

1 **Meta-evaluation of a whole systems programme,**

2 **ActEarly: A study protocol**

3 **ActEarly meta-evaluation: A study protocol**

4 Liina Mansukoski^{1,2}, Bridget Lockyer², Amy Creaser^{2*}, Jessica Sheringham³, Laura Sheard¹,
5 Philip Garnett⁴, Tiffany Yang², Richard Cookson⁵, Alexandra Albert⁶, Shahid Islam², Robert
6 Shore², Aiysha Khan², Simon Twite⁷, Tania Dawson⁴, Halima Iqbal⁸, Ieva Skarda⁵, Aase
7 Villadsen⁹, Miqdad Asaria¹⁰, Jane West², Trevor Sheldon¹¹, John Wright² and Maria
8 Bryant^{1,12}

9
10 ¹ Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK

11 ² Bradford Institute for Health Research, Bradford, UK

12 ³ Department of Applied Health Research, University College London, London, UK

13 ⁴ The School for Business and Society, University of York, York, UK

14 ⁵ Centre for Health Economics, University of York, York, UK

15 ⁶ NESTA, UK

16 ⁷ Public Health Division, London Borough of Tower Hamlets, UK

17 ⁸ School of Nursing and Healthcare Leadership, University of Bradford, UK

18 ⁹ Centre for Longitudinal Studies, University College London, UK

19 ¹⁰ Department of Health Policy, London School of Economics and Political Science, London,
20 UK

21 ¹¹ Centre for Public Health & Policy, Queen Mary University of London, UK

22 ¹² Hull York Medical School, University of York, York, UK

23
24 *Corresponding author

25 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
Email: amy.creaser@bthft.nhs.uk

26 **Abstract**

27 **Introduction**

28 Living in an area with high levels of child poverty predisposes children to poorer mental and
29 physical health. ActEarly is a 5-year research programme that comprises a large number of
30 interventions (>20) with citizen science and co-production embedded. It aims to improve the
31 health and well-being of children and families living in two areas of the UK with high levels of
32 deprivation; Bradford in West Yorkshire, and the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. This
33 protocol outlines the meta-evaluation (an evaluation of evaluations) of the ActEarly
34 programme from a systems perspective, where individual interventions are viewed as events
35 in the wider policy system across the two geographical areas. It includes investigating the
36 programme's impact on early life health and well-being outcomes, interdisciplinary
37 prevention research collaboration and capacity building, and local and national decision
38 making.

39 **Methods**

40 The ActEarly meta-evaluation will follow and adapt the five iterative stages of the 'Evaluation
41 of Programmes in Complex Adaptive Systems' (ENCOMPASS) framework for evaluation of
42 public health programmes in complex adaptive systems. Theory-based and mixed-methods
43 approaches will be used to investigate the fidelity of the ActEarly research programme, and
44 whether, why and how ActEarly contributes to changes in the policy system, and whether
45 alternative explanations can be ruled out. Ripple effects and systems mapping will be used
46 to explore the relationships between interventions and their outcomes, and the degree to
47 which the ActEarly programme encouraged interdisciplinary and prevention research
48 collaboration as intended. A computer simulation model ("LifeSim") will also be used to
49 evaluate the scale of the potential long-term benefits of cross-sectoral action to tackle the
50 financial, educational and health disadvantages faced by children in Bradford and Tower
51 Hamlets. Together, these approaches will be used to evaluate ActEarly's dynamic

52 programme outputs at different system levels and measure the programme's system
53 changes on early life health and well-being.

54 **Discussion**

55 This meta-evaluation protocol presents our plans for using and adapting the ENCOMPASS-
56 framework to evaluate the system-wide impact of the early life health and well-being
57 programme, ActEarly. Due to the collaborative and non-linear nature of the work, we reserve
58 the option to change and query some of our evaluation choices based on the feedback we
59 receive from stakeholders to ensure that our evaluation remains relevant and fit for purpose.

60 **Introduction**

61 Living in an area with high levels of child poverty predisposes children to poorer mental and
62 physical health outcomes due to exposures to economic, physical, built, cultural, learning,
63 social, and service environmental risk factors [1, 2]. With health inequalities anticipated to
64 widen over time [3], various interventions, initiatives and policies have been implemented
65 aimed at reducing health inequality gaps (e.g. providing families with income support,
66 changes in environmental infrastructure and public health campaigns), with varying impact
67 [4, 5].

68 ActEarly is a UK Prevention Research Partnership (UKPRP) funded research consortium
69 focused on improving the health and well-being of children and families living in two areas
70 with high levels of deprivation; Bradford in West Yorkshire, and the London Borough of
71 Tower Hamlets [6]. ActEarly is unique, in that it is a series of interlinked interventions,
72 embedded with citizen science and co-production of research with local communities, across
73 two complex systems [6]. The 5-year programme, whose implementation began in
74 September 2019, creates testbeds of upstream interventions within whole-system city
75 settings, supporting intervention identification, implementation and evaluation [6]. A 'whole-
76 system city setting' can be thought of as a complex adaptive system consisting of multiple

77 interconnected, emergent and dynamic parts that are open to influences both from inside
78 and outside of the system [7]. ActEarly aims to: 1) establish a prevention research
79 consortium that unites broad transdisciplinary expertise (e.g., economics, urban design,
80 transport, education, housing, social justice and welfare) with the public, policy leaders and
81 practitioners from across the two areas; 2) identify, co-produce and implement system-wide
82 early life upstream prevention solutions; 3) provide efficient data platforms and
83 methodological expertise enabling robust population-scale evaluation of the impact of
84 interventions on environments, health related behaviours and interlinked health, educational,
85 social and economic outcomes; and 4) evaluate, refine, replicate and disseminate the City
86 Collaboratory approach as a model for addressing upstream determinants of health and
87 inequality [6].

88 To date, over 40 individual projects have been launched under the ActEarly umbrella,
89 including over 20 interventions targeting the ActEarly themes: 'healthy places', 'healthy
90 learning', 'healthy livelihoods', 'food and healthy weight' (cross-cutting theme) and 'play and
91 physical activity' (cross-cutting theme) [6], with citizen science and co-production of research
92 with local communities across the two study sites [8, 9]. It is anticipated that the number of
93 interventions and projects will increase as the project continues. The nature of complex
94 systems inevitably involves a wide range of target areas which means resource has been
95 spread relatively thinly across the child health system, and ActEarly funding did not cover the
96 cost of interventions.

97 In the short term, rather than a sole focus on large and measurable improvements in health
98 and wellbeing, our evaluation of ActEarly will explore changes across various processes of
99 researcher collaboration, local authority partnership working, co-production, citizen science,
100 and data linkage. This type of evaluation is crucial for understanding the mechanisms of
101 action behind an intervention and understanding how and why an intervention is (in)effective
102 [10]. The evaluation of the ActEarly programme is unique in that it will require a meta-
103 evaluation (an evaluation of evaluations), given the >20 dynamic interventions included

104 within the system [6, 11]. It necessitates a systems dynamic perspective, where individual
105 interventions are viewed as events and wider policy system change across the two study
106 areas. This is because, in any research programme, programme outcomes may be a result
107 of the context, rather than the implementation of the programme alone [12]. The evaluation
108 of complex systems interventions requires a hybrid research design, in which more than one
109 overall approach is combined and tailored to support the evaluation [13]. This builds on
110 realist methodology, and further acknowledges that focusing on events at a single time point
111 cannot sufficiently describe how the intervention interacts with changes in the wider complex
112 adaptive system [12, 14]. Instead, a two-phase approach is needed where first, the existing
113 system is described, including hypothesising how the intervention may change it (i.e., theory
114 of change, logic models). In the second phase, the changes resulting from the intervention
115 and their interaction with the wider system is described [14].

116 The meta-evaluation of ActEarly itself is complex, because the projects that are part of the
117 research portfolio encompass a wide range of different types of interventions, with a range of
118 stakeholders, working across different areas (including the transport system, educational
119 system, health system and food system). Defining which systems ActEarly targets is
120 therefore challenging, and as such, it has been more useful to think of the impact of ActEarly
121 as something that targets the wider child health policy system of the geographical areas,
122 with individual subsystems (e.g., healthcare) as interlinked parts. It could be argued that the
123 target of ActEarly is a type of 'meta-system' - the wider policy environment in which
124 decisions are made to direct resources to different and often competing causes. ActEarly
125 therefore contributes to the *environment*, or context, in which other systems exist. The
126 implication of this for the design and focus of the meta-evaluation is that the methodology of
127 the evaluation needs to have sufficient flexibility to capture wide ranging and even
128 unexpected changes in the system. Many of these may not be evident in the study design
129 phase and may only be discovered during the evaluation process. This is because in a

130 complex system, it is difficult to foresee the outcome of different elements interacting
131 (interventions, stakeholders, wider political and policy environment).

132 The difficulty of evaluating complex adaptive systems is acknowledged, and as a result the
133 'Evaluation of Programmes in Complex Adaptive Systems' (ENCOMPASS) framework has
134 previously been developed [7]. The ENCOMPASS framework outlines five iterative stages
135 that can be applied to complex public health programmes, such as the ActEarly programme
136 (e.g., from defining system boundaries to measuring programme outcomes) [7].

137 Consequently, the aim of this protocol is to outline how the meta-evaluation of the ActEarly
138 research programme will be conducted, by using and adapting the ENCOMPASS framework
139 to meet the aims and scope of ActEarly.

140 **Methods**

141 **The ENCOMPASS framework**

142 The ActEarly meta-evaluation will follow and adapt the ENCOMPASS-framework [7], that
143 has been developed to guide the evaluation of public health programmes in complex
144 adaptive systems. The ENCOMPASS framework consists of five stages: 1) adopting a
145 system dynamics perspective on the overall evaluation design; 2) defining the system
146 boundaries; 3) understanding the pre-existing system to inform system changes; 4)
147 monitoring dynamic programme output at different system levels; and 5) measuring
148 programme outcome and impact in terms of system changes [7]. How the ENCOMPASS
149 framework will inform the meta-evaluation of the ActEarly programme is described below,
150 but it is important to note that the process of evaluation using this framework is non-linear,
151 that is, stages may be revisited as the process evolves.

152 **Stage 1 - Adopting a system dynamics perspective on the overall** 153 **evaluation design**

154 Stage 1 of the ENCOMPASS-framework involves (a) specifying a logic model, (b) specifying
155 the stages and aims of the evaluation, (c) framing evaluation questions, and (d) forming an
156 evaluation team. The evaluation team has already been formed based on the individual's
157 expertise and knowledge, therefore stages 1a-c will be discussed in this section.

158

159 *Stage 1a. Specifying a logic model*

160 The programme theory of ActEarly was initially developed in the consortium building phase
161 in 2018 and the logic model highlights that, through ActEarly activities (research, data
162 initiatives, citizen science and community engagement) knowledge and evidence will be
163 gathered and lead to increased awareness and perceived relevance in early years health
164 and well-being at the local and national level. Successful initiatives and changes in decision
165 making are proposed to eventually result in reductions in inequalities and non-communicable
166 disease (Fig 1). The idea underpinning the model is that changing any one element within
167 the system is not sufficient to see the desired changes in outcomes, but by enacting systems
168 wide change, the cumulative effect of the programme will lead to measurable impact.

169

170 The initial logic model was developed in 2019 (Fig 1), and revised in 2022 (Fig 2) to highlight
171 the pathways to outcomes and impact the research programme aims to achieve, following a
172 period of implementation and reflection. The consortium has produced a description of the
173 logic model in an audio-visual format [15]. The inputs in the model reflect what was already
174 in place, whereas the activities are what we envisioned ActEarly would contribute to within
175 the system. The two study sites are shown to be similar in terms of some of the wider
176 system context, but start off at different stages in terms of readiness for ActEarly (e.g., there
177 were more planned activities and system wide stakeholder engagement in place in Bradford
178 at the start of the project). Interventions and individual evaluations are intended to increase

179 knowledge, evidence, and awareness and perceived relevance of early life health and well-
180 being, first within the local communities and later across communities. As the project
181 matures, we expect that this may lead to increased influence on policy making. It is
182 anticipated that important feedback loops will exist alongside this main pathway to impact,
183 and that the other ActEarly activities of co-production, citizen science and developing strong
184 linked datasets across both sites will contribute to the impact that the project has.

185

186 The revised logic model was used to develop the questions the meta-evaluation seeks to
187 answer. The core members of the evaluation theme of ActEarly held two online workshops
188 to discuss the model and potential questions, and then sought feedback from the wider team
189 before agreeing on the final set of questions (see Stages 1b and 1c).

190

191 **Fig 1.** ActEarly original logic model

192

193 **Fig 2.** ActEarly revised logic model

194 *Stage 1b. Specifying the stages and aims of the evaluation*

195 The five iterative stages outlined by the ENCOMPASS framework will be used and adapted
196 to define the ActEarly programme's system boundaries, understand the pre-existing and
197 current system ActEarly exists within to inform system changes, monitor the dynamic
198 programme outputs of ActEarly at different system levels and measure ActEarly's outcomes
199 and impact on system changes.

200 *Stage 1c. Framing evaluation questions.*

201 The evaluation questions were based on the intended outputs, outcomes and impacts
202 outlined in the updated ActEarly logic model (Figure 2). The questions were developed to
203 capture if and how these are realised and identify interacting contextual factors. The
204 questions were queried and refined by the ActEarly Evaluation team over the course of
205 several meetings. Drawing on a systems perspective, the evaluation questions that this
206 meta-evaluation will address are:

- 207 1. What major external contextual factors were likely to influence the implementation of
208 ActEarly?
- 209 2. How, and to what extent, was ActEarly implemented as intended?
- 210 a. What effect has ActEarly had on interdisciplinary and prevention research
211 collaboration?
- 212 b. What effect has ActEarly had on interdisciplinary and prevention research
213 capacity?
- 214 c. To what extent has ActEarly improved citizen science and community
215 research capacity and commitment across both study sites (e.g., through
216 extended networks)?
- 217 d. To what extent has ActEarly contributed to system-wide linked local datasets?
- 218 e. Did ActEarly influence local and national decision making and if so, how?

- 219 f. To what extent has the evidence from ActEarly intervention evaluations been
220 acted on? (e.g. investment, disinvestment, continuation)
- 221 g. Was ActEarly able to intigate interventions that will persist beyond the life of
222 the project? If yes, how? If not, why?
- 223 3. Is there any evidence that ActEarly has started to have a meaningful impact on early
224 life health and well-being outcomes?
- 225 a. Have ActEarly intervention evaluations reported any measurable changes in
226 the outcomes included in the public health core outcome sets for early years
227 (COS-EY)?
- 228 b. Are there likely to be any long-term changes in outcomes due to ActEarly
229 activities?

230 **Stage 2 - Defining the system boundaries**

231 The second stage of the ENCOMPASS-framework involves defining the system boundaries
232 to determine what lies 'inside' and 'outside' of the system. This process guides what is and
233 what is not included in the scope of the meta-evaluation based on the programme's purpose
234 and determining who and what is part of the system. To address this, it is important to
235 describe the environment surrounding the evaluation.

236 *Environment surrounding the evaluation*

237 ActEarly takes place within a complex public health policy environment across the two local
238 authority areas of the Bradford District and the Borough of Tower Hamlets in London. While
239 the two areas share similarities in terms of certain population demographics (area level
240 deprivation, health outcomes, ethnic diversity), we describe each site separately and in detail
241 below.

242 Bradford

243 The City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (CBMDC) is the 5th largest metropolitan
244 District in England, with over 540,000 residents [16]. The district is known for its young and
245 diverse population, with 30% of the population aged 19-years or younger and 36% of people
246 from ethnic minorities and over 150 languages spoken [16]. Notably, there is a large
247 population of Pakistani origin in Bradford (20%) [16]. Within the district, there are
248 considerable health inequalities between affluent and deprived areas [17]. Bradford as a
249 district continues to face major challenges and has one of the lowest healthy life
250 expectancies in England, which is predominantly lower than the national average for males
251 and females, particularly in more deprived areas [17]. Half of Bradford residents live in
252 council wards where unemployment is above average [18], and child educational attainment
253 is below regional and national levels, particularly for children who are deemed “persistently
254 disadvantaged (on free school meals for >80% of their school life) [19]. Child poverty is high
255 with 30% of children in absolute low income families (living in households with an income
256 below 60% of median income in some base year) compared to the England average of
257 15.3% [17], and families living in poor housing conditions [20].

258 The district’s local authority, the CBMDC, is a crucial actor in setting the priorities of the early
259 years public health policy system by managing and planning built environments, access to
260 education and skills, as well as providing transport, sport and leisure, public health, welfare,
261 and other support services. Priorities and principles that guide the resource allocation
262 between these areas follow in part from the changes in the priorities of locally elected
263 democratic leaders. Currently, the district’s plans in terms of health and early years policy
264 priorities are set out in the Bradford Council Plan 2021-2025 [21]. Key principles detailed
265 within this plan include embedding prevention and early help across the system, with one
266 key priority being ‘Better Health, Better Lives’ which aims to improve the health and
267 wellbeing for everyone in the district through e.g., the Living Well initiative [21].

268 Supporting the work of the CBMDC is the Bradford Institute for Health Research (BIHR),
269 which was established in 2006 to support evidence-based local decision making. The BIHR
270 houses National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) research centres including the
271 Yorkshire and Humber NIHR Applied Research Collaboration (ARC). With support from the
272 NIHR, BIHR led the Local Authority Research system (LARS) project which explored what a
273 LARS for Bradford might look like [22]. Subsequently, the NIHR Unlocking Data project has
274 started to scope whole-system data linkage for health, education, social care, crime, and
275 housing [23]. In addition, the BIHR houses the Born in Bradford cohort study, tracking the
276 lives of over 30,000 Bradfordians to find out what influences the health and wellbeing of
277 families [24]. All together these initiatives engage over 50,000 Bradford residents in research
278 activities and have led to the ambition of establishing Bradford as a ‘City of Research’. This
279 includes aiming to recruit the world’s biggest community of health research volunteers that
280 through their participation in research activities can support evidence-led policy making [25].
281 As such, the public health policy environment in Bradford can be argued to be characterised
282 by close links between the local authority and researchers, but as of yet, it is unknown if this
283 continued collaboration has resulted in any positive shifts or changes in early years health
284 and well-being outcomes for the residents of the district.

285 Tower Hamlets

286 The Borough of Tower Hamlets is located within London and has 310,300 residents
287 speaking 137 languages [26]. It is the fastest growing population in England, and is home to
288 the largest Bangladeshi population in the country (1 in 3 residents) [26]. Sixty percent of the
289 borough live in the 30% most deprived areas in England, with 4 in 10 households living
290 below the poverty line and 23% of households rely on housing benefits to pay their rent [27].
291 Similar to Bradford, Tower Hamlets faces multiple public health challenges and has the 6th
292 lowest disability free life expectancy in London [28]. At a local authority level, 32% of school

293 children in Tower Hamlets are persistently disadvantaged, and these children are 6-months
294 behind their peers in secondary level GCSE subjects; English and Maths [19].

295 The strategic plan of the Tower Hamlets local authority for 2019-2022 aimed to ensure that
296 children and young people in the borough get the best start in life and realise their potential
297 – this was part of fulfilling the council’s priority of “*people are aspirational, independent and*
298 *have equal access to opportunity*” [29]. Following the change of political administration in
299 May 2022, the Strategic Plan for 2022-2026 sets out amongst its priorities tackling the cost
300 of living crisis (with particular focus on tackling poverty and food insecurity), housing and
301 education [30]. To achieve these aims, the local authority is committed to research informed
302 policy making and has a track record of collaborations and links with higher education
303 partners and the voluntary sector. While the data and community research infrastructure in
304 Tower Hamlets are not as linked up with the local authority as they are in Bradford, there has
305 been an increased effort in recent years to facilitate this e.g., allowing researchers access to
306 routine data to support council decision making, including developing data infrastructure that
307 can support public and population health [30].

308 System boundaries of ActEarly

309 The updated logic model for ActEarly is the result of a co-design process that sought input
310 from researchers across the consortium (see Stage 1a; Figure 2). As such, it is a natural
311 starting point for setting the boundaries for the meta-evaluation. Based on the logic model,
312 we have created criteria for inclusion and exclusion of projects in the meta-evaluation, using
313 the format of a ‘decision tree’ (S1 Fig). Overall, we anticipate that the boundaries of the
314 evaluation are bound to be somewhat fuzzy, as ActEarly targets a whole city environment,
315 and not all interlinked parts can be identified in advance. If we find that our current approach
316 seems to exclude key activities, we will revisit the boundary decisions proposed in this
317 protocol (the decision tree; S1 Fig).

318 *Defining the boundaries of the wider system*

319 The wider systems that ActEarly is operating within, both in Bradford and Tower Hamlets are
320 expansive and the boundaries are particularly hard to identify. Unlike the authors of the
321 ENCOMPASS framework, ActEarly is targeting many parts of the child health system across
322 Bradford and Tower Hamlets, rather than a specific part of it. Part of the challenge comes
323 from 'children's health' or the child health system not being a single clearly definable system,
324 but instead a highly complex, evolving, system-of-systems. Each of those systems-of-
325 systems will have varying significance to the different research projects and interventions.
326 There will also inevitably be overlaps with numerous other systems, such as education.
327 Boundaries between systems are therefore fuzzy and not fixed, and will be set to more of a
328 pragmatic limit.

329 The child health system is therefore a wicked problem, without simple solutions or clear
330 boundaries. Instead it is characterised by trade-offs between different objectives and what is
331 possible, competing interests, incomplete information and so on. Children's health is also
332 highly political, and views will differ as to what is a suitable approach to solving different
333 problems and domains of responsibility may in some cases be disputed.

334 This makes the formation of clear definition system boundaries for ActEarly, that can be
335 applied systematically to determine what is in or out of scope, practically impossible. Instead,
336 what is in or out of scope will be determined more through dialogues with stakeholders
337 around how significant something is to children's health (which will be guided by systems
338 thinking approaches, such as systems mapping), and whether or not the target of
339 investigation is within the two research areas of Bradford or Tower Hamlets. It is also likely
340 that there will be a political dimension to these discussions, centred around if the target of
341 investigation can be effectively influenced by ActEarly and its partners.

342 **Stage 3: Understanding the pre-existing system to inform system** 343 **changes**

344 To answer each of our evaluation questions, the ENCOMPASS framework recommends (a)
345 mapping the pre-existing system in which the ActEarly programme exists, as well as (b)
346 identifying the 'levers of change' within the systems identified (hypothesised to be the
347 ActEarly activities, *e.g.*, *knowledge sharing events, studentships, interventions, evaluations,*
348 *coproduction & citizen science activities, and data infrastructure activities*; see Figure 2).

349 *Stage 3a: Mapping the pre-existing and current system*

350 The work to map the wider child health system in Bradford and Tower Hamlets is ongoing
351 and has consisted of multiple local mapping exercises between 2018-2022, as well as
352 interviews with people working in the system before ActEarly started. Thus, some of this
353 work was conducted prior to the implementation of ActEarly in 2019 (2018), but also during
354 the implementation of ActEarly (2019-2022). This mapping work provides a sense of
355 relationships within ActEarly, and how they are developing through time. The changing
356 relationships between ActEarly and the local communities are also captured through
357 mapping ActEarly projects and their links with individuals and partner organisations. We will
358 use Jessiman et al's [31] systems map of the determinants of child health inequalities in
359 England at the local level as a starting point to develop specific 'child health' maps for
360 Bradford and Tower Hamlets. Following an initial 'proof of concept' exercise to review the
361 existing child health map [31] within the ActEarly team and partners, we will conduct two
362 workshops with key ActEarly stakeholders to consider where ActEarly is operating within the
363 map. This will enable us to overlay ActEarly projects and other activities to highlight the
364 areas that ActEarly is enacting on, whilst highlighting gaps in implementation. Other sources
365 of information that will contribute to the pre-existing system's map include smaller maps that
366 individual ActEarly teams develop, ActEarly project logs and other records of activities to

367 date. Although covering a period of multiple years, this process will create a description of
368 the baseline system, as well as the ActEarly project itself.

369 *Stage 3b: Identifying levers of change*

370 The ActEarly approach assumes that new levers of change in the pre-existing system will be
371 formed following the ActEarly activities: knowledge sharing events, studentships,
372 placements, securing of additional funding, interventions, evaluations, coproduction & citizen
373 science activities, and data infrastructure activities. We envisage, for instance, that the
374 added benefit of ActEarly (over the effect of influential individuals working on their own
375 outside the consortium), could be to join up individuals and information structures across the
376 two local authority areas. In this case, the levers of change would be the act of bringing
377 similar local authority areas together to solve issues that are the same or similar across both
378 sites. The methodological approaches we intend to use to formally evaluate each lever
379 (activity and output) from our logic model is described below under the fourth and fifth stages
380 of the ENCOMPASS-framework which seeks to monitor dynamic programme output at
381 different system levels, and to measure programme output and impact in terms of systems
382 changes.

383 **Stage 4: Monitoring dynamic programme output at different system** 384 **levels**

385 Stage 4 of the ENCOMPASS framework involves capturing data that can be used to monitor
386 the programme. The ActEarly meta-evaluation includes a concurrent triangulation study
387 design where qualitative and quantitative approaches are employed simultaneously [32].
388 ActEarly's evaluation will not only assess the reported impacts of ActEarly interventions, but
389 seek to evaluate the formation, outputs, and impact of transdisciplinary collaborations. To
390 achieve this, we will employ theory-based approaches to articulate if and how ActEarly is
391 working to deliver change. This approach will further investigate whether, why or how

392 ActEarly contributes to changes in the policy system, and whether alternative explanations
393 can be ruled out. In addition to interviews and document analysis, we will employ ripple
394 effects [33] and systems mapping [31] techniques to support the systematic analysis of
395 multiple interventions. Details of the approach we will use to address each evaluation
396 question (1, 2a-g, 3a-b) is displayed in Table 1 and discussed in further detail in the
397 ‘Methods and analyses in depth’ section.

398 Unlike conventional approaches, we will remain open to adjusting analytical approaches until
399 closer to the end of the ActEarly project, when it is clearer what the individual projects,
400 operating as part of ActEarly, have conducted in terms of evaluations. For evaluation of
401 primary quantitative data (e.g. from meta-evaluation surveys), a predetermined analysis plan
402 will be developed prior to reviewing the data.

403 A combination of data sources will be used to answer multiple questions (Stage 1c),
404 including primary data that are collected for the meta-evaluation (e.g., consortium surveys
405 and interviews), and data that are routinely collected by interventions, services or
406 governments. Other methods will use secondary data sources from individual ActEarly
407 projects, such as project protocols, reports, and published manuscripts. We may also utilise
408 more unofficial source materials such as meeting notes. For question 2a, routine data
409 collected across the two study sites will enable us to visualise patterns in key outcomes.

410

411

412

Table 1. ActEarly meta-evaluation questions and their corresponding data collection and analytical approaches

Evaluation question	Participants	Data sources	Indicative analytical approach	Timeline
<i>Question 1 -What major external contextual factors were likely to influence the implementation of ActEarly?</i>	Local authority representatives, consortium members & leadership	Stakeholder & consortium surveys and interviews; ActEarly documents (meeting minutes, existing evaluations, reports).	Qualitative thematic analysis	Autumn 2018, Autumn 2021, Autumn 2023
<i>Question 2a - What effect has ActEarly had on interdisciplinary and prevention research collaboration?</i>	Consortium members & leadership	Stakeholder & consortium surveys and interviews; ActEarly documents (meeting minutes, existing evaluations, reports).	Systems mapping, qualitative thematic analysis, documentary analysis	Autumn 2018, Autumn 2021, Autumn 2023
<i>Question 2b - What effect has ActEarly had on interdisciplinary and prevention research</i>	Consortium members & leadership	Stakeholder & consortium surveys and interviews, ActEarly documents (meeting minutes, existing evaluations, reports).	Systems mapping, qualitative thematic analysis, documentary analysis	Autumn 2018, Autumn 2021, Autumn 2023

capacity building?

Question 2c - <i>To what extent has ActEarly improved citizen science and community research capacity and commitment across both study sites (e.g., through extended networks)?</i>	Local authority representatives, community representatives, consortium members and leadership	Stakeholder & consortium surveys and interview/focus groups.	Qualitative thematic analysis	Autumn 2018, Autumn 2021, Autumn 2023
--	---	--	-------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Question 2d - <i>To what extent has ActEarly contributed to system-wide linked local datasets?</i>	Local authority representatives, consortium members & leadership	Stakeholder & consortium surveys and interviews, ActEarly documents (meeting minutes, existing evaluations, reports)	Qualitative thematic synthesis, documentary analysis	Spring 2024
---	--	--	--	-------------

Question 2e. <i>Did ActEarly influence local and national decision</i>	Local authority representatives, consortium members &	Ripple effects mapping, stakeholder & consortium interviews/focus groups	Qualitative thematic analysis	Autumn 2023 - Spring 2024
---	---	--	-------------------------------	---------------------------

<i>making and if so, how?</i>	leadership			
Questions 2f. <i>To what extent has the evidence from ActEarly intervention evaluations been acted on? (e.g., investment, disinvestment, continuation)</i>	Local authority representatives, consortium leadership	Stakeholder & consortium interviews/focus groups	Qualitative thematic analysis	Autumn 2018, Autumn 2021, Autumn 2023
Question 2g. <i>Was ActEarly able to instigate interventions that will persist beyond the life of the project? If yes, how? If not, why?</i>	Local authority representatives	Stakeholder & consortium interviews/focus groups	Qualitative thematic analysis	Autumn 2023 - Spring 2024
Question 3a - <i>Have ActEarly intervention evaluations reported any measurable</i>	NA	Data from interventions; routine data (e.g., Connected Bradford)	Natural- & quasi-experimental evaluations; data visualisations	Continuous

changes in the outcomes included in the public health core outcome sets for early years (COS-EY)?

<p>Question 3b - What are the potential long-term benefits of <i>cross-sectoral action to improve childhood circumstances and outcomes in Bradford and Tower Hamlets?</i></p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>Stakeholder consultation; administrative and survey data on current childhood demographics, socioeconomic circumstances and educational and health outcomes in Bradford and Tower Hamlets; and numerous other data sources to parameterise LifeSim (in particular, Millennium Cohort Study but also others)</p>	<p>Quantitative: Long-term modelling (LifeSim) Continuous</p>
--	-----------	--	---

415 *Methods and analyses in depth*

416 **Qualitative methods**

417 Qualitative methods will be used to address eight of the meta-evaluation questions (1, 2a-g),
418 either in part or exclusively. This is because one of our central aims is to understand the
419 context of the system in which ActEarly interventions take place and the context specific
420 impact of those interventions on the system. Thus, qualitative methods are most suitable for
421 this exploratory and interpretative work and will use the following approaches.

422 *Interviews and Focus Groups*

423 Interviews and focus groups will be conducted in Autumn 2023 with stakeholders including
424 local authority and consortium members as well as community members within Bradford and
425 Tower Hamlets ($n =$ approx 40). Most participants will be purposively sampled through our
426 existing systems network mapping, which identifies individuals most connected within
427 ActEarly. We will also purposively sample those who are less connected with ActEarly to
428 understand the limits of ActEarly's reach and why some members of the consortia are less
429 involved. This work has already begun in part through the 'Research on Research' element
430 of ActEarly, where interviews have been conducted with consortium members at two time
431 points, before the project began in 2018 ($n =$ 15) and at the mid-way point in 2021 ($n =$ 20).
432 The last Research on Research data collection point will be combined with the wider meta-
433 evaluation interview/focus group study and conducted in Autumn 2023 (n of researchers=
434 approx 20). The co-production team will identify members of the community who have been
435 involved with ActEarly interventions and an appropriate sample will be invited to participate
436 in an interview or focus group. Longitudinal interview and focus group data will be analysed
437 inductively through thematic analysis [34].

438 *Documentary Analysis and Meeting Observations*

439 We will conduct documentary analysis of selected ActEarly board and executive meetings
440 and publicly available local authority meeting minutes ($n =$ approx 20) between 2018-2024,

441 in addition to capturing meetings through observations and reflective notes. We will also
442 analyse the ActEarly annual reports ($n=4$). Documents and notes will be compiled and
443 analysed thematically. The findings will be triangulated with data from the interviews and
444 focus groups in order to validate, refute, elucidate, or expand on findings across other data
445 sources.

446 *Ripple Effects Mapping*

447 Ripple Effects Mapping (REM) can capture the wider impacts, and adaptive nature, of a
448 systems approach [33]. It is a participatory method and will involve consortia members and
449 other stakeholders in data gathering workshops. REM was chosen as a method because it is
450 concerned with understanding contribution rather than attribution, and we are seeking to
451 explore how a set of ActEarly interventions contributes towards changing an outcome or a
452 system [33]. Approximately 2-5 workshops will be conducted towards the end of the ActEarly
453 programme (2023/24). The aim of these workshops will be to create a visual output of
454 ActEarly activities and interventions along a timeline, helping us to understand unintended
455 and interlinking impacts of interventions [33]. Each workshop will be made up of around 20
456 participants, purposely sampled using the systems mapping network. We will use an
457 adapted version of REM proposed by Nobles et al. [33] as a guide, and analyse the
458 workshop's materials through a content analysis.

459 **Quantitative Methods**

460 *Systems mapping*

461 A number of system mapping activities have been undertaken with more planned. Relatively
462 detailed (at the level of interactions between individuals and organisations etc.) maps of the
463 ActEarly project itself have been developed to understand the relationships between parts of
464 ActEarly, and how these relationships have developed through time. This includes
465 relationships, such as connections between people and organisations, across the different
466 themes. Ongoing work is also being done to map the relationships between ActEarly and

467 other child health focused projects in the two areas. These maps also include links to other
468 organisations, such as the third sector and local government.

469 As part of the qualitative surveying of ActEarly members we have also produced a project
470 social network built from an individual's self-reported interactions with fellow project
471 members over time, an exercise that will be repeated again during the project (see Table 1
472 for timelines).

473 These project system maps will be analysed in conjunction with maps developed from larger
474 children's health systems to develop a higher-level view of where ActEarly is interacting
475 within the children's health system at the two research sites, Bradford, and Tower Hamlets.
476 We envision that these maps will allow us to develop a consensus with regards to
477 boundaries and domains, that is derived from the existing literature, resulting in a meta-
478 system map of children's health that provides information (locally) about how ActEarly
479 interventions interact with children's health more broadly. This work is underway and will be
480 reported on in due course elsewhere. Once completed network analysis methods will be
481 applied to the systems maps as part of our mixed methods approach. Such as, community
482 detection and core-periphery analysis to look for important sub-nets or produce clusters of
483 areas with increased network density, and centrality measures to understand the relative
484 importance of nodes.

485 *Natural- & quasi-experimental evaluations*

486 We will gather and synthesise information and data from individual ActEarly projects,
487 including those with planned randomised controlled designs (e.g. JU:MP; [35]), quasi-
488 experimental evaluations (e.g. BiB Breathes; [36]) and those with 'pre-post' evaluations to
489 respond to question 3a. Quasi-experimental designs are utilised when it is not possible to
490 randomise individuals/groups due to ethical, political, or logistical constraints [37]. Taken
491 with a rigorous approach, quasi-experimental research designs can test causal hypotheses.
492 Where a randomised controlled trial (RCT) includes a control arm in its design, quasi-

493 experimental designs identify a suitable comparison group to capture what would have been
494 the outcome had the intervention not taken place (i.e. the counterfactual), such as through
495 propensity score matching or regression discontinuity. When data allows, and
496 implementation of an intervention occurs at a defined point in time, an interrupted time series
497 design could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of population-level interventions. This
498 approach is utilised by the NIHR “BiB Breathes” project [36] which will evaluate the impact of
499 the introduction of a Clean Air Zone on health outcomes and could be applied to assess the
500 trend and change in selected outcomes (e.g. childhood obesity) from Connected Bradford
501 data prior to and after the introduction of the ActEarly programme (Connected Bradford is
502 discussed below in the section ‘data visualisations’).

503 *Data visualisations*

504 Connected Bradford links anonymous routine data across primary and secondary care with
505 local authority social care and education datasets from the Department for Education [38]. A
506 scoping exercise to identify the most appropriate datasets and variables is currently being
507 carried out for the final core outcome sets for early years (COS-EY). Analysts will use
508 secure, effective and efficient data visualisation to display actionable insights for local
509 citizens, practitioners, commissioners and policy makers. Google Data/Looker Studio is
510 already employed by analysts curating Connected Bradford datasets and is the most likely
511 tool to be used for visualisations of the core outcomes as it links directly to the collected
512 datasets. Interactive dashboards that can be filtered and sliced by demographics such as
513 sex, ethnicity, and age at diagnosis and/or data collection date/record will be accessible.

514 Using timestamps on data collection, extraction or diagnosis dates and where suitable,
515 trends over specific time periods will be displayed. Previous examples of data visualisations
516 using related datasets include bar and line charts, data tables with filters, Radial Sets and
517 linkage to Google Maps ‘heat maps’ by linking to lower-layer super output areas (LSOA),
518 middle-layer super output areas (MSOA) and partial postcode information. Developers of the

519 dashboard(s) also plan to overlay additional relevant information on dashboards, with text
520 boxes and labels. This will be discussed with the relevant theme leads and researchers. It is
521 possible that more definitive and direct conclusions could be afforded space in future, as well
522 as survey or data results related to the core outcomes.

523 *LifeSim*

524 LifeSim is a computer microsimulation model that models developmental, economic, social,
525 and health outcomes [39], and will be used to address question 3b of the meta-evaluation.
526 The long-term benefits, and public costs of a range of different potential short-term
527 improvements in childhood circumstances and outcomes will be extrapolated, with policy
528 scenarios agreed in consultation with stakeholders. Two linked dynamic microsimulation
529 models will be used: LifeSim Childhood, which models outcomes and costs from age 0 to 17
530 years, and LifeSim Adulthood, which models outcomes and costs from age >17 years.
531 Details of the LifeSim Adulthood model have been published elsewhere [39] and the
532 development of LifeSim Childhood, using high-quality longitudinal data from the UK
533 Millennium Cohort Study, is underway. We will undertake stakeholder consultation to agree
534 suitable “what if” scenarios about potential improvements to a core set of childhood financial,
535 educational and health disadvantages (what specific disadvantage measures and what
536 potential improvement ranges). We will use administrative and survey data to describe the
537 current demographic situation in Bradford and Tower Hamlets in terms of these childhood
538 disadvantages. We will then use LifeSim Childhood and LifeSim Adulthood to predict the
539 long-term benefits and cost savings of the various policy improvement scenarios.

540 **Data integration**

541 Quantitative and qualitative data will be summarised using the aforementioned methods
542 (e.g., thematic analysis, REMs, systems mapping, data visualisations, LifeSim), and
543 descriptive statistics will be conducted where appropriate (quantitative data). This will
544 provide preliminary insights into the quantitative and qualitative findings independently, and

545 inform further analyses where appropriate. Quantitative and qualitative findings will be
546 integrated and synthesised by establishing ‘context-mechanism-outcome (CMO)
547 configurations’ to understand what works, when, how and in what context [40]. Context-
548 mechanisms-outcome configurations will provide a theoretical understanding of how
549 ActEarly outcomes (O) emerge as a result of a mechanism(s) of action (M), which is/are only
550 present in certain contexts (C) [40]. CMO configurations are informed by realist
551 methodology, and although may be considered linear in nature, they have been used to
552 summarise complex findings arising from whole-systems interventions [35, 41], and align
553 with the current meta-evaluation’s overarching aim of identifying interacting contextual
554 factors within the ActEarly’s child health system. Approaches utilised in previous research,
555 including evaluations of whole system interventions [35, 42], will inform the methodology
556 used in the current meta-evaluation. The current ActEarly logic model (Figure 2) outlines the
557 hypothesised ways in which ActEarly will create change and will be used as a reference
558 point when developing the CMO configurations. An iterative approach will be used between
559 the qualitative and quantitative data and the ActEarly logic model to establish the CMO
560 configurations and consider how the ActEarly logic model can be developed into an
561 evidence-informed programme theory [42]. Such programme theory can be used to inform
562 future work by considering the transferability of the ActEarly programme into other contexts
563 and cities.

564 *Ethical approval*

565 The studies that form a part of the meta-evaluation have all gained ethical approval from the
566 relevant institutional ethics boards. We have ethical approval from the UCL Research Ethics
567 Committee for the longitudinal ActEarly Research on Research Study (2037/004) which
568 encompasses the majority of planned meta-evaluation data collection. We are currently
569 seeking an amendment from the UCL Research Ethics Committee to expand the scope of
570 the longitudinal study.

571 **Stage 5: Measuring programme outcome and impact in terms of** 572 **system changes**

573 Stage 5 of the ENCOMPASS framework involves understanding the programme's outcomes
574 and impact. Following from Stage 4, the analytical strategies employed to monitor dynamic
575 programme output will be expanded to measure programme outcomes and impact in terms
576 of system changes. The answers and analysis for each 'sub' evaluation question will form a
577 part of the wider answer to our overall evaluation questions of:

- 578 1) What major external contextual factors influenced the implementation of ActEarly?
- 579 2) How, and to what extent was ActEarly implemented as intended?
- 580 3) Is there any evidence that ActEarly has started to have a meaningful impact on early
581 life health and well-being outcomes?

582 We will synthesise the information and insights gained from the analysis of the data for each
583 of the questions, to understand the impact of ActEarly on the child health system in Bradford
584 and Tower Hamlets.

585 **Discussion**

586 This meta-evaluation protocol presents our plans of using and adapting the ENCOMPASS-
587 framework to evaluate the system-wide impact of the early life health and well-being
588 programme, ActEarly. The ENCOMPASS framework in its original form was focused on
589 capturing changes in one system, while ActEarly operates across multiple systems and
590 therefore has an additional level of complexity. We anticipate that the process of defining
591 what is and what is not ActEarly (and what will and what will not be included in the final
592 evaluation) will be challenging. As we are not proposing an effectiveness evaluation, we will
593 not be able to say with certainty whether ActEarly has had a measurable impact on the child
594 health system. However, our approach will allow us to map and explore the context,
595 mechanisms and outcomes of implementation of a large system change intervention in order

596 to estimate whether such implementation is able to enact systems change towards a tipping
597 point (where ActEarly processes/intervention/collaborations continue to function
598 independently of the ActEarly programme). It is possible that the boundaries we have
599 defined could be contested and that imposing different system boundaries might result in
600 different findings. Instead, it may be that our contribution will be adding to the overall
601 understanding of how systems evaluations can (or cannot) be conducted and in identifying
602 broader challenges in moving complex systems evaluations in public health from theory to
603 practice.

604 This protocol has re-emphasised the non-linear nature of system evaluation work, and
605 compared to a more traditional model, many of the practicalities and methodological choices
606 that will need to be made are not as clearly laid out if compared to other designs (e.g., the
607 evaluation protocol of a trial). This protocol aimed to describe the steps we plan to take to
608 describe the existing system, the methods we will use and have used to define system
609 boundaries and evaluation questions, and finally, detail some of the analytical approaches
610 we think will be relevant in addressing those questions at this stage of the project. Due to the
611 collaborative nature of the work, we reserve the option to change and query these choices
612 based on feedback we receive from stakeholders to ensure that our evaluation remains
613 relevant and fit for purpose.

614 For the meta-evaluation of ActEarly, the challenge will be to both assess whether there is
615 evidence of change in the system, but also, whether we think we identified the correct levers
616 of change. As with all research interventions (particularly of this scale), ActEarly is *part* of the
617 system it seeks to measure and intervene in, and will without question change those
618 systems. The difficulty comes when we want to understand and attribute changes in a
619 system to specific interventions. This remains a key challenge of complex systems work.

620 *Limitations*

621 A major challenge and limitation for the evaluation of ActEarly is the overlapping timeline
622 between the COVID-19 pandemic and the project. We already know that the context in

623 which the programme takes place has undergone major and unexpected changes since the
624 project started in 2019, but we do not know if, how and to what extent the system adapted,
625 and whether there is scope to draw apart any impact of ActEarly from the impact of the
626 pandemic.

627 The baseline data for defining the ActEarly system and its boundaries was collected over
628 several years (2018-2022) instead of a single time point. This is in part a result of the nature
629 of the project where new themes were added to the scope until 2021, and where new
630 projects continue to take shape today. Similarly, there have been important changes in terms
631 of key staff and institutions involved in the research, and as such, it is difficult to define what
632 timepoints should be defined as 'baseline'. Boundaries and the remit of ActEarly were not
633 clearly defined at the start of the project either, and debates regarding what is and what is
634 not 'ActEarly' continue at time of writing. This could be seen as inevitable for a large public
635 health programme that seeks to have a positive impact across a 'whole system', but in terms
636 of the evaluation of the program, poses major conceptual and practical challenges that we
637 will need to navigate going forward. So far, one of the consequences of the lack of clarity on
638 the programme boundaries has meant that detailed and precise plans for evaluation
639 (including the meta-evaluation questions) have had to be developed alongside the program,
640 not in advance. We acknowledge that this could potentially introduce bias in how and what
641 we evaluate because we already know some of the things that have/have not happened. To
642 mediate this risk, we believe special care needs to be taken to ensure that we continue to
643 question and reflect on our evaluation choices (incl. setting the boundaries for the
644 evaluation) as these strongly influence what will get reported and what will not. The useful
645 list of questions proposed by Williams [43], will act as the starting point for this process.

646 **Conclusion**

647 The ActEarly meta-evaluation protocol proposes a mixed method systems evaluation of
648 ActEarly, a large public health research programme focusing on early life health and well-

649 being across Bradford and the Borough of Tower Hamlets (London). The recently published
650 ENCOMPASS-framework was used as a guide to structure the proposed evaluation, with
651 some modifications. Due to the non-linear nature of the process, we anticipate that one or
652 more amendments to this protocol will be published in due course to describe the process
653 through which our evaluation plans and methods are developing alongside the project itself.

654 **References**

- 655 1. Adjei NK, Schlüter DK, Straatmann VS, Melis G, Fleming KM, McGovern R, Howard
656 LM, Kaner E, Wolfe I, Taylor-Robinson DC. Impact of poverty and family adversity on
657 adolescent health: a multi-trajectory analysis using the UK Millennium Cohort Study.
658 The Lancet Regional Health-Europe. 2022; 13: 100279. doi:
659 [10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100279](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100279)
- 660 2. Taylor-Robinson D, Lai ET, Wickham S, Rose T, Norman P, Bamba C, Whitehead
661 M, Barr B. Assessing the impact of rising child poverty on the unprecedented rise in
662 infant mortality in England, 2000–2017: time trend analysis. BMJ Open. 2019; 9(10):
663 e029424. doi: [10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029424](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029424)
- 664 3. Barr B, Higgerson J, Whitehead M. Investigating the impact of the English health
665 inequalities strategy: time trend analysis. BMJ. 2017; 26 (358): 2-8. doi:
666 [10.1136/bmj.j3310](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j3310)
- 667 4. Thomson K, Hillier-Brown F, Todd A, McNamara C, Huijts T, Bamba C. The effects
668 of public health policies on health inequalities in high-income countries: an umbrella
669 review. BMC Public Health. 2018; 18(1): 1-21. doi: [10.1186/s12889-018-5677-1](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-5677-1)
- 670 5. McGowan VJ, Buckner S, Mead R, McGill E, Ronzi S, Beyer F, Bamba C.
671 Examining the effectiveness of place-based interventions to improve public health
672 and reduce health inequalities: an umbrella review. BMC Public Health. 2021; 21(1):

- 673 1-7. doi: [10.1186/s12889-021-11852-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-021-11852-z)
- 674 6. Wright J, Hayward AC, West J, Pickett K, McEachan RM, Mon-Williams M, et al.
675 ActEarly: A City Collaboratory approach to early promotion of good health and
676 wellbeing. Wellcome Open Res. 2019; 4. doi: [10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15443.1](https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15443.1)
- 677 7. Pinzon L, Behav IJ, Phys N, Pinzon AL, Stronks K, Dijkstra C, et al. The
678 ENCOMPASS framework: a practical guide for the evaluation of public health
679 programmes in complex adaptive systems. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act. 2022; 19(1):
680 1–17. doi: [10.1186/s12966-022-01267-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12966-022-01267-3)
- 681 8. Lockyer B, Islam S, Rahman A, Dickerson J, Pickett K, Sheldon T, et al.
682 Understanding COVID-19 misinformation and vaccine hesitancy in context: Findings
683 from a qualitative study involving citizens in Bradford, UK. Heal Expect. 2021; 24(11):
684 58–67. doi: [10.1111/hex.13240](https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13240)
- 685 9. McEachan RRC, Dickerson J, Bridges S, Bryant M, Cartwright C, Islam S, et al. The
686 Born in Bradford COVID-19 Research Study: Protocol for an adaptive mixed methods
687 research study to gather actionable intelligence on the impact of COVID-19 on health
688 inequalities amongst families living in Bradford. Wellcome Open Res. 2020; 5:1–19.
689 doi: [10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16129.1](https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16129.1)
- 690 10. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, Boyd KA,
691 Craig N, French DP, McIntosh E, Petticrew M. A new framework for developing and
692 evaluating complex interventions: update of Medical Research Council guidance.
693 BMJ. 2021; 30: 374. doi: [10.1136/bmj.n2061](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n2061)
- 694 11. Léveillé S, Chamberland C. Toward a general model for child welfare and protection
695 services: A meta-evaluation of international experiences regarding the adoption of
696 the Framework for the Assessment of Children in Need and Their Families (FACNF).
697 Children and Youth Services Review. 2010; 32(7): 929-44. doi:

- 698 [10.1016/j.childyouth.2010.03.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2010.03.009)
- 699 12. Skivington K, Matthews L, Simpson SA, Craig P, Baird J, Blazeby JM, Boyd KA,
700 Craig N, French DP, McIntosh E, Petticrew M. Framework for the development and
701 evaluation of complex interventions: gap analysis, workshop and consultation-
702 informed update. *Health Technol Assess.* 2021; 25(57): 1-132. doi:
703 [10.3310/hta25570](https://doi.org/10.3310/hta25570)
- 704 13. CECAN. The Complexity Evaluation Toolkit [Internet]. 2021. Version 1.0. Available
705 from: www.cecan.ac.uk
- 706 14. McGill E, Marks D, Vanessa E, Penney T, Petticrew M, Egan M. Qualitative process
707 evaluation from a complex systems perspective: A systematic review and framework
708 for public health evaluators. *PLoS Med.* 2020; 17: 1- 27. doi:
709 [10.1371/journal.pmed.1003368](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003368)
- 710 15. ActEarly. Evaluation Group [Internet]. 2022. Available from:
711 <https://actearly.org.uk/projects/evaluation-group/>
- 712 16. City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council. Population Report 2021 Census,
713 Intelligence Bulletin: Population [Internet]. 2021. Available from:
714 <https://ubd.bradford.gov.uk/about-us/2021-census/>
- 715 17. City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council. Understanding Bradford District,
716 Intelligence Bulletin: Health and Life Expectancy [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
717 <https://ubd.bradford.gov.uk/about-us/health-and-life-expectancy/>
- 718 18. City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council. Understanding Bradford District,
719 Intelligence Bulletin: Poverty and Deprivation [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
720 <https://ubd.bradford.gov.uk/media/1580/poverty-and-deprivation-jan-2020-update.pdf>.
- 721 19. Department for Education. GCSE results (Attainment 8) [Internet]. 2022. Available

- 722 from: <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/education-skills-and->
723 [training/11-to-16-years-old/gcse-results-attainment-8-for-children-aged-14-to-16-key-](https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/education-skills-and-training/11-to-16-years-old/gcse-results-attainment-8-for-children-aged-14-to-16-key-stage-4/latest#download-the-data)
724 [stage-4/latest#download-the-data](https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/education-skills-and-training/11-to-16-years-old/gcse-results-attainment-8-for-children-aged-14-to-16-key-stage-4/latest#download-the-data)
- 725 20. Boxer D. From inequality to opportunity: a plan for recovery and growth [Internet].
726 2021. Available from: [https://www.bdct.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Item-](https://www.bdct.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Item-22.0-Born-In-Bradford-From-Inequality-to-Opportunity-DRAFT-v2.0.pdf)
727 [22.0-Born-In-Bradford-From-Inequality-to-Opportunity-DRAFT-v2.0.pdf](https://www.bdct.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Item-22.0-Born-In-Bradford-From-Inequality-to-Opportunity-DRAFT-v2.0.pdf)
- 728 21. City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council. Bradford Council Plan Priorities and
729 Principles 2021-2025 [Internet]. 2021. Available from:
730 <https://www.bradford.gov.uk/media/6508/bradfordcouncilplan.pdf>.
- 731 22. Wright J, West J, Bridges S, Cartwright C, Ciesla K, Pickett K, Shore R, Muckle S,
732 Witcherley P, Flinders M, McEachan R. A local authority research system (LARS) for
733 Bradford [Internet]. 2020. Available from: [https://actearly.org.uk/wp-](https://actearly.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Appendix-D-Report-version-for-our-local-partners.pdf)
734 [content/uploads/2020/12/Appendix-D-Report-version-for-our-local-partners.pdf](https://actearly.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Appendix-D-Report-version-for-our-local-partners.pdf)
- 735 23. National Institute for Health and Care Research, Applied Research Collaboration
736 Yorkshire and Humber. Unlocking Data for Inform Public Health Policy and Practice
737 [Internet]. 2022. Available from: [https://www.arc-yh.nihr.ac.uk/what-we-do/health-](https://www.arc-yh.nihr.ac.uk/what-we-do/health-economics/unlocking-data-project)
738 [economics/unlocking-data-project](https://www.arc-yh.nihr.ac.uk/what-we-do/health-economics/unlocking-data-project)
- 739 24. Wright J, Small N, Raynor P, Tuffnell D, Bhopal R, Cameron N, Fairley L, Lawlor DA,
740 Parslow R, Petherick ES, Pickett KE. Cohort profile: the Born in Bradford multi-ethnic
741 family cohort study. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2013; 42(4): 978-91. doi:
742 [10.1093/ije/dys112](https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dys112)
- 743 25. National Institute for Health and Care Research, Clinical Research Network
744 Yorkshire and Humber. City of Research [Internet]. 2022. Available from:
745 <https://cityofresearch.org/>

- 746 26. Tower Hamlets Council. Population [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
747 [https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/community_and_living/borough_statistics/Boro](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/community_and_living/borough_statistics/Borough_profile.aspx)
748 [ugh_profile.aspx](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/community_and_living/borough_statistics/Borough_profile.aspx)
- 749 27. Tower Hamlets Council. Poverty [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
750 [https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/community_and_living/borough_statistics/Boro](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/community_and_living/borough_statistics/Borough_profile.aspx)
751 [ugh_profile.aspx](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/community_and_living/borough_statistics/Borough_profile.aspx)
- 752 28. Tower Hamlets Council. Health [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
753 [https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/community_and_living/borough_statistics/Boro](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/community_and_living/borough_statistics/Borough_profile.aspx)
754 [ugh_profile.aspx](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgnl/community_and_living/borough_statistics/Borough_profile.aspx)
- 755 29. Tower Hamlets. Tower Hamlets Strategic Plan 2019-2022 [Internet]. 2019. Available
756 from: [https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/Documents/Strategy-and-](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/Documents/Strategy-and-performance/TH_Strategic_Plan.pdf)
757 [performance/TH_Strategic_Plan.pdf](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/Documents/Strategy-and-performance/TH_Strategic_Plan.pdf)
- 758 30. Tower Hamlets. Tower Hamlets Strategic Plan 2022-2026 [Internet]. 2022. Available
759 from: [https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/Documents/Strategy-and-](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/Documents/Strategy-and-performance/Tower-Hamlets-Council-Strategic-Plan-2022-2026.pdf)
760 [performance/Tower-Hamlets-Council-Strategic-Plan-2022-2026.pdf](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/Documents/Strategy-and-performance/Tower-Hamlets-Council-Strategic-Plan-2022-2026.pdf)
- 761 31. Jessiman PE, Powell K, Williams P, Fairbrother H, Crowder M, Williams JG, Kipping
762 R. A systems map of the determinants of child health inequalities in England at the
763 local level. PLoS One. 2021;16(2): e0245577. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0245577
- 764 32. Castro FG, Kellison JG, Boyd SJ, Kopak A. A methodology for conducting integrative
765 mixed methods research and data analyses. Journal of Mixed Methods Research.
766 2010; 4(4): 342-60. doi: 10.1177/1558689810382916
- 767 33. Nobles J, Wheeler J, Dunleavy-Harris K, Holmes R, Inman-Ward A, Potts A, Hall J,
768 Redwood S, Jago R, Foster C. Ripple effects mapping: capturing the wider impacts
769 of systems change efforts in public health. BMC Medical Research Methodology.


- 770 2022; 22(1): 1-4. doi: 10.1186/s12874-022-01570-4
- 771 34. Braun V, Clarke V. Thematic analysis. American Psychological Association
772 handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs:
773 Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological. 2012; 57–71. doi:
774 10.1037/13620-004
- 775 35. Hall J, Bingham DD, Seims A, Dogra SA, Burkhardt J, Nobles J, McKenna J, Bryant
776 M, Barber SE, Daly-Smith A. A whole system approach to increasing children’s
777 physical activity in a multi-ethnic UK city: a process evaluation protocol. BMC Public
778 Health. 2021; 21(1): 1-6. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-12514-4>
- 779 36. National Institute for Health and Care Research. Born in Bradford’s BiB Breathes
780 project is a breath of fresh air for the city [Internet]. 2022. Available from:
781 [https://www.arc-yh.nihr.ac.uk/news-events-and-media/blogs/bib-breathes-for-fresh-](https://www.arc-yh.nihr.ac.uk/news-events-and-media/blogs/bib-breathes-for-fresh-air)
782 [air](https://www.arc-yh.nihr.ac.uk/news-events-and-media/blogs/bib-breathes-for-fresh-air)
- 783 37. Thyer BA. Quasi-experimental research designs. Oxford University Press. 2012.
- 784 38. Sohal K, Mason D, Birkinshaw J, West J, McEachan RR, Elshehaly M, Cooper D,
785 Shore R, McCooe M, Lawton T, Mon-Williams M. Connected Bradford: a Whole
786 System Data Linkage Accelerator. Wellcome Open Research. 2022; 7(26): 26. doi:
787 [10.12688/wellcomeopenres.17526.2](https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.17526.2)
- 788 39. Skarda I, Asaria M, Cookson R. LifeSim: a lifecourse dynamic microsimulation model
789 of the Millennium birth cohort in England. International Journal of Microsimulation.
790 2021; 14(1): 2-42. doi: [10.1101/2021.02.12.21251642](https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.12.21251642)
- 791 40. Fletcher, A., Jamal, F., Moore, G., Evans, R.E., Murphy, S. and Bonell, C. Realist
792 complex intervention science: applying realist principles across all phases of the
793 Medical Research Council framework for developing and evaluating complex

794 interventions. Evaluation. 2016; 22(3): 286-303. doi: [10.1177/1356389016652743](https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389016652743)


795 41. Warren E, Melendez-Torres GJ, Viner R, Bonell C. Using qualitative research to
796 explore intervention mechanisms: findings from the trial of the Learning Together
797 whole-school health intervention. Trials. 2020; 21(1): 1-4.
798 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-020-04688-2>

799 42. Flynn R, Rotter T, Hartfield D, Newton AS, Scott SD. A realist evaluation to identify
800 contexts and mechanisms that enabled and hindered implementation and had an
801 effect on sustainability of a lean intervention in pediatric healthcare. BMC Health
802 Services Research. 2019; 19(1): 1-2. doi: [10.1186/s12913-019-4744-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4744-3)

803 43. Williams B. Prosaic or profound? The adoption of systems ideas by impact
804 evaluation. IDS Bulletin. 2015; 46(1): 7-16. doi: [10.1111/1759-5436.12117](https://doi.org/10.1111/1759-5436.12117)



Figure



Figure