exposed group (and this is larger than the HS2
745 homeowner compensation scheme boundary), it is possible that the impact of HS2 extends beyond
746 this. To mitigate this, the interviews with local stakeholders may offer insight into the impacts of HS2
747 on a larger geographic area which can be used to inform our overall conclusions from the study. In
748 addition, it is still possible participants that we have defined as “unexposed” may be affected by HS2
749 through impacts on other aspects of their lives such as commuting or place of work. However, our
750 sampling approach is designed to minimise this risk and reduce contamination between the two
751 groups. Additionally, while we are intending to focus on Phase 2 of the HS2 development, those
752 living at the southern end of the Phase 2 route will also have had some exposure to Phase 1 of the
753 development, which is now at the construction stage. Although Phase 1 is not within the scope of this
754 research project, we will be able to try to explore this potential effect using information on the
755 geographical proximity of participants to both HS2 phases.

756 Recruiting and retaining study participants is likely to be challenging given the length of time of the
757 study. There is likely to be participant drop-out; to mitigate this, we will recruit new participants at

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

758 wave 2 and 3 to ensure we maintain a sufficient sample size general. This approach has been used in
759 long-term studies of infrastructure project health impacts to manage participant attrition [48]. Our use
760 of general practices to recruit people will mean that people who are not registered with a GP will be
761 excluded from the research, although the GP registration in England is almost universal.

762 HS2 can be an emotive topic and can trigger strong reactions in people; as participants will self-select
763 to take part in the study our sample may be skewed towards residents with stronger views and feelings
764 towards HS2, or those who have been impacted to a greater extent by HS2. During the interviews and
765 focus groups, we will ask participants about positive and negative impacts of HS2, as well as attempt
766 to establish where there has been no notable impact, to ensure we explore all possible outcomes in
767 detail.

768 Finally, as this is an evaluation of government policy, the “exposure” we are investigating is beyond
769 the control of the research team. Given the timeline for the project, and the changes that have already
770 occurred to date, it is possible that further changes will occur over the project’s intended lifetime. This
771 may ultimately preclude assessment of the operational phase of HS2 as part of this research.

772 **Discussion**

773 The need for this research study was identified by the UK House of Commons Select Committee,
774 driven by public concern regarding the impact of HS2 on mental health and wellbeing, the lack of
775 evidence on the topic, and the need for community support to mitigate any negative impacts. This will
776 be the only controlled, quasi-experimental study of the mental health and wellbeing impacts of
777 transport infrastructure from planning to completion, filling an evidence gap on HS2 and large-scale
778 infrastructure projects more broadly. The entire HS2 scheme is intended to be completed in 2035-40,
779 so the findings of this study will be directly relevant for at least 20 years. However, the study findings
780 will support development of strategies to reduce negative impacts or enhance positive mental health
781 and wellbeing impacts, which is also relevant to other infrastructure projects.

782 **Acknowledgements**

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

- 783 The research team would like to thank the WISH2 Public Advisory Group and the Study Steering
784 Committee for offering their ongoing time and support in designing and conducting the study.

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

785 **References**

- 786 1. Cheng J, Chen Z. Socioeconomic impact assessments of high-speed rail: A meta-analysis.
787 *Transp Rev.* 2022;42: 467–502. doi:10.1080/01441647.2021.1979689
- 788 2. Momenitabar M, Bridgelall R, Dehdari Ebrahimi Z, Arani M. Literature Review of
789 Socioeconomic and Environmental Impacts of High-Speed Rail in the World. *Sustainability.*
790 2021;13: 12231. doi:10.3390/su132112231
- 791 3. van Eldijk J, Gil J, Marcus L. Disentangling barrier effects of transport infrastructure:
792 synthesising research for the practice of impact assessment. *Eur Transp Res Rev.* 2022;14: 1.
793 doi:10.1186/s12544-021-00517-y
- 794 4. Lucas K, Philips I, Verlinghieri E. A mixed methods approach to the social assessment of
795 transport infrastructure projects. *Transportation.* 2022;49: 271–291. doi:10.1007/s11116-021-
796 10176-6
- 797 5. Robertson T, McCarthy A, Jegasothy E, Harris P. Urban transport infrastructure planning and
798 the public interest: a public health perspective. *Public Health Res Pract.* 2021;31.
799 doi:10.17061/phrp3122108
- 800 6. Higgsmith M, Stockton J, Anciaes P, Scholes S, Mindell JS. Community severance and health –
801 A novel approach to measuring community severance and examining its impact on the health of
802 adults in Great Britain. *J Transp Health.* 2022;25: 101368. doi:10.1016/j.jth.2022.101368
- 803 7. Almujibah H, Preston J. The total social costs of constructing and operating a high-speed rail
804 line using a case study of the riyadh-dammam corridor, Saudi Arabia. *Front Built Environ.*
805 2019;5: 1–18. doi:10.3389/fbuil.2019.00079
- 806 8. Jones P, Lucas K. The social consequences of transport decision-making: Clarifying concepts,
807 synthesising knowledge and assessing implications. *J Transp Geogr.* 2012;21: 4–16.
808 doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2012.01.012
- 809 9. Ogilvie D, Panter J, Guell C, Jones A, Mackett R, Griffin S. Health impacts of the
810 Cambridgeshire Guided Busway: a natural experimental study. *Public Health Res.* 2016;4: 1–
811 154. doi:10.3310/phr04010
- 812 10. Mackett RL, Thoreau R. Transport, social exclusion and health. *J Transp Health.* 2015;2: 610–
813 617. doi:10.1016/j.jth.2015.07.006
- 814 11. Lucas K. Transport and social exclusion: Where are we now? *Transp Policy.* 2012;20: 105–113.
815 doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2012.01.013
- 816 12. Cassarino M, Shahab S, Biscaya S. Envisioning Happy Places for All: A Systematic Review of
817 the Impact of Transformations in the Urban Environment on the Wellbeing of Vulnerable
818 Groups. *Sustainability.* 2021;13: 8086. doi:10.3390/su13148086
- 819 13. Delbosc A. The role of well-being in transport policy. *Transp Policy.* 2012;23: 25–33.
820 doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2012.06.005
- 821 14. Çelik T, Kamali S, Arayici Y. Social cost in construction projects. *Environ Impact Assess Rev.*
822 2017;64: 77–86. doi:10.1016/j.eiar.2017.03.001

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

- 823 15. Raicu S, Costescu D, Popa M, Rosca MA. Including negative externalities during transport
824 infrastructure construction in assessment of investment projects. *Eur Transp Res Rev.* 2019;11.
825 doi:10.1186/s12544-019-0361-9
- 826 16. Markovich J, Lucas K. The social and distributional impacts of transport: a literature review.
827 *Work Pap Ser Transp Stud Unit.* 2011; 1–81.
- 828 17. Khreis H, May AD, Nieuwenhuijsen MJ. Health impacts of urban transport policy measures: A
829 guidance note for practice. *J Transp Health.* 2017;6: 209–227. doi:10.1016/j.jth.2017.06.003
- 830 18. Nieuwenhuijsen MJ, Khreis H. *Integrating Human Health into Urban and Transport Planning: A*
831 *Framework.* Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing; 2019.
- 832 19. Department for Transport. *Britain’s Transport Infrastructure: High Speed Two.* London:
833 Department for Transport; 2009.
- 834 20. Department for Transport. *High speed rail.* London: Department for Transport; 2010. Report
835 No.: CM 7827.
- 836 21. House of Commons Transport Committee High Speed Rail. *Tenth Report of Session 2010–12.*
837 London: House of Commons; 2011. Report No.: HC 1185-1.
- 838 22. House of Commons High Speed Rail (West Midlands - Crewe) Bill Select Committee. *Third*
839 *Special Report of Session 2017-19.* London: House of Commons; 2019. Report No.: HC 2270.
- 840 23. High Speed Rail (London–West Midlands) Act 2017 - Parliamentary Bills - UK Parliament.
841 [cited 24 May 2023]. Available: <https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/1313>
- 842 24. High Speed Rail (West Midlands-Crewe) Act 2021 - Parliamentary Bills - UK Parliament. [cited
843 24 May 2023]. Available: <https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2046>
- 844 25. Longhorn D. Phase 2a of HS2 delayed by two years - industry reaction. In: *RailBusinessDaily*
845 [Internet]. 10 Mar 2023 [cited 28 Jul 2023]. Available:
846 <https://news.railbusinessdaily.com/phase-2a-of-hs2-delayed-by-two-years-industry-reaction/>
- 847 26. Department for Transport. *Integrated Rail Plan for the North and Midlands.* London:
848 Department for Transport; 2021.
- 849 27. High Speed Rail (Crewe - Manchester) Bill - Parliamentary Bills - UK Parliament. [cited 24
850 May 2023]. Available: <https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/3094>
- 851 28. HS2 Independent Assessor. *High Speed Rail (London - West Midlands) Bill: Summary of*
852 *Issues Raised by Comments on The Environmental Statement.* London: House of Commons;
853 2014. Report No.: 13514980570.520/A.0.
- 854 29. House of Commons High Speed Rail (West Midlands - Crewe) Bill Select Committee. *Second*
855 *Special Report of Session 2017-19.* London: House of Commons; 2018. Report No.: HC 1452.
- 856 30. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, et al. A new framework
857 for developing and evaluating complex interventions: update of Medical Research Council
858 guidance. *BMJ.* 2021;374: n2061. doi:10.1136/bmj.n2061
- 859 31. Damschroder L, Reardon CM, Widerquist MAO, Lowery JC. *The Updated Consolidated*
860 *Framework for Implementation Research: CFIR 2.0.* In Review; 2022 Apr. doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-
861 1581880/v1

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

- 862 32. Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Opra Widerquist MA, Lowery J. Conceptualizing outcomes for
863 use with the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR): the CFIR
864 Outcomes Addendum. *Implement Sci.* 2022;17: 7. doi:10.1186/s13012-021-01181-5
- 865 33. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering
866 implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated framework for
867 advancing implementation science. *Implement Sci.* 2009;4: 50. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-50
- 868 34. Waltz TJ, Powell BJ, Fernández ME, Abadie B, Damschroder LJ. Choosing implementation
869 strategies to address contextual barriers: diversity in recommendations and future directions.
870 *Implement Sci.* 2019;14: 42. doi:10.1186/s13012-019-0892-4
- 871 35. Keith RE, Crosson JC, O'Malley AS, Crompton D, Taylor EF. Using the Consolidated Framework
872 for Implementation Research (CFIR) to produce actionable findings: a rapid-cycle evaluation
873 approach to improving implementation. *Implement Sci.* 2017;12: 15. doi:10.1186/s13012-017-
874 0550-7
- 875 36. Hill JN, Locatelli SM, Bokhour BG, Fix GM, Solomon J, Mueller N, et al. Evaluating broad-
876 scale system change using the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research:
877 challenges and strategies to overcome them. *BMC Res Notes.* 2018;11: 560.
878 doi:10.1186/s13104-018-3650-9
- 879 37. Smith JD, Li DH, Rafferty MR. The Implementation Research Logic Model: a method for
880 planning, executing, reporting, and synthesizing implementation projects. *Implement Sci.*
881 2020;15: 84. doi:10.1186/s13012-020-01041-8
- 882 38. Ogilvie D, Cummins S, Petticrew M, White M, Jones A, Wheeler K. Assessing the Evaluability
883 of Complex Public Health Interventions: Five Questions for Researchers, Funders, and
884 Policymakers. *Milbank Q.* 2011;89: 206–225.
- 885 39. Craig P, Di Ruggiero E, Frohlich KL, Mykhalovskiy E, White M, on behalf of the Canadian
886 Institutes of Health Research (CIHR)–National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Context
887 Guidance Authors Group (listed alphabetically), et al. Taking account of context in population
888 health intervention research: guidance for producers, users and funders of research. 2018 Apr.
889 doi:10.3310/CIHR-NIHR-01
- 890 40. Limited HST (HS2). HS2 Homeowner payment scheme: Guidance and application form.
891 Birmingham; 2020.
- 892 41. Taggart F, Stewart-Brown S, Parkinson J. Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale
893 (WEMWBS): User guide. Coventry; 2015.
- 894 42. Maheswaran H, Weich S, Powell J, Stewart-Brown S. Evaluating the responsiveness of the
895 Warwick Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS): Group and individual level
896 analysis. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2012;10: 156.
- 897 43. Davies R. An evolutionary approach to facilitating organisational learning: an experiment by the
898 Christian Commission for Development in Bangladesh. *Impact Assess Proj Apprais.* 1998;16:
899 243–250. doi:10.1080/14615517.1998.10590213
- 900 44. Dart J, Davies R. A dialogical, story-based evaluation tool: The Most Significant Change
901 technique. *Am J Eval.* 2003;24: 137–155. doi:10.1016/S1098-2140(03)00024-9
- 902 45. Office for National Statistics. Patient Register: quality assurance of administrative data used in
903 population statistics, Dec 2016. London; 2016.

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

- 904 46. Office for National Statistics. Census 2021 geographies - Office for National Statistics. In:
905 Census 2021 geographies [Internet]. 10 May 2023 [cited 5 Oct 2023]. Available:
906 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/methodology/geography/ukgeographies/censusgeographies/census2021>
907 geographies
- 908 47. Palinkas LA, Horwitz SM, Green CA, Wisdom JP, Duan N, Hoagwood K. Purposeful Sampling
909 for Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis in Mixed Method Implementation Research. *Adm*
910 *Policy Ment Health*. 2015;42: 533–544. doi:10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y
- 911 48. Foley L, Prins R, Crawford F, Humphreys D, Mitchell R, Sahlqvist S, et al. Effects of living
912 near an urban motorway on the wellbeing of local residents in deprived areas: Natural
913 experimental study. *PLoS ONE*. 2017;12: 1–16. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0174882
- 914 49. Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, Platt S, Joseph S, Weich S, et al. The Warwick-Edinburgh
915 mental well-being scale (WEMWBS): Development and UK validation. *Health Qual Life*
916 *Outcomes*. 2007;5: 1–13. doi:10.1186/1477-7525-5-63
- 917 50. Mulhern B, Mukuria C, Barkham M, Knapp M, Byford S, Soeteman D, et al. Using generic
918 preference-based measures in mental health: psychometric validity of the EQ-5D and SF-6D.
919 2020. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.112.122283
- 920 51. Campbell J, Smith P, Nissen S, Bower P, Elliott M, Roland M. The GP patient survey for use in
921 primary care in the national health service in the UK- development and psychometric
922 characteristics. *BMC Fam Pract*. 2009;10: 1–8. doi:10.1186/1471-2296-10-57
- 923 52. Jung Y, Junna MR, Mandrekar JN, Morgenthaler TI. The National Healthy Sleep Awareness
924 Project Sleep Health Surveillance Questionnaire as an Obstructive Sleep Apnea Surveillance
925 Tool. *J Clin Sleep Med JCSM Off Publ Am Acad Sleep Med*. 2017;13: 1067–1074.
926 doi:10.5664/jcsm.6724
- 927 53. Bush Kristen, Kivlahan DR, McDonell MB, Fihn SD, Bradley KA, for the Ambulatory Care
928 Quality Improvement Project (ACQUIP). The AUDIT alcohol consumption questions (AUDIT-
929 C). *Arch Intern Med*. 1998;158: 1789–1795. doi:10.1097/0000374-199811000-00034
- 930 54. University of Essex, Institute for Social and Economic Research, NatCen Social Research,
931 Kantar Public. *Understanding Society: Waves 1-10, 2009-2019*. UK Data Service; 2020.
- 932 55. Cornick P, Keyes A, Swannell B, Templeton I, Woolfe E, Yarde J. National Travel Survey
933 2020. 2020; 303.
- 934 56. NHS England Primary Care Commissioning. GP Practice Submitted Inner Catchment Area
935 KML Files. Available: [https://data.england.nhs.uk/dataset/gp-practice-submitted-inner-](https://data.england.nhs.uk/dataset/gp-practice-submitted-inner-catchment-area-kml-file)
936 [catchment-area-kml-file](https://data.england.nhs.uk/dataset/gp-practice-submitted-inner-catchment-area-kml-file)
- 937 57. Wing C, Simon K, Bello-Gomez RA. Designing Difference in Difference Studies: Best
938 Practices for Public Health Policy Research. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2018;39: 453–469.
939 doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040617-013507
- 940 58. Craig P, Cooper C, Gunnell D, Haw S, Lawson K, Macintyre S, et al. Using natural experiments
941 to evaluate population health interventions: New medical research council guidance. *J*
942 *Epidemiol Community Health*. 2012;66: 1182–1186. doi:10.1136/jech-2011-200375
- 943 59. Ogilvie D, Adams J, Bauman A, Gregg EW, Panter J, Siegel KR, et al. Using natural
944 experimental studies to guide public health action: Turning the evidence-based medicine

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

- 945 paradigm on its head. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2019; 203–208. doi:10.1136/jech-2019-
946 213085
- 947 60. Humphreys DK, Panter J, Sahlqvist S, Goodman A, Ogilvie D. Changing the environment to
948 improve population health: A framework for considering exposure in natural experimental
949 studies. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2016;70: 941–946. doi:10.1136/jech-2015-206381
- 950 61. The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale (WEMWBS). [cited 29 Nov 2023]. Available:
951 <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/sci/med/research/platform/wemwbs>
- 952 62. Joint Health Surveys Unit. Health Survey for England 2011: Health, social care and lifestyles.
953 London: Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London;
954 Available: [https://files.digital.nhs.uk/publicationimport/pub09xxx/pub09300/hse2011-sum-
955 bklet.pdf](https://files.digital.nhs.uk/publicationimport/pub09xxx/pub09300/hse2011-sum-bklet.pdf)
- 956 63. Khoury MJ, Flanders WD. Nontraditional Epidemiologic Approaches in the Analysis of Gene-
957 Environment Interaction: Case-Control Studies with No Controls! *Am J Epidemiol*. 1996.
- 958 64. Crowe M, Inder M, Porter R. Conducting qualitative research in mental health: Thematic and
959 content analyses. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2015;49: 616–623. doi:10.1177/0004867415582053
- 960 65. Braun V, Clarke V. What can “thematic analysis” offer health and wellbeing researchers? *Int J*
961 *Qual Stud Health Well-Being*. 2014;9: 26152. doi:10.3402/qhw.v9.26152
- 962 66. Guest G, MacQueen KM, Namey EE. *Applied Thematic Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE;
963 2011.
- 964 67. Gibson L, Zimmerman F. Measuring the sensitivity of difference-in-difference estimates to the
965 parallel trends assumption. *Res Methods Med Health Sci*. 2021;2: 148–156.
966 doi:10.1177/263208432111061306
- 967 68. Cinelli C, Hazlett C. Making sense of sensitivity: extending omitted variable bias. *J R Stat Soc*
968 *Ser B Stat Methodol*. 2020;82: 39–67. doi:10.1111/rssb.12348
- 969 69. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *British National Formulary*. [cited 1 Dec
970 2020]. Available: <https://bnf.nice.org.uk/>
- 971 70. NHS England. *National Cost Collection for the NHS*. [cited 1 Dec 2020]. Available:
972 <https://www.england.nhs.uk/national-cost-collection/#ncc1819>
- 973 71. Curtis L, Burns A. *Unit Costs of Health and Social Care 2019*. Canterbury; 2019.
- 974 72. Herdman M, Gudex C, Lloyd A, Janssen MF, Kind P, Parkin D, et al. Development and
975 preliminary testing of the new five-level version of EQ-5D (EQ-5D-5L). *Qual Life Res*.
976 2011;20: 1727–1736. doi:10.1007/s11136-011-9903-x
- 977 73. EQ-5D-5L Crosswalk Index Value Calculator. 2019 [cited 1 Dec 2020]. Available:
978 [https://euroqol.org/eq-5d-instruments/eq-5d-5l-about/valuation-standard-value-sets/crosswalk-
979 index-value-calculator/](https://euroqol.org/eq-5d-instruments/eq-5d-5l-about/valuation-standard-value-sets/crosswalk-index-value-calculator/)
- 980 74. Claxton K, Martin S, Soares M, Rice N, Spackman E, Hinde S, et al. Methods for the estimation
981 of the National Institute for Health and care excellence cost-effectiveness threshold. *Health*
982 *Technol Assess*. 2015;19: 1–503. doi:10.3310/hta19140

WISH2-WP0-W1W2W3-D3

- 983 75. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Guide to the methods of technology appraisal
984 2013. London; 2013.
- 985 76. Glover D, Henderson J. Quantifying health impacts of government policies. London; 2010.
- 986 77. Johnson RE, Grove AL, Clarke A. Pillar Integration Process: A Joint Display Technique to
987 Integrate Data in Mixed Methods Research. *J Mix Methods Res.* 2019;13: 301–320.
988 doi:10.1177/1558689817743108
- 989 78. O’Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. Three techniques for integrating data in mixed methods
990 studies. *BMJ.* 2010;341: c4587. doi:10.1136/bmj.c4587
- 991

Manchester

Leeds

Crewe

Manchester
Airport

East Midlands Parkway

Birmingham
Interchange

Birmingham

Old Oak
Common

London



Phase 1



Phase 2a and Phase 2b



Phase 2b not going ahead as planned

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4