

1 **Barriers and opportunities relating to the implementation and evaluation of a complex digital**
2 **intervention in England: A case study of Greater Manchester Diabetes My Way**
3
4

5
6
7 Author Information:
8

9 Joanna Goldthorpe*¹ (ORCID: 0000-0001-7839-7544), Tommy Allen^{2,3} (ORCID: 0000-0002-
10 2972-7911), Martin K Rutter ^{4,5}, (ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6380-539X), Joanna Brooks¹
11 (ORCID ID: 0000-0003-0220-9847).
12

13 ¹University of Manchester, Manchester Centre for Health Psychology, Division of Health
14 Sciences, Manchester, UK
15

16 ²Manchester Centre for Health Economics, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK;
17

18 ³Danish Centre for Health Economics, University of Southern Denmark, Denmark
19

20 ⁴NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK; University of Manchester, Division of Diabetes,
21 Endocrinology and Gastroenterology,
22

23 ⁵School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of
24 Manchester, Manchester, UK.
25

26 *Corresponding author: joanna.goldthorpe@manchester.ac.uk
27
28

29 **Author Contribution**

30 Conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, project administration and
31 original draft preparation were performed by Joanna Goldthorpe; conceptualisation, formal
32 analysis, investigation, methodology and original draft preparation were performed by
33 Joanna Brooks; conceptualisation, validation, review and editing were performed by Thomas
34 Allen; funding acquisition, conceptualisation, validation, review and editing were performed
35 by Martin Rutter.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Abstract**

47 Introduction: Digital diabetes management systems have the potential to deliver cost-
48 effective, flexible self-management support to patients with type 2 diabetes. DiabetesMyWay
49 (DMW) is a platform for an open access website that aims to support diabetes self-
50 management and provide patients with access to their care records. We present a case
51 study focusing on a project involving patients across the large urban area of Greater
52 Manchester (GM).

53
54 Methods: Interviews were undertaken with 8 members of the project team and 3 patients
55 using the platform. Data were analysed thematically using the template analysis approach.

56
57 Results: Three themes are presented: Complex approvals, permissions and access across
58 multiple organisations and systems; Capacity challenges in primary care settings; Ongoing
59 support for the project. Implementation and evaluation of GMDMW involved navigating data
60 sharing systems and regulations for complex private and public sector organisations and
61 these impacted on the electronic data sharing necessary for the DMW platform to work as
62 intended. Participants felt that the complexities associated with merging different systems,
63 operated by different organisations, with different data controllers and data owners were
64 greater than anticipated.

65
66 Discussion: The complexity, number of organisations and levels of governance involved in
67 implementing and evaluating GMDMW were barriers to implementation and evaluation. This
68 reflects inherent problems around mobilising innovation in the NHS. Our findings can help
69 the development and evaluation electronic interventions to improve health to navigate this
70 complex research landscape and ensure that patients can access the most innovative and
71 effective ways to support their health. (245/250 words)

72
73 Author summary: Digital health interventions and Public Private Partnerships for innovation
74 in the NHS are on the rise and in order to establish efficacy, these need to be evaluated.
75 Often, this research and evaluation is carried out by Universities. However, challenges
76 around navigating governance across these complex, multiple organisations exist where
77 there is a need to share data and collaborate across systems effectively. Here, we describe
78 the many unexpected challenges and solutions to effective data sharing reported by
79 professionals and patients involved in the delivery and evaluation of a UK-based NHS/
80 private sector collaboration to provide a digital platform to support self-management of
81 diabetes.

82

83 Introduction

84

85 DiabetesMyWay (DMW) is a platform for an open access website for people with diabetes
86 that has been available in Scotland since 2008. DMW offers a variety of multimedia
87 resources aimed at improving self-management and from 2010, has offered users access to
88 their clinical data in the form of an electronic personal health record. By 2020 over 60,000
89 people had registered for DMW (including people with both T2D and type 1 diabetes).
90 Evaluations of the system were encouraging, with 90% of respondents to one survey of
91 users reporting that engagement with DMW helped them make better use of their
92 consultation, improved their diabetes management and improved their condition-related
93 knowledge [1].

94

95 Plans for the delivery and evaluation of an enhanced version of DMW across Greater
96 Manchester are described in our original study protocol (2). The project was funded by the
97 National Health Service's Accelerated Access Collaborative Test Bed Programme. The Test
98 Bed Programme is intended to bring NHS organisations and industry partners together to
99 test combinations of digital technologies in real world settings. The implementation period
100 for GMDMW was punctuated by the Covid-19 pandemic, during which patients with diabetes
101 were considered clinically vulnerable [2,3].

102

103 Originally, a census approach to recruitment across the Greater Manchester area was
104 planned; approximately 140k people in the area registered as having T2D were to be offered
105 access to the GMDMW platform from August 2019. 600 were also to be offered additional
106 adjunct digital health interventions: Oviva; Changing Health (both offering behaviour change
107 support) and MyCognition (offering 'cognitive fitness' training). However, there have been
108 barriers to implementation and uptake was lower than planned. In 12 April 2022, 628 people
109 had registered to use the platform and 130 of these have the GP enabled permissions to
110 enable all the platform's functions. By October 2022, this had risen to 4,863 registrations
111 with 370 having GP enabled permissions. Previously, research teams evaluating digital and
112 electronic health innovations have been unable to collect sufficient data on clinical outcomes
113 and have reported barriers to implementation using qualitative methods [4–6]. For this paper,
114 we report lessons learned based on the experiences of stakeholders involved in the
115 implementation and evaluation of GMDMW .

116

117 **Methods**

118 Ethical approval was received on 02/09/2019, REC Reference 19/WM/0236, IRAS ID
119 265621.

120

121 ***Participants***

122 *Practitioners/ professional staff*

123 We contacted staff involved in the implementation and delivery of the project via email to
124 invite them to participate. Those interested in taking part contacted the researcher directly to
125 arrange the interview.

126

127 Eight staff members involved in implementation and evaluation from relevant organisations
128 took part: NHS (N=4), My Way Digital Health (N=2) and the evaluation team (N=2).

129

130 *Patients*

131 Three T2D patients were recruited via adverts posted on the Diabetes My Way websites.
132 Potential participants were able to contact a member of the research team via email. When
133 contact was made, a participant information sheet was sent to the patient and this was
134 followed up by the researcher.

135

136 Given the small sample size, and in order to protect anonymity, individual characteristics of
137 the participants are not reported.

138

139 ***Interviews***

140 All interviews took place over a video conferencing platform or telephone, according to
141 participant preference and lasted between 27-57 minutes (mean=48 minutes).

142

143 ***Analysis***

144 An amended template analysis approach was used to structure analysis. Template analysis
145 [7] is a flexible form of thematic analysis which can be adapted to meet the needs of a
146 particular study. It permits the use of a priori themes in advance of coding and analysis to
147 facilitate a focus on specific areas of interest and as a means of guiding initial coding [e.g.
148 King and Brooks, 2017 [7]. The planned process evaluation objectives and exploration of
149 acceptability objectives described in the original study protocol (Goldthorpe et al, in press)
150 were used as an a priori focus for analysis. Analysis was led by JG who undertook manual
151 line by line coding of the data with process and acceptability objectives in mind. This was
152 followed by clustering of initial codes and synthesis of themes in an iterative process until the
153 thematic template developed adequately captured the data. JG and JB met regularly to

154 discuss the evolving analysis with input from the wider research team comprising input from
155 academic researchers, clinicians and clinical network leads. The final template comprised
156 three key themes which are reported here. Quotations are presented verbatim to support
157 findings, with the role and identification number of the participant.

158

159

160

161 **Results**

162

163 ***'It gets complicated pretty quickly': Approvals, permissions and access across*** 164 ***multiple organisations and systems***

165

166 Difficulties associated with multi-organisation working to deliver the project together with the
167 complexities of merging different systems, operated by different organisations, with different
168 data controllers and data owners were significantly greater than anticipated.

169

170 *If you, sort of, map it all out on a piece of paper the number of interactions between those*
171 *individuals, it's quite complex ... And each one of those interactions potentially requires a*
172 *contract in place and a data sharing agreement, and you can imagine, you know, it gets*
173 *complicated pretty quickly in that sort of situation (Practitioner/ Professional 1)*

174

175 The (mostly clinical) team who developed the original application did not anticipate the
176 length of time required to apply, review and receive the necessary approvals from NHS
177 research ethics and research governance required for implementation and evaluation of the
178 project, or the extent of the processes involved.:

179

180 *I think from our point of view we're obviously NHS based, so the research element of this*
181 *project has been a bit of an unknown entity, you know, we don't know some of the processes*
182 *for ethical approval and, you know, green lights from the university, the HRAs role in it as*
183 *well. (Practitioner/ Professional 2)*

184

185 Obtaining permissions for information governance, data control and data sharing produced
186 unanticipated barriers and delays to implementation and evaluation. For example, the
187 issuing of Patient Identification Centre (PIC) agreements were problematic. These are
188 contracts between NHS sites and the research sponsor: sites that are to be used for the
189 identification and recruitment of patients confirm that they have capacity, plans and
190 necessary governance in place to support the research activity.

191

192 During the HRA approvals process, it became apparent that PIC agreements could not be
193 arranged with Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) (formal clusters of General Practices)
194 and rather needed to be authorised with individual practices. This had huge implications on
195 planning for time and resources.

196

197 *Because GPs own the data, they are basically individual components of this big picture. ...*

198 *So, we've got, you know, lots of general practitioners that are linked to the NHS, but they're*

199 *all individual entities and they don't have any obligation to share their data with anybody*

200 (Practitioner/ Professional 1)

201

202 At the planning stage for DMW in Manchester there had been an assumption that the
203 Scottish pilot study would serve as a roadmap for implementation. However, in practice, a
204 crucial difference existed between the Scottish and English healthcare systems existed in
205 that the Scottish system had patient data sharing agreements for diabetes in place prior to
206 the implementation of DMW.

207

208 *Rather than making the agreements and the connections between the individual providers*
209 *and Diabetes My Way, they integrated with this data aggregator, which then basically had all*
210 *the data anyway, so there was no permissions issues, or that sort of stuff. ... (Practitioner/*

211 Professional 3)

212

213

214 In GM the project team dealt with two main groups of NHS organisations with responsibility
215 for the management of data collected and technology used within the NHS: primary care
216 practices and NHS Digital. Adjunct interventions operating from the DMW platform also
217 needed to gain appropriate permissions to interact with patient record systems. General
218 practices control the data for their systems, patients own the data and three separate private
219 companies own the data management platforms. One of the three systems would not
220 engage with the organisations providing the digital platforms for the intervention or the
221 evaluation team (*One of them is really, sort of, not very accommodating to linking up with*
222 *outside tech or outside interventions [Practitioner/ Professional 5]), meaning that patients of*
223 *practices using this system were effectively excluded from GMDMW. In response, the DMW*
224 *team made a pragmatic decision to initially target practices using one patient record system*
225 *(EMIS). However, this simplified approach also encountered barriers:*

226

227 *So we've gone live with the EMIS clinical system first, and that is the vast majority of our GP*
228 *practices, that's why we've gone with them first. But it's a process where our technical*
229 *partner has to speak to EMIS, and EMIS have to kind of go backwards and forwards with*
230 *NHS Digital. (Practitioner/ Professional 2)*

231
232 Researchers experienced multiple barriers to accessing NHS-held patient data for a control
233 group to conduct an analysis of primary and secondary outcomes and cost-effectiveness.
234 Issues were again around data sharing agreements and information governance.

235
236 *Earlier on in the project some of the connections we had were suggesting that we could get*
237 *the data through various different, sort of, regional paths, through systems that were either*
238 *developed or in development to do similar things in Greater Manchester. None of those*
239 *panned out in the end and we ended up getting the data through NHS Digital, through a new*
240 *dataset that they had compiled (Practitioner/ Professional 5).*

241 (N.B. Accessing data from NHS Digital was delayed due to COVID-19 and the increased demand and pressure this placed on
242 the data processing and applications infrastructure. Ultimately, patient records were accessed via the Greater Manchester Care
243 Record: <https://gmwearebettertogether.com/>)

244
245 ***'You don't know how it's going to work until it's in the real world': Implementation***
246 ***challenges in primary care settings***

247
248 The Covid-19 pandemic and subsequent restrictions in place in the UK since March 2020
249 meant that engagement with practices was significantly restricted due to extremely limited
250 opportunities to engage with key staff members to overcome identified barriers to data
251 sharing.

252
253 *And then, of course, COVID came along which is another layer of complexity and that meant*
254 *that, you know, the whole focus of primary care was on other things. (Practitioner/*
255 *Professional 8)*

256
257 The number of participants accessing the DMW platform has been much lower than
258 planned. This impacted the availability of clinical data required to complete evaluation tasks.

259
260 *We're going to get even fewer people using it and having two usable blood glucose*
261 *readings. One, because so few people use the app but two, those that did probably weren't*

262 *able to go to their GP practice to get a blood glucose reading done. Or if they were able to,*
263 *they chose not to because they didn't want to go to a GP practice*

264 (Practitioner/ Professional 5)

265

266

267 However, whilst Covid-19 may have exacerbated difficulties, broader issues relating to
268 capacity and buy-in existed. To link the GMDMW way platform to patient records required
269 additional activity: before GP surgeries can share information they need permission from
270 individual patients, which requires patients to provide the practice with a formal request to
271 access their data. Once this approval has been registered on the system, digital platforms,
272 with appropriate permissions, can then (theoretically) electronically access personalised
273 patient data based on care records. Once permissions were granted, patients had to enter
274 registration codes to activate the link to their patient records. This process was lengthy and
275 required motivation and action from practice staff and patients to seek and approve the
276 relevant permissions.

277

278 *With the best will in the world, you can test as much as you want, but until it's real patients*
279 *trying to use it, that haven't got the ideal settings set up behind the scenes, then you won't*
280 *see some of the unique problems that will come out of a project like this (Practitioner/*

281 *Professional 2)*

282

283 Given the inherent difficulties involved in registering during the early implementation stage,
284 participants felt that patients who successfully registered and engaged with the intervention
285 were likely to be among the most capable, motivated and persistent. This is supported by the
286 quotes from the patient below:

287

288 *The person that I rang initially wasn't in, so I had to wait for them to come back in....*
289 *Although they'd passed the stuff over to somebody in the GP's surgery, they didn't really*
290 *know what they were doing with it so...and I had some questions and nobody could answer*
291 *them at the beginning...and then, even when I did speak to the person responsible, she*
292 *couldn't answer the questions. (Patient participant 1)*

293

294 One participant was concerned that medical language and jargon might cause unnecessary
295 anxiety in patients and felt that this could result in additional workload for primary care staff.
296 They felt that some GPs may feel obligated to make appointments with patients to discuss
297 their records, or edit them before release.

298

299 *I think from April this year [2020] the government has decided that patients who want access*
300 *to their records should have access to their records. But, like I said before, what they haven't*
301 *done is provided the funding along with it to try and discuss the records better with the*
302 *patients and tell them exactly what they're seeing, what disease, what values mean and*
303 *things like that. (Practitioner/ Professional 7)*

304 A patient we interviewed did indeed report feeling confused in relation to some information
305 accessed via GMDMW. She felt that some information did not relate to her own medical
306 history and that some information had been missed. Although she did not report feeling
307 distressed about this, the information was not helpful to her:

308 *I don't know how it extracts the information from my GPs, but it seemed to have stuff down*
309 *there that I don't think I've ever had... . And you know when you have these sorts of, like*
310 *quite strange thoughts and you think to yourself, because I do, "has somebody been*
311 *prescribing stuff in my name for somebody else's use?" (Patient participant 2)*

312

313

314 ***'It would yield benefits': Ongoing support for the GMDMW project***

315

316

317 Despite the challenges encountered, significant support remained for the project.

318 Participants viewed the GMDMW platform positively as a potentially useful way to support
319 diabetes self-management in addition to providing additional clinical benefits such as
320 prediction of individual risk:

321

322 *The outcomes for people with diabetes, particularly type 2, across GM are not that good. So,*
323 *they don't have, you know, such good control, their management of their risk factors, their*
324 *cardiovascular receptance is less good, you know, compared to some areas of the country.*
325 *And the data that I've seen as far as My Diabetes My Way is concerned suggested that it*
326 *would yield benefits in terms of the overall management and the self-management, the self-*
327 *care that people could achieve (Practitioner/ Professional 1)*

328

329 Amongst professionals interviewed there was a perceived need for patients to be able to
330 access an alternative to traditional face to face self-management education sessions, and
331 digital solutions such as DMW were seen as a promising option:

332

333 *The main thing was trying to improve outcomes for the person living with diabetes but*
334 *additionally the way we were planning to do it was innovative by providing digital solutions*
335 *and we have a very low uptake of our structured education with regards to diabetes*
336 (Practitioner/ Professional 7)

337
338 Participants believed that patients with diabetes were particularly vulnerable to complications
339 associated with Covid-19 and some felt that there were opportunities for DMW to offer
340 support in this context, for example, filling gaps in service provision due to the restrictions
341 around in-person support available at the time of the interview.

342
343 *During COVID and as part of our COVID response that's going out to practices, we're*
344 *saying, "please let your patients know about this [DMW]. We've got major issues because of*
345 *COVID. (Practitioner/ Professional 8)*

346
347 Clinicians felt that digital interventions were likely to continue playing a major part in diabetes
348 management beyond the pandemic and that the DMW platform could play a role in this
349 change in delivery.

350
351 *So, our argument is that, you know, in the COVID pandemic people have had less access to*
352 *primary care and therefore those people that have taken up the intervention, Diabetes My*
353 *Way potentially benefit more because of that action that they've taken (Practitioner/*
354 *Professional 1)*

355
356 Patients reported that the DMW platform delivered credible information. They valued the
357 ability to access their diabetes-related medical information and have it presented visually.
358 The graphs and "dartboard" visuals on the Diabetes My Way platform were cited as being
359 particularly useful:

360 *So, for example, since I've had this, I've been looking at the HbA1C results, and there*
361 *seems to be a bit of a trend in terms of, it always seems to get worse over the winter*
362 *period....So, perhaps being aware of that, and trying to be even more diligent with exercise*
363 *and diet, to see if that makes any difference (P1)*

364
365 Practitioners similarly felt that they could trust the information on the DMW platform to be
366 trustworthy and evidence-based. Access to personalised data available through the DMW
367 platform was perceived as supporting patients to get the most out of their face-to-face

368 consultations, as well as supporting self-management, and knowledge about their own
369 condition:

370 *Initial feedback from the people who took up the thing, they found that, yes, it was very*
371 *useful...ideally what we were thinking is to empower the person with diabetes to manage*
372 *their own condition better... so they can make informed choices about what they do with*
373 *their diet, exercise et cetera, and also enable better consultations with the clinicians as well*
374 (Practitioner/ Professional 7)

375 376 **Discussion**

377 We developed three themes from the data: 'It gets complicated pretty quickly': Approvals,
378 permissions and access across multiple organisations and systems; 'You don't know how it's
379 going to work until it's in the real world': Implementation challenges in primary care settings;
380 'It would yield benefits': Ongoing support for the GMDMW project. Participants reported
381 barriers around implementation of the GMDMW system that meant patients were unable to
382 access the self-management interventions in the numbers expected and we could not carry
383 out the evaluation study as originally planned. However, we have captured some valuable
384 learning from the experience, which can help planning for implementation and evaluation of
385 future electronic health innovations.

387
388 The diversity of organisations and individuals involved in enabling GMDMW was extremely
389 complex. Patients generate (via attendance at GP practices) and engage with (via GMDMW
390 platform) their own data to self-manage their diabetes. For this to happen, GP practices
391 collect data inputted into electronic patient record systems during consultations and enable
392 sharing after patients have given permission. Private sector companies own and manage the
393 systems that hold the data. NHS Digital collate and manage large amounts of data from
394 these systems for health care intelligence. Finally, for the evaluation of this system to take
395 place, the research team, employed by a University, needed to access this data.

396 These complex systems need to be co-ordinated and relevant NHS governance and
397 approvals put into place. For implementation of GMDMW, this included HRA approval for
398 recruitment of patients, sign off on Participant Identification Centre agreements for primary
399 care practices to agree to participation including obtaining patient's permission to share their
400 data with GMDMW. For the evaluation to succeed, approvals from NHS Digital around
401 access to control data were also needed. Insufficient time and resources were available to
402 enable the data linkage and governance needed to complete the implementation and
403 evaluation of GMDMW in the 24 months originally allocated.

404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440

The website of the NHS Health Research Authority (HRA) (“HRA Approval – one year on - Health Research Authority,”) [8] states that in 2017 the median time from application via the Integrated Research Application System (IRAS) to approval being granted was 60 days. However for complex cases this can take as long as 18 months [9]. Health and care researchers and organisations who wish to implement and evaluate complex interventions within the NHS should consider the potential barriers to accessing and linking datasets, paying particular care to the multiple layers of permissions and governance that need to be obtained and the length of time needed to negotiate relevant systems.

Although the COVID-19 pandemic affected engagement with Primary Care services and subsequently slowed down activation of the permissions GMDMW required to access patient data, opportunities for research arose based on the mobilisation of data and digital responses to support pandemic management and intelligence [10]. The research team were able to access suitable control data from the Greater Manchester Care Record which was facilitated via use of the Control of patient information (COPI) notice which allowed for the sharing of patient data for COVID-19 purposes [11].

A general practitioner who participated in the research was concerned that extra resources would be needed to support patients to understand and interpret healthcare data, citing potential for misunderstandings and the generation of anxiety, particularly around medical jargon and interpretation of test results. This concern was supported by reports from a patient who felt that some entries in her records might be erroneous. However, research carried out in Sweden and the USA suggests that, despite initial concerns, patients are able to access and understand their health records without over-burdening care providers [12,13]. Further research is needed to explore whether this is the case for diabetes patients in a UK context.

Despite the barriers to implementing and evaluating GMDMW identified by this study, the three patients who were able to access the platform did find it acceptable. They liked the way the platform translated and presented their data with user-friendly graphics, and practitioners feel that DMW could be a valuable support tool for patients with diabetes. This only further highlights the need for solutions to the issues of governance and data linkage reported in this paper to be found, so that researchers can successfully test innovations and patients can ultimately benefit from the latest developments in healthcare.

441 In conclusion, the complexity, number of organisations and levels of governance involved in
442 implementing and evaluating GMDMW caused the barriers to implementation and evaluation
443 we found in this study. This reflects inherent problems around mobilising innovation in
444 Public-Private Innovation Partnerships (PPIPs) reported by Hammond et al., [4] in their case
445 study of implementation of another NHS Test Bed. The authors cite “magical thinking”
446 around the axiomatic virtue of innovation as leading to a failure of rationalisation and
447 planning [4].

448
449 We do however hope that our findings can help those involved in the development and
450 evaluation electronic interventions to improve health to navigate this complex research
451 landscape and ensure that patients can access the most innovative and effective ways to
452 support their health.

453 454 **Acknowledgements**

455
456 The authors would like to thank Martina Ratto (MSc) from the Beingwell Group and
457 Debbie Wake, CEO and Chief Medical Officer for My Way Digital Health for fact
458 checking and providing comments regarding some of the technical aspects of
459 implementation.

460
461
462

463 **References**

- 464
- 465 1. Wake DJ, He J, Czesak AM, Mughal F, Cunningham SG. MyDiabetesMyWay: An
466 Evolving National Data Driven Diabetes Self-Management Platform. *J Diabetes Sci*
467 *Technol.* 2016;10(5):1050–8.
 - 468 2. Goldthorpe J, Allen T, Brooks J, Kontopantelis E, Holland F, Moss C, et al. Digital
469 Interventions Supporting Self-care in People With Type 2 Diabetes Across Greater
470 Manchester (Greater Manchester Diabetes My Way): Protocol for a Mixed Methods
471 Evaluation. *JMIR Res Protoc* 2022;11(8)e26237
472 <https://www.researchprotocols.org/2022/8/e26237> [Internet]. 2022 Aug 17 [cited 2022
473 Sep 2];11(8):e26237. Available from:
474 <https://www.researchprotocols.org/2022/8/e26237>
 - 475 3. Feldman EL, Savelieff MG, Hayek SS, Pennathur S, Kretzler M, Pop-Busui R.
476 COVID-19 and Diabetes: A Collision and Collusion of Two Diseases. *Diabetes*
477 [Internet]. 2020 Dec 1 [cited 2022 Apr 25];69(12):2549–65. Available from:

- 478 [https://diabetesjournals.org/diabetes/article/69/12/2549/16291/COVID-19-and-](https://diabetesjournals.org/diabetes/article/69/12/2549/16291/COVID-19-and-Diabetes-A-Collision-and-Collusion-of)
479 [Diabetes-A-Collision-and-Collusion-of](https://diabetesjournals.org/diabetes/article/69/12/2549/16291/COVID-19-and-Diabetes-A-Collision-and-Collusion-of)
- 480 4. Bornstein SR, Rubino F, Khunti K, Mingrone G, Hopkins D, Birkenfeld AL, et al.
481 Practical recommendations for the management of diabetes in patients with COVID-
482 19. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2020 Jun 1;8(6):546–50.
- 483 5. Hammond J, Bailey SIMON, Gore OZ, Checkland KATH, Darley S, Mcdonald R, et al.
484 The Problem of Success and Failure in Public-private Innovation Partnerships. *J Soc*
485 *Policy*. 2021;
- 486 6. Greenhalgh T, Robert G, Macfarlane F, Bate P, Kyriakidou O. Diffusion of innovations
487 in service organizations: Systematic review and recommendations. *Milbank Q*
488 [Internet]. 2004;82. Available from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0887-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0887-378X.2004.00325.x)
489 [378X.2004.00325.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.0887-378X.2004.00325.x)
- 490 7. Greenhalgh T, Wherton J, Papoutsi C, Lynch J, Hughes G, A’Court C, et al. Beyond
491 adoption: A new framework for theorizing and evaluating nonadoption, abandonment,
492 and challenges to the scale-up, spread, and sustainability of health and care
493 technologies. *J Med Internet Res* [Internet]. 2017 Nov 1 [cited 2020 Nov 2];19(11).
494 Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29092808/>
- 495 8. Brooks J, McCluskey S, Turley E, King N, Brooks J, McCluskey S, et al. Qualitative
496 Research in Psychology The Utility of Template Analysis in Qualitative Psychology
497 Research. *Qual Res Psychol* [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2019 Mar 19];12(2):202–22.
498 Available from:
499 <https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=uqrp20>
- 500 9. Brooks J, King N. *Applied Qualitative Research in Psychology* [Internet]. London:
501 Macmillan ; 2018 [cited 2019 Sep 12]. Available from:
502 [https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=x64sDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT7&d](https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=x64sDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT7&dq=Brooks,+J.+and+King,+N.+(2017).+Approaches+to+qualitative+psychology.+In+J.B+rooks+and+N.King+(Eds),+Applied+qualitative+research+in+psychology.+Palgrave.&ots=Guz5ZJAWFe&sig=pgf1rz)
503 [q=Brooks,+J.+and+King,+N.+\(2017\).+Approaches+to+qualitative+psychology.+In+J.B](https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=x64sDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT7&dq=Brooks,+J.+and+King,+N.+(2017).+Approaches+to+qualitative+psychology.+In+J.B+rooks+and+N.King+(Eds),+Applied+qualitative+research+in+psychology.+Palgrave.&ots=Guz5ZJAWFe&sig=pgf1rz)
504 [rooks+and+N.King+\(Eds\),+Applied+qualitative+research+in+psychology.+Palgrave.&](https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=x64sDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT7&dq=Brooks,+J.+and+King,+N.+(2017).+Approaches+to+qualitative+psychology.+In+J.B+rooks+and+N.King+(Eds),+Applied+qualitative+research+in+psychology.+Palgrave.&ots=Guz5ZJAWFe&sig=pgf1rz)
505 [ots=Guz5ZJAWFe&sig=pgf1rz](https://books.google.co.uk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=x64sDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT7&dq=Brooks,+J.+and+King,+N.+(2017).+Approaches+to+qualitative+psychology.+In+J.B+rooks+and+N.King+(Eds),+Applied+qualitative+research+in+psychology.+Palgrave.&ots=Guz5ZJAWFe&sig=pgf1rz)
- 506 10. Health Research Authority. HRA Approval – one year on [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2022
507 Apr 4]. Available from: [https://www.hra.nhs.uk/about-us/news-updates/hra-approval-](https://www.hra.nhs.uk/about-us/news-updates/hra-approval-one-year/)
508 [one-year/](https://www.hra.nhs.uk/about-us/news-updates/hra-approval-one-year/)
- 509 11. Ethics, Tavistock and Portman NHS [Internet]. Tavistock and Portman NHS. [cited
510 2022 Apr 4]. Available from: [https://tavistockandportman.nhs.uk/research-and-](https://tavistockandportman.nhs.uk/research-and-innovation/student-research/ethics/)
511 [innovation/student-research/ethics/](https://tavistockandportman.nhs.uk/research-and-innovation/student-research/ethics/)
- 512 12. Coronavirus - NHS Digital [Internet]. [cited 2022 Apr 4]. Available from:
513 <https://digital.nhs.uk/coronavirus>
- 514 13. Control of patient information (COPI) notice - NHS Digital [Internet]. NHS Digital.

- 515 [cited 2022 Apr 25]. Available from: [https://digital.nhs.uk/coronavirus/coronavirus-covid-19-response-information-governance-hub/control-of-patient-information-copi-](https://digital.nhs.uk/coronavirus/coronavirus-covid-19-response-information-governance-hub/control-of-patient-information-copi-notice)
516 [notice](https://digital.nhs.uk/coronavirus/coronavirus-covid-19-response-information-governance-hub/control-of-patient-information-copi-notice)
517
518 14. Bell SK, Mejilla R, Anselmo M, Darer JD, Elmore JG, Leveille S, et al. When doctors
519 share visit notes with patients: A study of patient and doctor perceptions of
520 documentation errors, safety opportunities and the patient-doctor relationship. *BMJ*
521 *Qual Saf* [Internet]. 2017;26(4):262–70. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/>
522 15. Rexhepi H, Åhlfeldt RM, Cajander Å, Huvila I. Cancer patients' attitudes and
523 experiences of online access to their electronic medical records: A qualitative study.
524 *Health Informatics J* [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2022 Apr 6];24(2):115–24. Available from:
525 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1460458216658778>
526