

Article type: Original Research

How and why do Quality Circles work for General Practitioners - a realist approach

Adrian Rohrbasser,¹ Geoff Wong,² Sharon Mickan,³ Janet Harris⁴

1 Institute of Primary Health Care (BIHAM), University of Bern, Switzerland

2 Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences; University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

3 Faculty of Health Sciences & Medicine, Bond University, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia

4 University of Sheffield; School of Health and Related Research (SchARR), Sheffield, UK

Disclosure of interest

The authors report no conflicts of interest. AR works as a general practitioner at Medbase Health Care Centres, a network providing primary health care services in Switzerland. As a member of the committee for quality improvement in the Swiss Society of General Internal Medicine, he supervises and trains quality circle facilitators.

GW is Deputy Chair of the United Kingdom's National Institute of Health Research Health Technology Assessment Prioritisation Committee: Integrated Community Health and Social Care Panel (A) and a member of Methods Group (A).

Funding details

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Corresponding author:

Adrian Rohrbasser, PHD

Adjunct Researcher, General Practitioner

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](#) .

Institute of Primary Health Care (BIHAM), University of Bern; Mittelstrasse 43; 3012

Bern/Switzerland; Phone: +41 31 684 58 70; adrian.rohrbasser@biham.unibe.ch

orcid.org/0000-0001-6718-6821

Contact: adrian.rohrbasser@bluewin.ch; phone: +41 79 603 65 31

Abstract wordcount	277
Manuscript word count	3898
Figures:	3
Tables:	2
Supplemental material:	11
Research checklist:	1
Ethics:	2
Participant information sheet	1
Participant consent sheet	1
Protocol of the study	1

Abstract

Objectives: To understand how and why general practitioners in quality circles (QC) reflect on and improve routine practice over time. To provide practical guidance for participants and facilitators to implement and for policy makers to organise this complex social intervention.

Design: A theory-driven mixed method

Setting: Primary health care

Method: We collected data in four stages to develop and refine the programme theory of QCs: 1) co-inquiry with Swiss and European stakeholders to develop a preliminary programme theory; 2) realist review with systematic searches in MEDLINE, Embase, PsycINFO, and CINHAL (1980-2020) to extend the preliminary programme theory; 3) programme refinement through interviews with participants, facilitators, tutors and managers of quality circles; 4) consolidation through interviews and iterative searches for theories enabling us to strengthen the programme theory.

Sources of data: The co-inquiry comprised 3 interviews and 3 focus groups with 50 European experts. From the literature search we included 108 papers to develop the literature-based programme theory. In stage 3, we used data from 40 participants gathered in 6 interviews and 2 focus groups to refine the programme theory. In stage 4, five interviewees from different health care systems consolidated our programme theory.

Result: Requirements for successful QCs are governmental trust in GPs' abilities to deliver quality improvement, training, access to educational material and performance data, protected time, and financial resources. Group dynamics strongly influence success; facilitators should ensure participants exchange knowledge and generate new concepts in a safe environment. Peer interaction promotes professional development and psychological well-being. With repetition, participants gain confidence to put their new concepts into practice.

Conclusion: QCs can improve practice, promote professional development, and psychological well-

being given adequate professional and administrative support.

Strengths and limitations of this study

- To our knowledge, this is the first published research that explains how and why general practitioners participating in quality circles may improve standard practice and their psychological well-being over time.
- The findings can be used to inform practice and policy decisions.
- The resulting theory relies on the detail and depth of the reports in the literature and the veracity and adequacy of the information participants revealed in interviews and focus groups.
- To mitigate the risk of selection bias if researchers choose underlying theories and synthesise them ad hoc, we used stakeholders' mental model and programme documentation as our framework for analysis.

Introduction

Quality circles (QCs) are made up of 6–12 health care professionals who regularly meet to reflect on and improve their standard practice. The terms Practice Based Small Group Work, Peer Review Group, Problem Based Small Group Learning, Practice Based Research Group, Quality Circle, Continuous Medical Education (CME) Group, and Continuous Professional Development (CPD) Group were used interchangeably and varied among countries. The labels suggest the basic, original intent of the group. We decided to use the umbrella term Quality Circle to describe all of them.¹ In the UK and Europe, QC are commonly used by general practitioners (GPs) for continuous professional development (CPD). The focus of discussion is usually a critical evaluation of an aspect of quality which participants themselves identify as important to them. GPs seek to improve the quality of their care by linking evidence to practice, learning to deal with uncertainty, discussing and reflecting on practice issues.² Participation in QCs can raise self-esteem create a sense of belonging and improve psychological well-being in GPs.¹ QCs may be especially helpful in crisis situations like the current Covid-19 pandemic, where working continuously under high pressure can undermine the professionalism and mental health of GPs.³

QCs can improve prescription patterns and diagnostic habits, whilst enhancing professional development and psychological well-being, but the results of randomized controlled trials are inconsistent and offer only limited behavioural explanations for these positive effects. As a complex social intervention, QCs combine didactic methods like brainstorming and reflective thinking with quality improvement (QI) techniques like audit and feedback or purposeful use of local experts. Their activities must be tailored to address local problems in primary health care (PHC) that participants want to solve.^{4,5} Our understanding of QCs is incomplete, and we need to learn more about these complex social interventions and their context-dependent outcomes and effects. This study seeks to clarify the contexts in which QCs are conducted, when they change GP behaviour and improve psychological well-being and why. We intended to develop a programme theory for QCs that explains

how and why they work, with the aim of creating a common language and understanding,^{6 7} to engage stakeholders in discussions about improving QC processes in a participatory way and prepare the ground for further empirical testing.^{8 9} Our end goal was to develop an initial set of policy recommendations for setting up optimal QC processes and maintaining them.¹⁰⁻¹²

Methods

A project protocol was registered with PROSPERO (CRD42013004826) and published in 2013.⁵

We answered our research question in four stages. In stage one, we conducted a co-inquiry with stakeholders on QCs from Switzerland and other European countries, in which we narrowed the research question and provided a preliminary programme theory. In stage two, we synthesised evidence from a literature review and built a literature-based programme theory. In stage three, we collected evidence from interviews and focus groups with QC participants, facilitators, tutors, and managers and refined the programme theory. In stage four we consolidated our work, integrating interview data with participants across Europe and examining existing theories.

We conducted this research between 2013 and 2020, when the first author (AR) was completing his DPhil (PhD) project at the University of Oxford. AR's thesis research engaged key Swiss and European experts and stakeholders at all stages; these were QC participants, facilitators, tutors, managers, and policy makers. The different players shared their perspectives when we developed the research questions, methods and analysis, and when we considered the implications of the results.

Pawson and Tilley's realist logic was used to analyse the collected data because this form of analysis addressed the complexity of QCs as an intervention.^{13 14} We sought to provide an in-depth explanation of QCs that showed how mutual learning in a social context improves standard practice and raises professional self-esteem, and increases well-being. The realist approach examines causal explanations of outcomes and then expresses them in their simplest form: context (C) 'triggers' or 'activates' a mechanism (M) that produces an outcome (O). These context-mechanism-outcome

(CMO) configurations are ‘mini’ theories situated within a programme theory.¹⁵ As we develop CMO configurations, we can more clearly see the contexts that produce desired outcomes. Once we identify these contexts, we can more easily select activities to change a given context to match our desired outcome.

Ethics Approval

The project was approved by the Central University Research Ethics Committee in Oxford (MSD-IDREC-C1-2015-002); it fulfilled the requirements of informed consent: handling of personal information and confidentiality conformed to the operational principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and adhered to the Belmont Report principles mandating respect for persons, beneficence, and justice.

Stage one: the co-inquiry

From May to December 2013, we consulted with stakeholders and experts from Switzerland and with the European Society of Quality and Safety in Family Medicine (EQuiP). They shared their perspectives on our research questions and helped us construct a mental model of QCs function. For characteristics of participants, see supplemental material 1. We also collected information from QC programme documentation and training materials, extracting QC aims, detailed objectives, and roles. This preliminary programme theory built the framework for our realist review.

Stage two: realist review

Searching for evidence

Our search strategy was informed by an earlier scoping review that reported on the intentions and benefits, historical development, and spread of QCs.¹ In collaboration with a librarian, we refined our search strategy, combining terminology like ‘Programme’, ‘Quality Improvement,’ and ‘Group’ terms with a PHC search filter.¹⁶ We ran the search in Medline, EMBASE, PsycINFO, and CINAHL, without language restrictions (supplemental material 2) from 1974, to reflect the emergence of QCs

in 1974, at McMaster, Canada, and in 1979 at the University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands. We conducted the search in October 2013 and updated it in December 2020. We broadened the search by examining citations in reference lists and Web of Science and searched manually for closely related papers (kinship papers) that had contextual features and theoretical background similar to those found in the referring studies.⁵

Searching for theories

In principle, any theory that explained QCs was a candidate for our realist review, including those from psychology, social, or economic sciences. We first identified key components of QCs; these were theories that described groups, their dynamics within organisations, and the role of the facilitator. We searched for theories about motivation, learning, and behaviour change to inform professional development and improve quality of care. After this search we had identified 52 threads of theories across several levels. Since the overlapping theories were complex, we deviated from the original protocol and used the preliminary programme theory (stage one) as an organising framework.

Selecting articles

Criteria for inclusion were: 1) the studies focused on small group work, 2) took place in the PHC setting, and 3) had a quantitative or qualitative outcome. We managed search results in EndnoteX8. SM and JH each assessed half of the retrieved papers and AR examined them all. The authors resolved disagreements through discussion. AR updated the search and included papers published from November 2013 to December 2020. GW checked the process paper selection and interpretation of the new data.

We appraised the relevance and rigour of each paper's contribution. Data were relevant if they helped us understand a specific element or thread of theory in the larger programme theory. Threads of theory were rigorous if they met three explanatory criteria: consilience (the theory

accounts for most of the data), simplicity (the theory is straightforward, without exceptions) and analogy (the theory relates to already known principles).^{15 17 18}

Analysis and synthesis of the data

We created a data extraction framework from the preliminary programme theory and implemented it in Microsoft Excel. For each study, we extracted data on mechanisms, contexts, and outcomes (Table 1).¹⁰ At least two authors (AR, SM, or JH) reviewed extracted data and all authors reviewed the analysis and interpretation.

Table 1 Data analysis process throughout the study

Step	Description of the analytical step
One	We collected data on the following key elements of QCs: <ul style="list-style-type: none">➤ Outcomes➤ Participant characteristics: who was doing what and why?➤ Activities: what was being done and why?➤ Implementation context: where and how were QCs implemented?➤ Patterns of outcomes over time or intermediate outcomes.
Two	Outcomes: each intermediate outcome, or final outcome received a new code.
Three	To identify the components of CMO configurations, we linked activities to intermediate outcomes, or final outcomes, and noted any corresponding contextual features and mechanisms that were mentioned.
Four	We linked activities to outcomes and sought explanation for when and why they had these outcomes (if the source mentioned context or underlying reasoning or mechanism) and then built CMO configurations.
Five	We categorised and ordered the CMO configurations to create a chain of outcomes and explained how CMO configurations related to each other.
Six	We compared and contrasted patterns identified in different sources.
Seven	We formulated, revised, and consolidated the programme theory foundation of quality circles.

Initially, for each paper, we extracted components of context along with descriptions of mechanisms that led to an outcome. We summarised these configurations into descriptions of interaction between context and mechanisms to either facilitate or constrain QCs. Since papers were often

closely related, we grouped them based on their kinship, which helped us look for and confirm CMO configurations between papers within the same (family) study. We iteratively arranged and rearranged the CMO configurations, moving between the papers, their data, and families, and built semi-predictable patterns of outcomes (demi-regularities) to develop the programme theory (see supplemental material 3).

Stage three: refining the programme theory

AR conducted interviews and focus groups to refine and test the configuration, interpretation, and underlying mechanisms of each CMO configuration and its relative position/contribution to the programme theory.¹⁹

We invited a broad range of participants to participate in interviews, including experts and stakeholders from stage one, so we could capture a range of professional backgrounds and roles. Those we invited included tutors who train QC facilitators, facilitators who guide small groups, participating GPs, and QC managers.^{20 21} We applied the concepts of data saturation and stopped collecting data when additional information added no further relevant evidence. None of the invited participants declined. Throughout the process, we reflected critically on assumptions that AR or participants might have made during the interviews or focus groups.²⁰ AR conducted six 30–60-minute interviews in Swiss German between March and May 2015. After explaining the literature-based programme theory in plain words, AR offered contrasting options for participants to discuss and then asked them to share their understanding of the underlying reasoning for QC interactions.

In April 2015, during an EQuiP conference, we held two focus group sessions with GPs from over 19 European countries. Participants were given written descriptions of the emerging programme theory, phrased as conditional clauses that did not suggest mechanisms. During the focus group, participants were asked if and how much they agreed with the statements, and then the group discussed whether and why parts of the programme would or would not work in certain contexts. We summarise the characteristics of interview and focus group participants in supplemental material 4.

Stage four: consolidating the programme theory

To consolidate the programme theory, AR invited representatives from countries with different PHC provision systems to a one-hour online interview to discuss the ways that different professional associations, institutional settings, and other contexts affect QC outcomes.²¹ Participant characteristics are summarised in supplemental material 5.

We then compared and contrasted this emerging programme theory with formal theories to explain intermediate and final QC outcomes. Formal theories capture a programme theory's underlying mechanisms and explain how its threads weave into patterns across different disciplines. Programme theories that are based on formal, existing, theories may also provide better explanations of phenomena than those that are not.⁷ Our candidate formal theories came from four sources: the scoping review;⁵ the realist review; theories described by interviewees; and theories identified during iterative searches when we were looking for and testing possible mechanisms. We chose theories with the highest level of explanatory coherence, based on the three criteria of consilience, simplicity, and analogy.^{17 18}

Results

Stage one: the co-inquiry

50 QC experts and stakeholders narrowed the research question and provided data in three interviews and three focus groups, and also provided programme documentation and training materials. The interviews and focus groups sessions took place after the meetings of professional associations (Swiss Society of General Internal Medicine). This co-inquiry resulted in the following preliminary programme: 6–12 health-care professionals meet regularly to reflect on and improve their standard practice, employing didactic methods and QI techniques to identify gaps in their knowledge. Two fundamental concepts shape QCs from the beginning. The first is the cycle of

learning, or QI, and the second is the social context in which the group functions. We have described in detail the CMO configurations we developed in this stage in supplemental material 6.

Stage two: realist review

Our search strategy returned 2,812 results (Figure 1), out of which AR, JH, and SM assessed 73 papers. An update in December 2020 yielded 35 more papers.

Figure 1. Paper flow realist review

The literature mainly covered QCs in which GPs participated. We found 24 relevant articles about German QCs, 12 about Dutch QCs, and two about Swiss QC; 10 papers were about CME groups in Canada and Scotland, 6 about a QC research project in Norway, 3 about QCs on osteoporosis in Canada, and 5 about the Drug Education Project in Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands and Slovakia; 6 papers covered QC projects in England, Austria, Belgium and France; 5 other relevant papers were from South Africa, the US (Hawaii and California), New Zealand, and Australia. We categorised these papers into groups to clarify their kinship network, including an underlying trial, common themes, common contexts like geographical area, and common methods of organising QCs (e.g., papers that tested similar didactic methods or similar QI tools in QCs).

Study designs varied by research question. Our search returned 5 study protocols, 2 case series, 14 before-and-after studies, 13 controlled before-and-after studies, 9 randomised controlled trials, nine cluster randomised controlled trials, 12 surveys and 9 qualitative research papers that used data from interviews or focus groups. Few papers studied the performance of well-established QCs; data were often limited to interventions in newly formed groups. In pre-existing QCs (German, Dutch, or Norwegian trials), researchers introduced their own interventions on prescription or test-ordering patterns rather than studying interventions chosen and designed by the QC group. For full details of study characteristics, see supplemental material 7. We present the literature-based programme

theory and supporting quotations from the literature in supplemental material 8. The data we retrieved from the update search did not change our CMO configurations or programme theory.

Stage three: the refined programme theory

We used data from 40 participants, collected during six interviews and two focus group sessions held at the EQuiP meeting in Fischingen, Switzerland. For each CMO configuration, we tested its configuration, interpretation, underlying mechanism, and time relationship to others. We refined the wording of six CMO configurations and added three new configurations that linked the chains of outcomes. See supplemental material 9 for the resulting intermediate programme theory and supporting quotations and data from focus group sessions.

Stage four: consolidating the programme theory

We consolidated the intermediate programme theory and explored its contextual layers during interviews with participants from five European countries. Interviewees provided rich data and detailed descriptions about what they deemed necessary preconditions for successful QCs and added an additional CMO configuration (1b 'being embedded in a QI system'). For supporting quotations during these interviews, see supplemental material 10. Figure 2 shows the final CMO configurations of the consolidated programme theory (iteratively developed from stages one to four).

To further consolidate the programme theory, we used our candidate formal theories we found during the research process. Some theories about organisational context, groups, learning, knowledge exchange, development of innovations and their implementation were relevant. Some CMO configurations fit well with, or are directly supported by, existing theories, whilst others seem to clarify how existing theories work when they are applied to QCs. Table 2 summarises the theories and their corresponding CMO configurations.

Figure 2. Consolidated programme theory on quality circles

Table 2. CMO configurations from the programme theory and their relationships to existing theories

Theory	Explanation of relationships	CMO configurations in the programme theory (Figure 2)
Receptive capacity of an organisation ^{22 23}	Theories about the organisational setting elucidate the mechanisms by which organisations help or hinder quality circles in their work. Quality circles should be embedded in a system that provides training in QI and promotes it by providing explicit knowledge, valuing tacit knowledge, and ensuring that groups have competent facilitators. These features are part of an organisation’s receptive capacity: how well it values, integrates, and uses new external knowledge.	CMO configuration 1 b-c
The PARIHS framework (Promoting Action on Research Implementation in Health Services) ²⁴	The PARIHS framework suggests that three elements must be in place before quality circles can successfully implement innovations: 1) explicit or implicit knowledge, including quality circle members’ interpretations of that knowledge; 2) the context, which must stimulate use and evaluation of new knowledge; and 3) facilitation, which should meet professional standards to support the process of change.	CMO configuration 1 b
Self-determination theory ²⁵	Self-Determination Theory suggests that GPs are motivated to participate in quality circles if they feel that the quality circle will satisfy their basic needs for competence, social bonding, and autonomy.	CMO configurations 1 a, 1 c, 2 a-c, 3 4 b and 4 e
Theories about groups ²⁶⁻³⁰	Theories about groups and facilitation describe how groups form and norm their rules, a prerequisite for building an environment of trust in which participants can exchange ideas and thoughts. The knowledge and capacity of the group may be greater than the sum of the average of each individual’s capacity. When participants share their knowledge and incorporate all perspectives, they can collectively solve problems more efficiently than they could alone.	CMO configurations 2 b-d, 3 a-c, 4 c and 4 g
Social learning theory ^{31 32}	Social learning theory frames learning as an active cognitive process of perception and thinking in a social context like quality circles. Participants learn by observing and imitating peers. They also learn from the responses they receive, or expect to receive, when they try something new or avoid unrewarding actions. Learning depends much on individual expectations and feelings of competence to carry tasks. Organisational factors that lend support to learners, e.g., by giving access to learning material, incentives or rewards, improve the process.	CMO configuration 3 f
Adult-learning theories ³³	Adult-learning theories suggest that adults are highly motivated: they learn things that are immediately	CMO configurations 1 c, 2 b and 3 b-d

	useful to them, and prefer to do so in a self-directed, task-oriented, experience-based manner.	
Experience-based learning ^{34 35}	GPs prefer experiential learning, in which experience is the starting point. Reflecting on an experience enables GPs to restructure their knowledge. They turn insights gained from experience into knowledge and transfer them to other situations. They actively experiment with the new knowledge, and then report their experiences back to the group.	CMO configurations 3 b- e
Transformative learning theory ^{36 37}	Transformative learning begins with cognitive dissonance, a negative emotional state triggered by conflicting perceptions. Generally, people want to reduce discordant feelings. In the safe environment of a quality circle, cognitive dissonance prompts GPs to reflect on and accept new arguments or revise their old ones to resolve their internal conflict.	CMO configurations 3 e and 4 g
Social interdependence theory ^{38 39}	Social interdependence theory explains why groups may work together towards a common goal. When quality circle participants realise that they will only achieve their own goals if their peers achieve theirs, this creates a positive interdependence, which encourages participants to reassure and support each other in pursuit of those goals. Positive interdependence improves psychological well-being and raises self-esteem through cooperation and mutual appreciation.	CMO configurations 4 a and 4 c
Knowledge-creation theory ⁴⁰⁻⁴²	Knowledge-creation theories describe the process by which implicit knowledge becomes explicit when participants relate and combine their experiences with other explicit knowledge like evidence-based information, generating new concepts that participants integrate into their everyday clinical practice.	CMO configurations 1 b, 3 c, 4 c, e, g
Theory of planned behaviour ^{43 44}	The theory of planned behaviour describes how intentions can change behaviour: if the new behaviour makes sense, others approve and it feels easy enough to change.	CMO configuration 4 f
Automaticity ⁴⁵	There are theories that support the argument that quality circles are much more successful when they repeatedly implement new knowledge, giving participants the opportunity to build confidence in innovation and their quality circle skills.	CMO configurations 5 a-b

Discussion

Summary of the consolidated programme theory

The most important contextual requirements for successful QCs are governmental trust in the ability of GPs to deliver QI and appropriate professional and administrative support for QC work.

Professional support includes training in QI techniques, easy access to teaching materials, and trustworthy personalised performance data. Administrative support includes providing protected time, an appropriate venue, and financial resources for meetings. If QC groups are to be successful, participants must feel that they have a say in their CPD and QI work, but the additional workload from participating in QCs must be manageable.

Several factors in QCs influence practitioner performance. QC members and their group dynamics are at the core of the process. Facilitators help participants build social bonds and mutual trust so that the QC becomes a safe environment that fosters open discussions and where participants link insights to everyday practice, manage uncertainty, and develop their professional role. Members reflect on personal experiences, add information from relevant sources, including evidence-based information and personal performance data, and then develop new ideas and concepts to improve their practice. With skilful facilitation, participants work towards a common goal and test their new ideas in the group, knowing that success depends on the individual member contributions. The QC process raises self-esteem and fosters psychological well-being. QI is cyclical, so putting innovations into practice is a continuous and repetitive process that increases participants' confidence in their innovation and QI skills with each repetition.

How the programme theory contributes to our understanding of QCs and relates to existing QC literature

Our understanding that QCs should be embedded in a system of QI that values, integrates, and uses new external knowledge aligns with the existing literature.^{23 46} Health systems should provide

training in QI tools and give access to trustworthy data (explicit knowledge) that help participants identify their own learning needs (CMO configuration 1 b-c and 3 e in Figure 2).^{22 47-50}

Our research confirmed that well-functioning groups are essential to the QC process. The group's capacity for problem-solving surpasses the ability of individual when members share and pool their experiences and views^{29 48}. Supportive facilitation in a non-threatening environment of mutual trust eases learning in the group and opens possibilities for sharing, creating and integrating new knowledge.^{23 48 51-53} Trust implies that participants operate on the basis of equality and mutual respect, according to the principle of benevolence, when they take risks and participate actively in the group (CMO configurations 1 c, 2 b 3 a-c, 4 c and 4 g in Figure 2).^{26 54}

We had several insights that had not been reported in current QC literature. Cognitive dissonance, like conflicting attitudes, beliefs or behaviours that create unease, is a mechanism that compels GPs to reflect on, accept, and adopt new reasoning to resolve inner conflict. According to our interview data, GPs can risk doing this in a QC group where they feel safe and confident, a process described in educational literature (CMO configurations 3 e and 4 g in Figure 2).⁵⁵⁻⁵⁹

Our data show that reflecting on an experience enables GPs to restructure their knowledge for transfer to other situations. When they share knowledge and experience, they can validate their clinical reasoning and thus integrate tacit and explicit knowledge and develop professional values like integrity and empathy; this process is recognised in the literature on psychology of learning as important to professional development.^{60 61} Explicit knowledge can be easily expressed through language or in writing because it is factual, e.g., evidence-based information, or a measurement of practice performance; whereas implicit or tacit knowledge is embodied in the knowledge or skills that a GP accumulates through experience but may find difficult to communicate.⁶² CMO configurations 3 b-e, 4 g, and 5 a (in Figure 2) show GPs' need for tangible experiences and repeated attempts to absorb new knowledge.³⁷

According to our data, the mechanism of positive interdependence explained how and why collective or social learning can flourish and create a sense of ownership in QCs. When QC participants realise that they will only achieve their own goals if their peers achieve theirs, they are encouraged to reassure and support each other. Peers create new ideas and the cooperation and mutual appreciation that results improves their psychological well-being, increases their self-esteem, and may reduce their risk of burnout (CMO configurations 4 a and 4 c, e in Figure 2).^{1 39 63-65}

Participants relate and combine their experiences with other explicit knowledge and generate new concepts or improve quality of care — a process described in business literature as knowledge creation.^{40-42 60 66-68} A key function of QCs is to merge familiar knowledge, local context, and personal experience with evidence-based knowledge and extend this from the micro view of single-patient care to a wider view of the whole system (CMO configurations 3 c, 4 e, 4 g and 5 g in Figure 2).

The literature, data from the realist review, and our interview data together suggest that participants may change their behaviour if it makes sense to do so, if others approve, and if change is not too demanding.⁶⁹ But to embed these behaviour changes in everyday practice, the QC processes must be repeated, especially during the phase when GPs are implementing new knowledge,^{70 71} (CMO configurations 4 f, 5 a and 5 b in Figure 2).

Implications for policy and practice

Based on our findings, we summarised the recommendations for organising and performing QCs to increase the likelihood that GPs successfully improve the quality of their work (Figure 3). Each recommendation is based on one or more CMO configurations. Not all recommendations will apply to every QC. These recommendations should be considered as a form of decision support that QCs can draw on to determine if action is needed in their specific circumstances.

Figure 3. Recommendations and principles for organising successful quality circles

The QC process and its implications are summarised as an infographic in supplemental material 11.

Limitations

These realist approaches have two major limitations. First, the resulting theory relies on the detail and depth of the reports we identified in our literature review. To ensure we searched broadly, we looked for related reports and papers (kinship papers) including qualitative papers and evaluations that discussed different aspects of the research project and proposed other possible explanations for their findings. Our results also depend on the veracity and adequacy of the information participants revealed in interviews. To check the consistency and accuracy of this data, we relied upon sequential interviews to refine and consolidate our programme theory, step-by-step, as it emerged and interviewed groups of people with different perspectives (QC participants, facilitators, tutors, organisers and managers) to ensure our CMO configurations were adequate and clear. To mitigate the risk of social desirability bias, AR carefully posed neutral interview questions and tried to avoid embedding assumptions in his questions.

Second, the realist approach carries the risk of selection bias if researchers choose underlying theories and synthesise them ad hoc. To mitigate this risk, we used stakeholders' mental model, programme documentation, and training material for facilitators to build the preliminary programme theory that served as our framework for analysis.

Future research

Future researchers can build on this programme theory to design, implement and evaluate new QC interventions. We encourage researchers to test our programme theory to confirm, refute or refine it for specific settings and/or professional groups.

Conclusion

Our consolidated programme theory explains how QCs can improve practice, foster professional development, and increase psychological well-being among participants. Group dynamics are at the core of the process. Facilitators help participants exchange knowledge in a safe environment where they generate new concepts to improve their practice. With repetition, QC participants gain confidence in their QI skills and put their innovations into practice. The requirements for successful QCs are 1) governmental trust in GPs' abilities to deliver QI and appropriate support like professional facilitation, 2) training in QI techniques, 3) access to educational material and personal performance data; 4) granting protected time, appropriate venues, and financial resources for QC group members.

Author Contributions

AR performed the research as part of formal postgraduate studies (DPhil Programme in Evidence-Based Health Care, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK). SM and JH supervised the development of the research and actively participated in the review process (eligibility, selection, data extraction followed by discussions). GW, as AR's main supervisor, provided important input regarding the methodology and supervised the whole research process. All authors critically reviewed the text, assisted with editing read and approved the final manuscript. GW, SM and JH contributed independently to this project from their academic and methodological experience.

Literature


1. Rohrbasser A, Harris J, Mickan S, et al. Quality circles for quality improvement in primary health care: Their origins, spread, effectiveness and lacunae— A scoping review. *PloS one* 2018;13(12):e0202616. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0202616
2. Rohrbasser A, Kirk UB, Arvidsson E. Use of quality circles for primary care providers in 24 European countries: an online survey of European Society for Quality and Safety in family practice delegates. *Scandinavian Journal of Primary Health Care* 2019;1-10. doi: 10.1080/02813432.2019.1639902
3. Carrieri D, Mattick K, Pearson M, et al. Optimising strategies to address mental ill-health in doctors and medical students: 'Care Under Pressure' realist review and implementation guidance. *BMC Med* 2020;18(1):76. doi: 10.1186/s12916-020-01532-x [published Online First: 2020/04/02]
4. Plsek PE, Greenhalgh T. The challenge of complexity in health care. *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 2001;323(7313):625-28.
5. Rohrbasser A, Mickan S, Harris J. Exploring why quality circles work in primary health care: a realist review protocol. *Systematic reviews* 2013;2(1):1-7. doi: 10.1186/2046-4053-2-110
6. Davidoff F, Dixon-Woods M, Leviton L, et al. Demystifying theory and its use in improvement. *BMJ quality & safety* 2015;24(3):228-38. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2014-003627 [published Online First: 2015/01/27]
7. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, et al. RAMESES II Project: “Theory” in realist evaluation 2017 [cited 2019 27/04]. Available from: http://www.ramesesproject.org/media/RAMESES_II_Theory_in_realist_evaluation.pdf accessed 28/04 2019.
8. MacAulay AC, Commanda LE, Freeman WL, et al. Participatory Research Maximises Community and Lay Involvement. *BMJ: British Medical Journal* 1999;319(7212):774-78.
9. Jagosh J, Macaulay AC, Pluye P, et al. Uncovering the benefits of participatory research: implications of a realist review for health research and practice. *The Milbank quarterly* 2012;90(2):311-46. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0009.2012.00665.x [published Online First: 2012/06/20]
10. Funnel SC, Rogers PI. Purposeful Program Theory: Effective Use of Theories of Change and Logic Models. San Francisco: Wiley 2011:550.
11. Leeuw FL. Reconstructing Program Theories: Methods Available and Problems to be Solved. *American Journal of Evaluation* 2003;24(1):5-20. doi: 10.1177/109821400302400102
12. Astbury B, Leeuw FL. Unpacking Black Boxes: Mechanisms and Theory Building in Evaluation. *American Journal of Evaluation* 2010;31(3):363-81. doi: 10.1177/1098214010371972
13. Pawson R, Tilley N. Realistic evaluation. London: Sage 1997.
14. Wong G. Getting to grips with context and complexity – the case for realist approaches. *Gaceta Sanitaria* 2018;32(2):109-10. doi: doi.org/10.1016/j.gaceta.2017.05.010

15. Emmel N, Greenhalgh J, Manzano A, et al., editors. *Doing Realist Research*. London: SAGE, 2018.
16. Gill PJ, Roberts NW, Wang KY, et al. Development of a search filter for identifying studies completed in primary care. *Fam Pract* 2014 doi: 10.1093/fampra/cmu066 [published Online First: 2014/10/20]
17. Thagard P. Explanatory coherence. *Behavioral and brain sciences* 1989;12(03):435-67.
18. Haig BD, Evers CW. *Realist Inquiry in Social Science*. London: SAGE 2016.
19. Edwards PK, O'Mahoney J, Vincent S, editors. *Studying Organizations Using Critical Realism: A Practical Guide*: Oxford University Press, 2014.
20. Pawson R. Theorizing the Interview. *The British Journal of Sociology* 1996;47(2):295-314. doi: 10.2307/591728
21. Manzano A. The craft of interviewing in realist evaluation. *Evaluation* 2016;22(3):342-60. doi: 10.1177/1356389016638615
22. Lane PJ, Lubatkin M. Relative absorptive capacity and interorganizational learning. *Strategic Management Journal* 1998;19(5):461-77. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199805)19:5<461::AID-SMJ953>3.0.CO;2-L
23. Berta W, Cranley L, Dearing JW, et al. Why (we think) facilitation works: insights from organizational learning theory. *Implementation Science* 2015;10(1):141. doi: 10.1186/s13012-015-0323-0
24. Kitson A, Harvey G, McCormack B. Enabling the implementation of evidence based practice: a conceptual framework. *Qual Health Care* 1998;7(3):149-58. [published Online First: 1998/08/05]
25. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *Am Psychol* 2000;55(1):68-78. [published Online First: 2001/06/08]
26. Cross R, Rice RE, Parker A. Information seeking in social context: structural influences and receipt of information benefits. *Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C: Applications and Reviews, IEEE Transactions on* 2001;31(4):438-48.
27. Dirks KT, Ferrin DL. The Role of Trust in Organizational Settings. *Organization Science* 2001;12(4):450-67.
28. Pereles L, Lockyer J, Fidler H. Permanent small groups: group dynamics, learning, and change. *The Journal of continuing education in the health professions* 2002;22(4):205-13. doi: 10.1002/chp.1340220404 [published Online First: 2003/03/05]
29. Kozlowski SWJ, Ilgen DR. Enhancing the Effectiveness of Work Groups and Teams. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 2006;7(3):77-124. doi: 10.1111/j.1529-1006.2006.00030.x
30. Baumeister RF, Ainsworth SE, Vohs KD. Are groups more or less than the sum of their members? The moderating role of individual identification. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 2016;39:1-38. doi: 10.1017/s0140525x15000618
31. Bandura A, McClelland DC. *Social learning theory*. 1977

32. Bandura A. Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology* 2001;52(1):1-26. doi: doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1
33. Mukhalalati BA, Taylor A. Adult Learning Theories in Context: A Quick Guide for Healthcare Professional Educators. *Journal of Medical Education and Curricular Development* 2019;6:1-10. doi: 10.1177/2382120519840332
34. Kolb D, editor. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and development*: Prentice Hall, 1984.
35. Kolb DA, Boyatzis RE, Mainemelis C. Experiential learning theory: Previous research and new directions. *Perspectives on thinking, learning, and cognitive styles* 2001;1:227-47.
36. Mezirow J. Transformative Learning: Theory to Practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education* 1997;1997(74):5-12. doi: 10.1002/ace.7401
37. Sandars J. Transformative learning: The challenge for reflective practice. *Work Based Learning in Primary Care* 2006;4(1):6-10.
38. Johnson DW, Johnson RT. New Developments in Social Interdependence Theory. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs* 2005;131(4):285-358. doi: 10.3200/mono.131.4.285-358
39. Johnson DW, Johnson RT. An Educational Psychology Success Story: Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning. *Educational Researcher* 2009;38(5):365-79. doi: 10.3102/0013189x09339057
40. Nonaka I, Byosiere P, Borucki CC, et al. Organizational knowledge creation theory: A first comprehensive test. *International Business Review* 1994;3(4):337-51. doi: 10.1016/0969-5931(94)90027-2
41. Von Krogh G, Ichijo K, Nonaka I. Enabling knowledge creation: How to unlock the mystery of tacit knowledge and release the power of innovation: Oxford university press 2000.
42. Nonaka I, von Krogh G. Perspective—Tacit Knowledge and Knowledge Conversion: Controversy and Advancement in Organizational Knowledge Creation Theory. *Organization Science* 2009;20(3):635-52. doi: doi:10.1287/orsc.1080.0412
43. Ajzen I. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes* 1991;50(2):179-211.
44. Eccles MP, Hrisos S, Francis J, et al. Do self-reported intentions predict clinicians' behaviour: a systematic review. *Implement Sci* 2006;1:28. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-1-28 [published Online First: 2006/11/23]
45. Logan GD. Repetition priming and automaticity: Common underlying mechanisms? *Cognitive Psychology* 1990;22(1):1-35. doi: 10.1016/0010-0285(90)90002-L
46. Kilo CM. A framework for collaborative improvement: lessons from the Institute for Healthcare Improvement's Breakthrough Series. *Qual Manag Health Care* 1998;6(4):1-13. doi: 10.1097/00019514-199806040-00001 [published Online First: 1999/05/29]
47. Kelly DR, Cunningham DE, McCalister P, et al. Applying evidence in practice through small-group learning: a qualitative exploration of success. *Quality in Primary Care* 2007;15(2):93-99.

48. Brennan S, Bosch M, Buchan H, et al. Measuring organizational and individual factors thought to influence the success of quality improvement in primary care: a systematic review of instruments. *Implementation Science* 2012;7(1):1-19.
49. Brennan SE, Bosch M, Buchan H, et al. Measuring team factors thought to influence the success of quality improvement in primary care: a systematic review of instruments. *Implementation Science* 2013;8(1):1-20. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-8-20
50. Huang H, Jefferson E, Gotink M, et al. Collaborative improvement in Scottish GP clusters after the Quality and Outcomes Framework: a qualitative study. *British Journal of General Practice* 2021:BJGP.2020.1101. doi: 10.3399/bjgp.2020.1101
51. Rhydderch M, Edwards A, Marshall M, et al. Developing a facilitation model to promote organisational development in primary care practices. *BMC Family Practice* 2006;7(1):38.
52. Dogherty EJ, Harrison MB, Graham ID. Facilitation as a Role and Process in Achieving Evidence-Based Practice in Nursing: A Focused Review of Concept and Meaning. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing* 2010;7(2):76-89. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-6787.2010.00186.x
53. Elwyn G, Greenhalg T, Macfarlane F, editors. *Groups a guide to small group work in healthcare, management, education and research*: Radcliffe Medical Press, 2004.
54. Gubbins C, MacCurtain S. Understanding the Dynamics of Collective Learning: The Role of Trust and Social Capital. *Advances in Developing Human Resources* 2008;10(4):578-99. doi: 10.1177/1523422308320372
55. Newton J, Hutchinson A, Steen N, et al. Educational potential of medical audit: observations from a study of small groups setting standards. *Quality in health care : QHC* 1992;1(4):256-59.
56. Payne VL, Hysong SJ. Model depicting aspects of audit and feedback that impact physicians' acceptance of clinical performance feedback. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2016;16:1-12. doi: 10.1186/s12913-016-1486-3 [published Online First: 2016/07/15]
57. Van Braak M, Visser M, Holtrop M, et al. What motivates general practitioners to change practice behaviour? A qualitative study of audit and feedback group sessions in Dutch general practice. *BMJ Open* 2019;9(5):1-8. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025286
58. Brennan N, Bryce M, Pearson M, et al. Towards an understanding of how appraisal of doctors produces its effects: a realist review. *Med Educ* 2017;51(10):1002-13. doi: 10.1111/medu.13348 [published Online First: 2017/08/02]
59. Eva KW, Regehr G. Effective feedback for maintenance of competence: from data delivery to trusting dialogues. *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 2013;185(6):463-64. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.121772
60. Eraut M. Non-formal learning and tacit knowledge in professional work. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 2000;70(1):113-36. doi: 10.1348/000709900158001
61. Oborn E, Barrett M, Racko G. Knowledge translation in healthcare: Incorporating theories of learning and knowledge from the management literature. *J Health Organ Manag* 2013;27(4):412-31. [published Online First: 2013/09/06]
62. Hildreth PM, Kimble C. The duality of knowledge. *Information research* 2002;8(1)

63. Eliasson G, Mattsson B. From teaching to learning. Experiences of small CME group work in general practice in Sweden. *Scand J Prim Health Care* 1999;17(4):196-200. [published Online First: 2000/02/16]
64. Zaher E, Ratnapalan S. Practice-based small group learning programs: systematic review. *Can Fam Physician* 2012;58(6):637-42, e310-6.
65. Lancaster J, Prager S, Nash L, et al. Psychiatry peer review groups in Australia: a mixed-methods exploration of structure and function. *BMJ Open* 2020;10(11):e040039. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-040039
66. Gabbay J, le May A. Evidence based guidelines or collectively constructed "mindlines?" Ethnographic study of knowledge management in primary care. *BMJ* 2004;329(7473):1-4. doi: 10.1136/bmj.329.7473.1013 [published Online First: 2004/10/30]
67. Eraut M. Learning from other people in the workplace. *Oxford Review of Education* 2007;33(4):403-22. doi: 10.1080/03054980701425706
68. Orzano AJ, McInerney CR, Scharf D, et al. A knowledge management model: Implications for enhancing quality in health care. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 2008;59(3):489-505. doi: 10.1002/asi.20763
69. Armson H, Elmslie T, Roder S, et al. Is the Cognitive Complexity of Commitment-to-Change Statements Associated With Change in Clinical Practice? An Application of Bloom's Taxonomy. *The Journal of continuing education in the health professions* 2015;35(3):166-75. doi: 10.1002/chp.21303 [published Online First: 2015/09/18]
70. Poldrack RA, Gabrieli JDE. Characterizing the neural mechanisms of skill learning and repetition priming. *Brain* 2001;124(1):67-82. doi: 10.1093/brain/124.1.67
71. Hauptmann B, Karni A. From primed to learn: the saturation of repetition priming and the induction of long-term memory. *Cognitive Brain Research* 2002;13(3):313-22. doi: 10.1016/s0926-6410(01)00124-0





Preconditions

1

(a) 'Need for autonomy and obligation'

If the administration at national level, or at the level of health insurance companies, entrusts GPs with QI and autonomy (so they can decide how to implement it) (C), then GPs might participate in QCs (O) because they feel they can take on the responsibility and make a difference (M).

(b) 'Being embedded in a QI system'

If QCs are embedded in a QI system (an organisation that negotiates and signs contracts with governmental bodies or health insurance companies, trains and supervises facilitators, provides courses on QI in PHC and easy access to educational material, timely data on practice performance, and protects participants' time and space) (C), then participants will take on responsibility and work purposefully (O) because they feel supported, empowered, and able to meet expectations (M).

(c) 'Feeling they have a say'

If an organisation (e.g., a physician network organisation) has a decentralised policy that encourages use of local knowledge (C), then the QC takes on tasks (O) because members feel that they have a say in QI in their practice (M).

(d) 'Participants know what to expect'

If the introductory workshop teaches the principles of QI in PHC and illustrates how QCs work (C), then potential members may be more willing to join QCs (O) because they know what to expect and feel that they can meet expectations (M).



Establishing the group

2

(a) 'Sharing similar needs'

If the administration at the organisational level of QCs provides support for training facilitators, data gathering, provision of evidence-based information, and the administration protects participants' time and space and offers CME points and small financial incentives to them (C), then participants will meet in groups to exchange ideas (O) because GPs prefer learning in QCs (M). Support generates positive expectations among participants (M) and GPs believe that QC meetings with their peers will be useful (M).

(b) 'Need for relatedness'

If a regular group of members engages in socially enjoyable contact, led by a skilled facilitator who, e.g., introduces people to each other, opens discussions and clarifies and summarises statements (C), then group members will get to know each other and decide on rules that they are willing to follow, building a safe environment based on trust (O) because members want to be among and to interact with equals (M).

(c) 'Need for autonomy and control'

If the group chooses its own topics and facilitator (C), then its members will feel they own the QC (O) because their need for autonomy - a feeling of being in control of their own behaviour - is satisfied (M).

(d) 'Size of the group affects communication'

If the group size exceeds 15 (C), then interaction among group participants decreases (O) because participants cannot keep up with each other and follow all conversations (M).

(e) 'Variety of characters stimulates reflection - cognitive dissonance'

If members of the group have individual character traits and describe different professional experiences but accept each other's views (C), then they can learn from each other (O) because individual attitudes and behaviours will contrast with the knowledge of their peers and cause cognitive dissonance (a negative emotional state triggered by conflicting perceptions) that makes them reflect on their way of working (M).

(f) 'strong cognitive dissonance threatens self-image'

If the cognitive dissonance individuals feel when they integrate new knowledge is too strong (C), then they may disrupt group dynamics and halt the QC process (O) because it poses a threat to their self-image and they fear losing their professional identity (M).



Learning environment

3

(a) 'Feeling safe and not vulnerable'

If participants trust each other (C), then they can describe how they work and admit what they do not know (O), because they feel safe rather than vulnerable (M).

(b) 'Need for competence and self-actualisation'

If the facilitator supports participants and encourages them to share their stories and experiences in a safe environment (e.g., by encouraging interactive responses) through discussions and by summarising statements, (C) then participants will become involved and share their positive experiences and failures (O) because they want to improve their professional competence (M), gain professional confidence (M), and fulfil their professional potential (M).

(c) 'Previous knowledge is activated'

If participants exchange case stories and experiences whilst actively listening to each other in the presence of a skilled facilitator in a safe environment (C), then they will share their knowledge by relating their own relevant stories (O) because the process activates knowledge they already possess (M).

(d) 'Immediate relevance for the practice'

If QCs use the technique of experience-based learning (C), then knowledge becomes more relevant to GPs (O) because they can connect it to their everyday work and put it to immediate use (M).

(e) 'Cognitive dissonance'

If participants discuss and reflect on their work processes (e.g., based on trustworthy data or personal experiences) during a professionally facilitated exchange of positive experiences or failures (C), then they discover knowledge gaps and identify learning needs and relevant topics (O) because their own attitudes and behaviours may differ from their peers', creating cognitive dissonance that makes them reconsider their own way of working (M).

(f) 'Social learning'

If the facilitator uses purposeful didactic techniques (e.g., brainstorming, contentious or consensus discussions, or role play) to keep the group active and to reward exploratory behaviour during reflection on the work process (C), then the group will create a learning environment that promotes knowledge exchange (O) because learning is a cognitive process in which participants observe and imitate their peers' behaviour to gain social approval (M).



Adapting, creating, and testing new knowledge

4

(a) 'Positive interdependence between the administration at national level and GPs'

If the administration at the national level requires continuous QC activities (C), then QCs will negotiate priorities and design creative solutions (O) because the tension between autonomy and obligation spurs the group to act and negotiate to reach a common goal (M).

(b) 'Threat to professional autonomy'

If GPs feel that the QC programme is only a top-down managerial intervention to reduce costs (C), then they will not be motivated and will not participate (O) because they feel unsafe and fear they lack autonomy in their clinical role (M).

(c) 'Positive interdependence among group members'

If participants maintain a learning environment based on trust that promotes the exchange of knowledge, assisted by facilitators who use professional techniques (e.g., contentious discussion, reaching consensus and role play) (C), then participants will adapt and generate new knowledge for local use (O) because they see themselves as similar, and so act and negotiate cooperatively to achieve a common goal (M).

(d) 'Identifying and removing barriers to change'

If participants, supported by skilled facilitators, address barriers to change (C), then they are more likely to implement the innovation (O) because participants help each other develop strategies to identify and overcome these barriers (M).

(e) 'Need for competence, autonomy and relatedness'

If participants create new knowledge and plan an implementation strategy (C), then they feel satisfaction, responsibility, and stewardship (O) because their need for competence (being able to achieve specific objectives) is fulfilled (M), autonomy (a feeling of being in control of their own behaviour) (M), and relatedness (a sense of connection to a larger group) (M).

(f) 'Intention to change'

If participants announce their intention to change (C), then they are more likely to implement the change (O) because they and others in the group all think it is a good idea and believe they can carry it through (M).

(g) 'Testing new knowledge'

If participants validate and test new knowledge in a QC, moderated by a skilled facilitator in a safe environment (C), then they feel confident putting that knowledge to use in everyday practice (O) because they have had the opportunity to practise and familiarise themselves with the innovation (M).



Repeating the process

5

(a) 'Gaining confidence in an innovation'

If the group repeatedly practises implementing and adjusting to an innovation (C), then its members trust their own competence and turn the innovation into a habit (O) because successful outcomes increase their confidence in their abilities (M).

(b) 'Repetition priming and automaticity' - 'practice makes perfect'

If participants build a regular group and practise using QI tools (C), then they will successfully implement new knowledge into everyday practice (O) because responses improve with repetition (M).

	Recommendation	CMO configurations in the programme theory
For the administration at a national level	Invite participants to take responsibility for their QI but let them decide what they do and how they perform QI.	CMO configuration 1 a-c, 4 b
For professional organisations or university departments	Provide information about the basic principles of QI, like the Plan-Do-Study-Act cycle (PDSA) and explain how to implement those principles in QC practice.	CMO configuration 1 b and 1 d
	Give rewards (such as CME credits) to acknowledge that QI work is further education.	CMO configuration 1 b and 2 a
	Provide facilitator training and additional coaching or supervision.	CMO configuration 1 b
	Provide access to knowledge resources like evidence-based information, clinical practice guidelines, and data needed to address their local priorities; this will increase their motivation and trust in the findings.	CMO configurations 1 b and 2 a
For administrative organisations	Give access to appropriate venues and help them organise meeting times.	CMO configurations 2 b and 2 a
	Integrate and use the new knowledge developed by QCs, so that GPs can see that their efforts have changed practice. Administrations must also accept local adjustments to national solutions or guidance, because QI is a local process and QCs will adapt or devise new interventions and ways of working.	CMO configuration 1 c and 4 a
	Provide protected time, so groups can work during regular working hours or at mutually agreed times. The process should not be disturbed by phone calls or urgent patient problems since these disrupt discussions.	CMO configuration 2 a, 4 a
	Accept that QCs work at different speeds, because excessive demands for rapid results often undermine QI efforts.	CMO configuration 1 c, d, 4 b
	Group size affects the level of cooperation between members. Between six and twelve members is the optimal size for communication.	CMO configuration 2 d
For facilitators	The social aspect of the group lays the ground for frank discussions. For example, eating together before starting work eases social interaction, making participants feel more comfortable. A friendly, relaxed, and non-hierarchical atmosphere encourages participants to share sensitive information and motivates their continued attendance. Agreement on group norms and removing barriers like computer screens, or arranging tables and chairs in a circle facilitates social interaction.	CMO configurations 1 c, 2 b-c and 3 a
	Create an atmosphere of openness based on trust, so that participants can interact authentically. Facilitators should open discussions, summarise, clarify statements, and raise questions.	CMO configuration 2 b
	Encourage participants to talk about their own clinical cases, because these are the basis of a learning community where participants can reflect on their current practice and compare it with educational or evidence-based material.	CMO configurations 3 a-c
	Aim at a balance between comfort and challenge that allows an appropriate degree of conflict within the group to stimulate learning.	CMO configuration 3 f
	Close meetings on time and plan future meetings by summarising progress and highlighting the goals that have been achieved.	CMO configurations 2 b, 4 c-d
	Support participants in expressing themselves since it can be hard to make implicit knowledge explicit. Participants require 'active empathy' when they struggle to express their thoughts. Active empathy is the ability of QC members to actively listen to and care for each other, even when they question each other's statements.	CMO configuration 3 b
	Promptly identify and resolve conflicts because breaking established habits may feel high-risk and even threaten selfimage. Individuals who feel this way may choose to withdraw or, worse, disrupt the group process.	CMO configuration 2 f
For participants in the group	Gaining agreement on the topic to be discussed is central in QC work. The group must have a shared understanding of the problem when it embarks on the QI process and the topic must be relevant to everyday practice and manageable. The group should agree on the need for change, or at least agree that a problem exists.	CMO configurations 2 c and 3 d
	Come to an agreement on how to address the topic and balance local expertise with wider knowledge. Once a topic is chosen, members should start with personal experiences. Discussing personal cases increases a sense of ownership and helps connect new knowledge to everyday practice.	CMO configurations 3 b d
	Develop new concepts and ideas by reflecting on members' experiences, discuss individual cases, add information from guideline and educational evidence-based material, prescription data, or invite input from a respected local opinion leader. Members should be ready to adjust their ideas about how to change and improve care, or work differently, to fit local circumstances	CMO configurations 3 ef, 4 a and 4 c
	Implementing innovation is a continuous, repetitive process. Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of new ideas or changes to practice and address barriers to change.	CMO configuration 4 d
	Debate proposals for change and agree on action plans. After testing and trying out these plans, the group may then choose to move forward with one or more of them, depending upon how sure it is that the plans will be successful.	CMO configuration 4 f
	Each time the group tests the innovation, the goal should be improving it. Members should devise plans to implement the next version based on their own practice until they feel satisfied.	CMO configurations 4 g and 5 a
	Be patient. QC groups have a learning curve and the group grows more skilled and improves performance after each QI cycle.	CMO configuration 5 b