

1 **Authors:** Hwayeon Danielle Shin<sup>a,b</sup>, Emily Hamovitch<sup>a</sup>, Evgenia Gatov<sup>a</sup>, Madison  
2 MacKinnon<sup>a,c</sup>, Luma Samawi<sup>a,d</sup>, Rhonda Boateng<sup>a</sup>, Kevin Thorpe<sup>a</sup>, Melanie  
3 Barwick<sup>a,d,e</sup>  
4

## 5 **Affiliations**

- 6 a. Institute of Health Policy, Management, and Evaluation, University of Toronto,  
7 Toronto, Canada  
8 b. Krembil Centre for Neuroinformatics, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health,  
9 Toronto, Canada  
10 c. The Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Toronto, Canada  
11 d. Child Health Evaluative Sciences, The Peter Gilgan Centre for Research and  
12 Learning, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada  
13 e. Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada  
14

## 15 **Correspondence to:**

16 Hwayeon Danielle Shin  
17 RN MScN PhD(c)  
18 [hdanielle.shin@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:hdanielle.shin@mail.utoronto.ca)  
19

## 20 **Conflicts of Interest**

21 There are no conflicts to declare.  
22

## 23 **The NASSS (Non-Adoption, Abandonment, Scale-Up,** 24 **Spread and Sustainability) framework use over time: A** 25 **scoping review** 26

### 27 **Abstract**

28 **Background:** The Non-adoption, Abandonment, Scale-up, Spread,  
29 Sustainability (NASSS) framework (2017) was established as an evidence-based,  
30 theory-informed tool to predict and evaluate the success of implementing health  
31 and care technologies. While the NASSS is gaining popularity, its use has not been  
32 systematically described. Literature reviews on the applications of popular  
33 implementation frameworks such as RE-AIM and CFIR have enabled their  
34 advancement in the implementation science field. Similarly, we sought to advance  
35 the science of implementation and application of theories, models, and frameworks  
36 (TMFs) in research by exploring the application of the NASSS in the five years since  
37 its inception.

38 **Objective:** We aim to understand the characteristics of studies that used the NASSS,  
39 how it was used, and the lessons learned from its application.

40 **Methods:** We conducted a scoping review following the Joanna Briggs Institute  
41 methodology. We searched the following databases on December 20, 2022: Ovid  
42 MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsychINFO, CINAHL, Scopus, Web of Science, and LISTA. We  
43 used typologies and frameworks to characterize evidence to address our aim.

44 **Results:** This review included 57 studies, which were a mix of qualitative (n=28),  
45 mixed/multi-methods (n=13), case studies (n=6), observational (n=3), experimental  
46 (n=3), and other designs (e.g, quality improvement) (n=4). The four most common  
47 types of digital applications being implemented were telemedicine/virtual care  
48 (n=24), personal health devices (n=10), digital interventions, such as internet  
49 Cognitive Behavioural Therapies (n=10), and knowledge generation applications  
50 (n=9). Studies used the NASSS to inform study design (n=9), data collection (n=35),  
51 analysis (n=41), data presentation (n=33), and interpretation (n=39). Most studies  
52 applied the NASSS retrospectively to implementation (n=33). The remainder  
53 applied the NASSS prospectively (n=15) or concurrently (n=8) with implementation.  
54 We also collated reported barriers and enablers to implementation. We found the  
55 most reported barriers fell within the Organization and Adopter System domains,  
56 and the most frequently reported enablers fell within the Value Proposition domain.  
57 Eighteen studies highlighted the NASSS as a valuable and practical resource,  
58 particularly for unravelling complexities, comprehending implementation context,  
59 understanding contextual relevance in implementing health technology, and  
60 recognizing the NASSS' adaptable nature to cater to researchers' requirements.

61 **Conclusions:** Most studies used the NASSS retrospectively, which may be attributed  
62 to the framework's novelty. However, this finding highlights the need for  
63 prospective and concurrent application of the NASSS within the implementation

64 process. In addition, almost all included studies reported multiple domains as  
65 barriers and enablers to implementation, indicating that implementation is a highly  
66 complex process that requires careful preparation to ensure implementation  
67 success. Finally, we identified a need for better reporting when using the NASSS in  
68 implementation research to contribute to the collective knowledge in the field.

69 **Keywords:** Scoping Review; Implementation Science; NASSS

## 70 **Introduction**

71 Healthcare technology innovations hold considerable promise for enhancing patient  
72 outcomes and service efficiency, but they frequently remain confined to small-scale  
73 demonstration initiatives [1–5]. Moreover, current evidence indicates a prevalent  
74 pattern of non-adoption and abandonment of healthcare technology innovations by  
75 their intended users, with limited success in integrating these innovations into  
76 regular practice or expanding their implementation to different contexts [6]. This  
77 challenge is especially evident in complex healthcare settings, where the  
78 multifaceted nature of the innovations and the environment can create barriers to  
79 successful implementation [7].

80 Healthcare is described as a complex adaptive system, discouraging simplistic linear  
81 cause-and-effect reasoning [8,9]. Instead, there is a growing recognition of the need  
82 to emphasize dynamic processes while implementing healthcare practices. This  
83 change in perspective reflects an understanding that healthcare is influenced by  
84 multifaceted interactions and feedback loops that cannot be adequately explained  
85 by linear models alone. In response to this evolving perspective, the Non-Adoption,  
86 Abandonment, Scale-up, Spread, and Sustainability (NASSS) framework was  
87 introduced in 2017 [10]. NASSS was developed as an evidence-based and theory-  
88 informed approach to enhance the ability to predict and assess the success of  
89 implementing innovative technologies in the healthcare context [10]. Related  
90 complexity assessment tools (NASSS-CAT) were developed in 2020 to enhance  
91 understanding, guide monitoring, and facilitate research on technology projects in  
92 healthcare or social care settings through stakeholder discussions [11].

93 The NASSS encompasses seven distinct domains: 1) Illness/Condition; 2)  
94 Technology; 3) Value Proposition; 4) Adopter System; 5) Organization(s); 6) Wider  
95 Context; and 7) Embedding and Adaptation Over Time [10]. Each domain can be  
96 categorized as simple, complicated, or complex [10]. The greater the complexity  
97 observed within these domains, the more obstacles will likely arise, hindering the  
98 successful adoption, scale-up, spread, and sustainability of innovative health and  
99 care technologies [10]. The NASSS framework considers the intricate web of  
100 dynamic interactions that influence the adoption and outcomes of innovations and  
101 aims to provide a more comprehensive and accessible tool for evaluating and  
102 improving the implementation of healthcare innovations [10].

103 Although new, the NASSS framework has been well-received. The seminal paper has  
104 had nearly 750 citations at the time of writing, as reported in the *Journal of Medical*  
105 *Internet Research* [10]. The surge in interest reflects the widespread adoption of the

106 NASSS, which has been utilized prospectively and retrospectively to assess patient-  
107 oriented technologies and tools for decision-making purposes [12,13]. Despite its  
108 popularity, there has been a lack of systematic documentation regarding the use of  
109 the NASSS framework following its release. Likewise, a comprehensive analysis of  
110 the framework's contributions and the insights derived from its application has not  
111 been conducted systematically.

112 The applications of popular implementation theories, models, and frameworks  
113 (TMFs), such as the Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, and  
114 Maintenance (RE-AIM) and Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research  
115 (CFIR), have been well documented in the literature. For example, there have been  
116 several literature reviews [14,15] on using RE-AIM since its inception in 1999.  
117 These reviews have described and assessed the application of the RE-AIM and have  
118 enabled the advancement of the framework (i.e., enhanced RE-AIM/Pragmatic  
119 Robust Implementation and Sustainability Model (PRISM) 2019) as well as its novel  
120 application, such as an opportunity to use the RE-AIM in combination with the  
121 Pragmatic Explanatory Continuum Indicator Summary (PRECIS) model [14,15].  
122 Similarly, we aim to contribute to the field of implementation science by exploring  
123 the NASSS applications to date and identifying opportunities to advance the  
124 framework. A scoping review is the selected method and was deemed most  
125 appropriate because our primary objective is to provide a breadth of literature  
126 currently available on the NASSS application [16]. A preliminary search of  
127 PROSPERO, MEDLINE, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Open Science  
128 Framework, and *JBI Evidence Synthesis* was conducted in October 2022. No current  
129 or in-progress scoping or systematic reviews on the topic were identified.

## 130 **Review questions**

- 131 1. What are the characteristics of studies that used the NASSS?
- 132 2. How has the NASSS been used in the identified studies, including, but not limited  
133 to, timing within implementation, depth of application, and use in combination with  
134 other tools (e.g., the NASSS-CAT)?
- 135 3. What are the author-reported lessons learned from applying the NASSS?

## 136 **Inclusion criteria**

### 137 **Concept**

138 This review included all studies that used the NASSS framework and/or NASSS-CAT  
139 in their design. Studies that only referred to the framework without application (e.g.,  
140 citing in the introduction and/or discussion) were excluded.

### 141 **Context and population**

142 There were no exclusion criteria for population and context. Any studies conducted  
143 in any context with any population were considered for inclusion. However, due to

144 the available resources in our research team, only English-language publications  
145 were included.

## 146 **Type of sources**

147 This review included all research designs (e.g., quantitative, observational,  
148 qualitative, and mixed methods). We also considered peer-reviewed and grey  
149 literature, including conference proceedings and dissertations, but we included only  
150 empirical studies. Reference lists in non-empirical literature (e.g., reviews) were  
151 screened to identify relevant primary studies. Only literature published since 2017,  
152 the year of the publication of the seminal NASSS framework paper, was included.

## 153 **Methods**

154 This scoping review was conducted following the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI)  
155 methodology for scoping reviews [17,18], and the manuscript was prepared in line  
156 with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses  
157 extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) [19]. Our *a priori* protocol [20] was  
158 registered on the Open Science Framework.

## 159 **Search strategy**

160 In collaboration with a health sciences librarian and following the Peer Review of  
161 Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) guideline [21], a comprehensive search  
162 strategy was developed to locate relevant scholarly literature using multiple  
163 bibliographic databases. This scoping review followed a three-step search strategy  
164 outlined in the JBI methodology. Firstly, an initial limited search of MEDLINE was  
165 undertaken to identify articles on the topic. Secondly, the text words in the titles and  
166 abstracts of relevant articles and the index terms used to describe the articles were  
167 used to develop a complete search strategy. Then, the entire search strategy,  
168 including all identified keywords and index terms, was adapted for each included  
169 information source and our search was undertaken on December 20, 2022, on the  
170 following databases: Ovid MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsychINFO, CINAHL, Scopus, Web of  
171 Science, and Library, Information Science and Technology Abstracts (LISTA).  
172 Thirdly, reference lists of relevant reviews were screened to identify eligible  
173 empirical studies. The full search strategies are provided in Supporting Information  
174 1. Since the NASSS framework was first published in 2017, databases have been  
175 searched from 2017 onwards. In addition to a scholarly database search, a forward  
176 citation search [22] was used in Scopus and Web of Science on October 13 and 17,  
177 2022, to complement our database searches. The main steps in this forward citation  
178 search included using citation indexes to identify studies that cite the original NASSS  
179 paper published in 2017. This search strategy helped to identify papers that our  
180 search strategy might have missed.

## 181 **Study/Source of evidence selection**

182 Following the search, all identified records were collated and uploaded into the  
183 Covidence [23], and duplicates were automatically removed. Then, five random

184 articles were selected for our pilot testing, and all five reviewers on the team  
185 independently assessed the titles and abstracts against the inclusion criteria. While  
186 our pilot testing generally went smoothly, we encountered a need for clarification  
187 regarding what constitutes NASSS application. After a team discussion, we clarified  
188 that simply citing the NASSS was insufficient for inclusion; instead, the work should  
189 incorporate the NASSS or NASSS-CAT tool into some aspect of the study design to  
190 ensure consistency in our screening decision-making process, which is often not  
191 mentioned in the abstract. Therefore, the team decided to err on the side of caution  
192 during the screening phase. After pilot testing for the calibration exercise, the  
193 remaining titles and abstracts were screened by sets of two independent reviewers  
194 (HDS, EG, MM, EH, LS, RB). Potentially relevant papers were retrieved in full, and  
195 their citation details were imported into the Covidence [23]. Two independent  
196 reviewers assessed full texts (HDS, EG, MM, EH, LS, RB). Full-text studies that did not  
197 meet the inclusion criteria were excluded, and reasons for their exclusion were  
198 documented. Any reviewer disagreements were resolved through discussion or with  
199 a third reviewer. Scoping reviews typically do not necessitate methodological  
200 evaluation [18]; therefore, critical appraisal was omitted.

## 201 **Data extraction**

202 Data were extracted from papers by sets of two independent reviewers (HDS, EH,  
203 EG, MM, RB, LS) using a data extraction tool developed in collaboration with the  
204 research team. We extracted the following information: general characteristics of  
205 the paper, intervention characteristics, description of the NASSS framework  
206 application, reported implementation barriers and facilitators, and study conclusion  
207 and author-reported lessons learned from applying the NASSS. Any reviewer  
208 disagreements were resolved through discussion or with a third reviewer. See  
209 Supporting Information 2 for our data extraction tool.

## 210 **Data analysis and presentation**


211 A descriptive, analytical approach was used to generate summary statistics (e.g.,  
212 frequency counts, percentages, etc.) for the data extracted concerning the general  
213 characteristics of the included studies. Subsequently, a content analysis was  
214 conducted to characterize the narrative data. First, the digital applications  
215 implemented in the included studies were categorized by two reviewers (MM, HDS)  
216 by adapting the framework, 'Evolving Applications of Digital Technology in Health  
217 and Health Care.' Application categories [24] are as follows: 1) Telemedicine/Virtual  
218 care; 2) Personal health devices; 3) Digital interventions; 4) Knowledge generation  
219 and/or integrators; 5) Health information; 6) Surgical/Radio graphic interventions;  
220 7) Diagnostic and imaging [24]. One innovation could be characterized by more than  
221 one category. Secondly, two reviewers categorized health conditions being  
222 examined in the included studies into disease types (EH, HDS). Thirdly, the  
223 description of the NASSS application was assessed by sets of two independent  
224 reviewers (HDS, EH, EG, MM, RB, LS) in terms of its timing within the  
225 implementation (i.e., prospective, retrospective, concurrent) and study design  
226 aspects (e.g., overall design, data collection, data analysis). This process required  
227 some level of interpretation by the team, and any conflicts in interpretation were

228 resolved through discussion. Fourth, barriers and enablers, often correspondingly  
229 reported to the primary NASSS domains, were collated from the papers. Then, sets  
230 of two reviewers (HDS, EH, EG, MM, RB) categorized these into subdomains of  
231 NASSS. Fifth, reported lessons learned from the authors were narratively  
232 summarized. The charted results are accompanied by narrative summaries that  
233 describe how the results relate to our review objectives and questions.

## 234 Results

235 Our search strategy yielded 1,705 citations (Figure 1). Following the automatic  
236 removal of duplicates by Covidence, 823 articles underwent title and abstract  
237 screening, and 355 articles underwent full-text evaluation to culminate in 57 studies  
238 in this review. Most excluded studies cited the NASSS framework in the text (e.g., in  
239 the discussion) but did not use the framework in study design, data collection,  
240 analyses, or presentation of results. Other excluded studies were non-empirical (e.g.,  
241 commentary) and those for which full text was unavailable.

242 <Insert Figure 1>



243  
244 **Figure 1:** PRISMA Flow Diagram

### 245 RQ1. Characteristics of included studies

246 Individual study characteristics are presented in Table 1. As indicated in summary  
247 Table 2, among the 57 included studies, the majority were qualitative (n=28),  
248 following mixed/multi-methods (n=13), case-studies (n=6), observational (n=3),  
249 experimental (n=3), and other designs (e.g., quality improvement, n=4). Many

250 studies originated in the United Kingdom (n=15), Australia (n=13), and the United  
 251 States (n=9), with a few other studies being set elsewhere in Europe, Southeast Asia,  
 252 and North America. However, It is noteworthy that the NASSS framework was  
 253 developed in the United Kingdom, and several included studies were part of the  
 254 initial empirical testing and refinement of the NASSS domains [25].

255 With the NASSS framework having been designed for health technology innovations,  
 256 there were a variety of health conditions for which innovations were implemented,  
 257 including cardiovascular (n=10), mental health (n=9), general health promotion  
 258 (n=9), cancer (n=5), and women’s health (n=5), among others. Of the 57 included  
 259 studies, 53 implemented digital applications, and the rest (n=4) implemented non-  
 260 digital interventions such as harm reduction services and COVID-19 testing  
 261 strategies. Of the 53 digital applications, approximately half of them were  
 262 telemedicine/virtual care (n=24), followed by personal health devices (n=10),  
 263 knowledge generation applications (n=9), and digital interventions (n=10), such as  
 264 internet-based Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (iCBT). See Table 3 for a complete list  
 265 of digital applications and examples.

266 <Insert Table 1>

267 Table 1. Study characteristics

Author & Year	Country	Study design	Setting	Study participants	Condition / Diagnosis	Intervention type	Brief Intervention Description	Timing of NASSS use in implementation	Study design aspects NASSS was used for	NASSS tools used
Abimbola 2019 [26]	Australia	Mixed-Methods	Australian General Practice	Patients; Service providers ; Other: program evaluation team (PI, investigators, PhD student)	Cardiovascular related	Digital intervention	Quality improvement intervention for cardiovascular disease prevention & a third-party add-on software tool	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Alhmod 2022 [27]	England	Qualitative	Hospitals	Service providers ; Clinic Staff	Cardiovascular-related	Digital intervention	EHR-integrated automated monitoring devices	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Banck 2020 [28]	Sweden	Qualitative	Hospital - Outpatient psychiatric clinics	Service providers ; Clinic Staff	Other: Insomnia	Digital intervention	iCBT	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	Developed own instrument (based on NASSS)
Barnett 2022 [29]	Australia	Qualitative	Hospital & Ambulatory Care	Service providers ; Clinic Staff	Diet & Nutrition: Lifestyle-related chronic conditions	Digital intervention	Technology-supported models of nutrition care	Prospective (to inform design)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used



It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Author & Year	Country	Study design	Setting	Study participants	Condition / Diagnosis	Intervention type	Brief Intervention Description	Timing of NASSS use in implementation	Study design aspects NASSS was used for	NASSS tools used
Bezuidenhout 2022 [30]	Sweden	Quantitative: Observational	Swedish Association of Physiotherapists	Service providers	Neurological diseases, Elderly Care: Older Adults	Digital intervention	Telehealth	Concurrent with implementation	Data collection	No tool used
Brown 2022 [31]	England	Qualitative	Hospitals - acute psychiatric wards	Patients; Clinic Staff	Mental Health: agoraphobic avoidance	Digital intervention	Virtual reality therapy	Prospective (to inform design)	Study design; Data collection; Interpretation	No tool used
Budhwani 2021 [32]	Canada	Qualitative	Hospital - Mental health department	Patients; Service providers	Mental health	Digital intervention	Virtual care (video visit)	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis	No tool used
Cartledge 2022 [33]	Australia	Qualitative	Members of the Australian Cardiovascular Health and Rehabilitation Association (ACRA)	Service providers	Cardiovascular related: Cardiac event or diagnosis	Digital intervention	Technology use for remotely delivered cardiac rehabilitation	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Catapan 2022 [34]	Brazil	Case study	Hospital & Outpatient Clinic	Service providers ; Intervention developers/vendors	Generalized: Patients seeking healthcare during the pandemic	Digital intervention	Teleconsultation	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Clarkson 2020 [35]	United Kingdom	Mixed-Methods	Community organizations	Patients	Pain-related: Joint pain	Digital intervention	Digital self-management tool and social network activation tool	Prospective (to inform design)	Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Davies 2021 [36]	United Kingdom (Greater Manchester area)	Mixed-Methods	Two schools	Patients; Caregivers; Service providers	No condition specified (school children)	Digital intervention	A reading screening assessment that uses eye-tracking technology and a digital support and well-being monitoring platform	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Dijkstra 2019 [37]	Netherlands	Case study	Hospitals - pediatric gastroenterology centers	Patients; Service providers ; Other: Research staff, web designer	Paediatric inflammatory bowel disease	Digital intervention	Web-based telemonitoring strategy	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Study design; Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Dyb 2021 [38]	Norway, Denmark	Qualitative	Various healthcare centres	Service providers ; Clinic Staff; Intervention developers/vendors; IT staff; Organizations' leadership; Government/politicians	Respiratory illness: COPD, Elderly care: elderly/frail patients	Digital intervention	Remote patient monitoring, mobile care in patients' homes, telemedicine	Prospective (to inform design)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	Developed own instrument (based on NASSS)

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Author & Year	Country	Study design	Setting	Study participants	Condition / Diagnosis	Intervention type	Brief Intervention Description	Timing of NASSS use in implementation	Study design aspects NASSS was used for	NASSS tools used
Edridge 2019 [39]	United Kingdom	Quantitative: Experimental	Schools: primary & secondary	Patients; Service providers	Mental health: Children's mental health	Digital intervention	mHealth: Mental health education	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis; Interpretation	No tool used
Fox 2021 [40]	Australia	Mixed-Methods	Hospital	Patients; Service providers	Women's Health: Pregnancy	Digital Intervention	Non-invasive fetal ECG monitoring device	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis	No tool used
Franck 2021 [41]	USA	Qualitative	Various children's hospitals	Service providers; Organizations' leadership	Not condition specific: Various acute illnesses for Medical beneficiaries	Digital intervention	Rapid genome sequencing	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection	No tool used
Gorbenko 2022 [42]	United States	Qualitative	Healthcare system	Service providers ; IT staff; Organizations' leadership	COVID-19 related	Digital intervention	Google Nest DTC cameras customized for inpatient monitoring.	Prospective (to inform design)	Study design; Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Grady 2020 [43]	Australia	Quantitative: Observational	Various childcare centres	Clinic Staff	Diet & Nutrition: Dietary guidelines	Digital intervention	Digital health interventions to support dietary guideline implementation	Prospective (to inform design)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	Developed own instrument (based on NASSS)
Greenhalgh 2018 [44]	United Kingdom	Mixed-Methods	Hospital - various departments	Patients; Service providers ; IT staff; Organizations' leadership; Government/policymakers	Other: Diabetes, Women's Health: diabetes antenatal, Cancer surgery	Digital intervention	Video outpatient consultations	Concurrent with implementation	Study design; Interpretation	No tool used
Greenhalgh 2018 [25]	United Kingdom	Case study	Healthcare organisations and national-level bodies	Patients; Caregivers (e.g. family members); Service providers ; IT staff; Organizations' leadership; Other: Research staff	Neurological Diseases: Cognitive impairment, Cardiovascular related: heart failure, general data management	Digital intervention	Various technologies: Video outpatient consultations, GPS tracking technology for cognitive impairment, pendant alarm services, remote biomarker monitoring, care organising software, integrated case management	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Author & Year	Country	Study design	Setting	Study participants	Condition / Diagnosis	Intervention type	Brief Intervention Description	Timing of NASSS use in implementation	Study design aspects NASSS was used for	NASSS tools used
Gremyr 2020 [12]	Sweden	Case study	Teaching hospital psychiatric department	Service providers ; Clinic Staff; IT staff; Organizations' leadership	Mental Health: Schizophrenia	Digital intervention	Digital Dashboard for Schizophrenia Care	Prospective (to inform design)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	NASSS-CAT LONG
Hall 2020 [45]	England	Qualitative	Hospital	Service providers ; Clinic Staff; Other: Consultants	Palliative care	Non-digital intervention	Evidence-based Carer Support Needs Assessment Tool to support carers during hospital discharge at end of life.	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Interpretation	No tool used
Hammerton 2022 [46]	England	Mixed-Methods	No condition specified: General practitioner practices	Service providers ; Clinic Staff; Intervention developers/vendors	General practice patients	Digital intervention	Various digital healthcare technologies	Prospective (to inform design)	Study design; Data collection	No tool used
Hehakaya 2020 [47]	Netherlands	Qualitative	Hospitals	Patients; Service providers*; Organizations' leadership; Other: Payers (insurance) & industry	Cancer: Prostate	Digital intervention	MRI-guided radiation therapy	Concurrent with implementation	Data collection; Data analysis	No tool used
Hehakaya 2020 [48]	Netherlands	Qualitative	Hospitals	Patients; Service providers; Organizations' leadership; Other: Care insurers, manufacturing industry executives	Cancer: Prostate	Digital intervention	MRI-guided radiation therapy	Concurrent with implementation	Data collection; Data analysis	No tool used
Hehakaya 2022 [49]	United States	Qualitative	Hospital-Radiation therapy/radiology departments	Service providers ; Clinic Staff; Organizations' leadership	Cancer	Digital intervention	MRI-guided radiation therapy	Concurrent with implementation	Data collection	No tool used
Hollick 2019 [50]	United Kingdom (England & Scotland)	Case study	Multiple UK Health Boards- Mobile bone density scanning services	Patients; Service providers ; Government/policymakers	Other: Osteoporosis	Digital intervention	Mobile body scanner for bone density	Multiple timepoints	Study design; Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Jacobs 2022 [51]	United States	QT: Observational	Various veteran affairs medical centres	Patients	Not condition-specific	Digital intervention	Telehealth	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection	No tool used
Jones 2022 [52]	United Kingdom	Qualitative	Various social care and volunteer sectors in health settings	Service providers	Occupational therapy treatment for stroke, geriatrics; therapeutics and palliative care (Elderly Care)	Digital intervention	Remote home visits for occupational therapy	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Study design; Data collection; Data analysis; Interpretation	NASSS-CAT LONG

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Author & Year	Country	Study design	Setting	Study participants	Condition / Diagnosis	Intervention type	Brief Intervention Description	Timing of NASSS use in implementation	Study design aspects NASSS was used for	NASSS tools used
Kip 2020 [53]	Netherlands	Mixed-Methods	Forensic mental healthcare organization	Patients; Service providers	Mental health	Digital intervention	Modules for various topics via a website	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Kozica-Olenski 2022 [54]	Australia	Qualitative	General maternity care	Patients; Service providers	Women's Health: Diabetes in pregnancy	Digital intervention	Telehealth	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Kozica-Olenski 2022 [55]	Australia	Qualitative	Hospital-Menopause Clinic	Patients; Service providers	Women's Health: Menopause	Digital intervention	Telehealth	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Study design; Data collection; Data analysis; Interpretation	No tool used
Liverani 2022 [56]	Cambodia	Qualitative	Ministry of Health and local and international non-governmental organizations.	Clinic Staff; Government/policymakers; Other: NGOs, WHO	Cardiovascular and other non-communicable diseases	Digital intervention	Wearable health monitors	Prospective (to inform design)	Study design; Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Longacre 2021 [57]	USA	Mixed-Methods	Hospital - Supportive Oncology and Palliative Care Program	Patients; Caregivers	Cancer	Digital intervention	Patient-caregiver portal system	Prospective (to inform design)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Martindale 2021 [58]	United Kingdom	Qualitative	Various primary and secondary health care settings	Service providers ; Government/policymakers; Other: Scientists	COVID-19 - Related	Non-digital intervention	No intervention; focus on pandemic diagnostic preparedness and testing strategies	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis	No tool used
Merolli 2019 [59]	Australia	Qualitative	Various clinical health care settings	Patients; Service providers	Pain-related: Chronic low-back pain	Digital intervention	Non specified ("technologies")	Prospective (to inform design)	Data collection	Developed own instrument (based on NASSS)
Miller 2021 [60]	United Kingdom	Mixed-Methods	Hospital-Stroke specialist staff	Service providers; Clinic Staff**	Cardiovascular related: Stroke	Digital intervention	Online toolkit	Concurrent with implementation	Data analysis; Presentation of results	No tool used
Neher 2022 [61]	Sweden	Qualitative	Four county councils	Patients; Government/policymakers	Cardiovascular related: Heart disease Mental Health: depression	Digital intervention	Four eHealth interventions, including iCBT.	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Interpretation	No tool used

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Author & Year	Country	Study design	Setting	Study participants	Condition / Diagnosis	Intervention type	Brief Intervention Description	Timing of NASSS use in implementation	Study design aspects NASSS was used for	NASSS tools used
Nguyen 2022 [62]	United States	Quantitative: Experimental	Home-based care - various sites	Patients; Caregivers; Service providers	Palliative care, Elderly Care: aging, Not condition specific: various serious illness with an expected survival of 1-2 year	Digital intervention	Video consultation	Concurrent with implementation	Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Nimsakul 2022 [63]	Thailand	Other	Hospitals	Service providers ; Clinic Staff; Organizations' leadership; Other: civil society member, experts in drug operations	Mental Health: Harm reduction	Non-digital intervention	Harm reduction service	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results	No tool used
Papoutsis 2020 [13]	United Kingdom	Qualitative	Hospitals & Primary care	Patients; Caregivers (e.g. family members); Service providers ; Other: researchers	Cardiovascular related: Heart failure	Digital intervention	Various tools	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results	No tool used
Perdacheer 2022 [64]	Australia	Qualitative	Prisons	Patients; Service providers	Mental Health	Digital intervention	Digital mental health tool	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Interpretation	No tool used
Przysocka 2022 [65]	Germany	Qualitative	Nursing care facilities & GP practices	Service providers	Not condition-specific: Primary care	Digital intervention	eMedCare	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Interpretation	No tool used
Pumplun 2021 [66]	Germany	Qualitative	Various clinics	Service providers; Clinic Staff; Other: "highly involved experts" who have detailed knowledge of clinical processes, experience with ML systems, and are involved in the respective decision-making processes: clinics' managers, physicians, and managers of diagnostic HIT suppliers.	Not condition-specific	Digital intervention	Understanding of clinics' adoption process of ML system	Prospective (to inform design)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Pumplun 2021 [67]	Germany & Switzerland	Qualitative	Various clinics	Service providers ; Clinic Staff; IT staff; Organizations' leadership	Machine learning- medical diagnosis	Digital intervention	Machine Learning systems for medical diagnostics in clinics	Prospective (to inform design)	Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Rudin 2021 [68]	United States	Other: Multi-methods	Various primary care clinics affiliated with an academic health system	Patients; Service providers	Respiratory Illness: Asthma	Digital intervention	Clinically integrated remote symptom monitoring intervention	Prospective (to inform design)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Author & Year	Country	Study design	Setting	Study participants	Condition / Diagnosis	Intervention type	Brief Intervention Description	Timing of NASSS use in implementation	Study design aspects NASSS was used for	NASSS tools used
Schougard 2019 [69]	Denmark	Quantitative: Experimental	Hospital - Department of Neurology	Patients	Neurological Diseases: Epilepsy	Digital intervention	Telehealth & website	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Interpretation	No tool used
Schultz 2021 [70]	Australia	Mixed-Methods	Hospital - virtual ward	Patients; Caregivers; Service providers	COVID-19-Related	Digital intervention	Virtual hospital ward	Concurrent with implementation	Data collection	NASSS-CAT LONG
Strohm 2020 [71]	Netherlands	Case study	Hospitals - Radiology departments	Service providers; Clinic Staff; Organizations' leadership; Other: Innovation manager, senior data scientist	Other: Radiology	Digital intervention	AI applications in clinical radiology	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Thomas 2022 [72]	Australia	Qualitative	Various state-wide cardiac and pulmonary networks	Service providers; Clinic Staff	Cardiovascular related: Cardiopulmonary health	Digital intervention	Telehealth	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Thomas 2022 [72]	Australia	Other: Multi-Method	Metropolitan health service network	Service providers; Clinic Staff; Other: allied health departments	Not condition-specific	Digital intervention	Telehealth	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Tolf 2020 [73]	Sweden	Qualitative	Hospital - Obstetric unit	Service providers; Clinic Staff	Women's Health: Obstetrics and gynecology	Digital intervention	Technology-supported QI programme	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results	No tool used
Tompson 2019 [74]	United Kingdom	Mixed-Methods	General Practitioner Surgery Clinics	Patients; Service providers	Cardiovascular related: Hypertension	Digital intervention	Blood pressure self-measurement kiosks	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Interpretation	No tool used
UribeGujardo 2022 [75]	Australia	Other: Multi methods	Outpatient drug and alcohol services	Service providers	Mental Health: Comorbid mental health and substance use problems	Digital intervention	Portal with eHealth Resources	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	No tool used
Vali, 2022 [76]	Various European countries	Mixed-Methods	International setting	Service providers	Other: Non-alcoholic fatty liver disease (NAFLD)	Non-digital intervention	Various non-alcoholic fatty liver disease non-invasive tests	Prospective (to inform design)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results	No tool used
Weidner 2021 [77]	United States	Mixed-Methods	International - various twitter user groups	Service providers; Other: Twitter users including users from nonprofit organization, public (personal account and/or health care consumer), business (for-profit group) and unknown	Not condition-specific	Digital intervention	Telepractice used by speech language pathologists	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results	No tool used

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Author & Year	Country	Study design	Setting	Study participants	Condition / Diagnosis	Intervention type	Brief Intervention Description	Timing of NASSS use in implementation	Study design aspects NASSS was used for	NASSS tools used
Yakovchenko 2021 [78]	United States	Qualitative	Various medical centres	Patients; Service providers	Not condition specific: Veterans' Health and Wellness	Digital intervention	Automated texting system	Retrospective (to evaluate implementation)	Data collection; Data analysis; Presentation of results; Interpretation	Other: NASSS-CAT LONG

\*Service providers includes physicians and therapists  
 \*\*Clinic staff include clinic administrators and managers

268

269

270

<Insert Table 2>

Table 2. Summary characteristics

Characteristic	n	%	Citation
<b>Study Type</b>			
<i>Qualitative</i>	28	49.1	[13,27–29,31–33,38,41,42,45,47–49,52,54–56,58,59,61,64–67,72,73,78]
<i>Mixed-methods</i>	13	22.8	[26,35,36,40,44,46,53,57,60,70,74,76,77]
<i>Case Study</i>	6	10.5	[12,25,34,37,50,71]
<i>Observational</i>	3	5.3	[30,43,51]
<i>Experimental</i>	3	5.3	[39,62,69]
<i>Other</i>	4	7.0	[63,68,75,79]
<b>Country of Origin</b>			
<i>United Kingdom (including studies set in individual UK countries and across the UK)</i>	15	26.3	[13,25,27,31,35,36,39,44–46,50,52,58,60,74]
<i>Australia</i>	13	22.8	[26,29,33,40,43,54,55,59,64,70,72,75,79]
<i>USA</i>	9	15.8	[41,42,49,51,57,62,68,77,78]
<i>Sweden</i>	5	8.8	[12,28,30,61,73]
<i>the Netherlands</i>	5	8.8	[37,47,48,53,71]
<i>Germany</i>	2	3.5	[65,66]
<i>Thailand</i>	1	1.8	[63]

<i>Brazil</i>	1	1.8	[34]
<i>Denmark</i>	1	1.8	[69]
<i>Canada</i>	1	1.8	[32]
<i>Cambodia</i>	1	1.8	[56]
<i>Multiple countries</i>	3	5.3	[38,67,76]
<b>Conditions Studied*</b>	<b>n</b>		
<i>Cardiovascular-related</i>	10		[13,25–27,33,56,60,61,72,74]
<i>Mental Health</i>	9		[12,31,32,39,53,61,63,64,75]
<i>Generalized</i>	9		[25,34,41,46,62,65–67,78]
<i>No condition specified</i>	5		[36,51,67,77,79]
<i>Cancer</i>	5		[44,47–49,57]
<i>Women's health</i>	5		[40,44,54,55,73]
<i>Elderly care</i>	4		[30,38,52,62]
<i>Neurological disease</i>	3		[25,30,69]
<i>COVID-related</i>	3		[42,58,70]
<i>Pain-related</i>	2		[35,59]
<i>Diet and Nutrition</i>	2		[29,43]
<i>Respiratory Illness</i>	2		[38,68]
<i>Palliative care</i>	2		[45,62]
<i>Other**</i>	6		[28,37,44,50,71,76]
*Not mutually exclusive			
**Other conditions include diabetes, insomnia, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease, osteoporosis, radiology			

271

272 <Insert Table 3>

273 Table 3: Innovations examined by included studies

*Category	Example of Interventions	n*	%	Citations
Virtual Care	Telemedicine, ehealth virtual care & monitoring	24	34.78	[13,25,28,30,32–34,37,38,42,44,46,51,52,54,55,57,61,62,68,70,72,77,79]
Personal Health Devices	Self-management/monitoring tools, self-assessment	10	14.49	[13,25,35,36,40,46,56,65,74,78]
Knowledge Generation and/or Integrators	eLearning, machine learning, decision aids, tools (web or app based)	9	13.04	[25–27,60,66,67,71,73,75]
Digital	A single	10	14.49	[28,30,31,33,39,43,46,53,64,69]



intervention	intervention/application that is digital and doesn't fit the above categories. (e.g., iCBT, VR therapy)			
Health Information	EMRs/patient records dashboards, patient portals	8	11.59	[12,13,46,57,65,69,73,75]
Surgical & Radiologic Interventions	Radiotherapy or new surgical intervention	4	5.80	[47-49,71]
Diagnostics & Imaging	Interventions that conduct diagnostic testing or imaging, onsite or remote.	2	2.90	[41,50]
Non-specified	Study just states "technologies" or "interventions"	2	2.90	[29,59]
<b>Note:</b> Categories adapted based on “Evolving Applications of Digital Technology in Health and Health Care” as cited in Abernethy et al., 2022[24] *Not mutually exclusive				

274 **RQ2. Application of the NASSS framework**

275 As indicated in Table 4, the NASSS framework was used in various aspects of  
 276 methodology in included studies. The NASSS was used to inform overall study  
 277 design (n=9), including conceptualization. Studies used the NASSS to inform data  
 278 collection methods (n=35) by adapting interview guides according to NASSS  
 279 domains (e.g., [47,72]). Studies also used the NASSS to inform data analysis (n=41),  
 280 for example by using the NASSS framework for directed content analysis (e.g., [66]).  
 281 The NASSS was also used to inform data presentation (n=33); studies often utilized  
 282 a table to organize barriers and enablers by NASSS domain (e.g., [54]). Finally,  
 283 studies also used the NASSS for interpretation of results (n=39), for example by  
 284 dedicating one paragraph of the discussion to each NASSS domain (e.g., [61]). Most  
 285 papers (n=43) used the NASSS to inform multiple aspects of their study.

286 <Insert Table 4>

287 Table 4: Application of the NASSS framework

NASSS Application Characteristic	n	%	Citation
<b>Study Design Aspect*</b>			
<i>Overall Study Design</i>	9	5.7	[31,37,42,44,46,50,52,55,56]
<i>Data Collection</i>	35	22.3	[12,13,27-31,37,38,41-43,46-53,55-57,59,63,67,68,70-73,76-79]
<i>Data Analysis</i>	42	26.1	[12,13,25-29,32-40,42,43,47,48,50,52-58,60,62,63,66-68,71-73,75-79]
<i>Presentation of results</i>	34	21.0	[12,13,25-29,33-38,42,43,50,53,54,56,57,60,62,63,66-68,71-73,75-

			79]
<i>Interpretation of results</i>	39	24.8	[12,25–29,31,33–39,42–45,50,52–57,61,62,64–69,71,72,74,75,78,79]
<b>Timing of Implementation</b>			
<i>Retrospectively</i>	33	57.9	[13,25–28,32–34,36,37,39–41,45,51–55,58,61,63–65,69,71–75,77–79]
<i>Prospectively</i>	15	26.3	[12,29,31,35,38,42,43,46,56,57,59,66–68,76]
<i>Concurrent with Implementation</i>	8	14.0	[30,44,47–49,60,62,70]
<i>Multiple Time Points</i>	1	1.8	[50]
<b>Number of NASSS domains reported</b>			
<i>1 domain</i>	1	1.75	[59]
<i>2 domains</i>	1	1.75	[77]
<i>3 domains</i>	3	5.26	[43,69,70]
<i>4 domains</i>	11	19.30	[27,30,31,35,39,42,46,60,65,74,75]
<i>5 domains</i>	9	15.79	[32,34,41,45,48,51,58,61,64]
<i>6 domains</i>	13	22.81	[29,44,47,49,52,53,55,57,66–68,71,78]
<i>7 domains</i>	19	33.33	[12,13,25,26,28,33,36–38,40,50,54,56,62,63,72,73,76,79]
*Not mutually exclusive			

288

289 In terms of timing, most studies conducted their analyses using the NASSS  
 290 framework retrospective to implementation, for example to analyze why  
 291 implementation did or did not succeed in terms of adoption, non-abandonment,  
 292 scale, spread, and sustainability of the innovation in a given context (n=33). The rest  
 293 applied the framework prospectively to inform future implementations (n=15), or  
 294 concurrently with implementation (n=8). Approximately one third (32%) of  
 295 included studies reported implementation barriers and enablers related to all 7  
 296 NASSS domains, and 21% reported barriers and enablers related to 6 domains. The  
 297 Embedding and Adaptation Over Time domain was often omitted, but studies  
 298 incorporated this concept into other domains (e.g., whether the technology will  
 299 require future iterations [27], whether the regulatory context is expected to change  
 300 [41]). Another one third (35%) of studies reported barriers and enablers related to  
 301 four to five NASSS domains, and 12% reported three or fewer, with the latter relying  
 302 on advisory committees to identify domains of particular relevance to the study  
 303 [43].

### 304 **RQ3. Lessons learned from the application of the NASSS**

305 The barriers and enablers of the successful implementation of innovations are  
306 presented by the NASSS domain in Figure 2. The most common barriers across  
307 studies (n=47) were in the Organization domain, whereby organizations were cited  
308 as lacking in infrastructure, resources, or capacity to innovate and/or whereby the  
309 innovation substantially disrupts organizational routines. Specifically, the  
310 organization's capacity, such as technical or human resources, was the most  
311 frequently reported barrier and enabler. Another common barrier within the  
312 Organization domain was the extent of change required in routines. The following  
313 are some exemplary quotes of organizational barriers reported in studies:

314 *“Technical infrastructure was sometimes poor, increasing the likelihood of*  
315 *technical crashes” [26]*

316 *“Representatives from all three groups expressed that an impediment to*  
317 *engaging in the [Quality Improvement] teams was insufficient time and that*  
318 *meeting times conflicted with clinical engagements” [73]*

319 *“Space and the need for dedicated and private telehealth rooms were also*  
320 *common concerns for clinicians. Such spaces need to be fitted with appropriate*  
321 *hardware, software, and peripheral devices.” [72]*

322 *“Therapists stated that the intervention was often not discussed in meetings*  
323 *and was not integrated in electronic patient records they used.” [53]*

324 *“Participants indicated they were concerned that administrative tasks would*  
325 *continue to be a significant time barrier with increased adoption and scale up.”*  
326 *[29]*

327 The most reported enablers were within the Value Proposition domain, whereby a  
328 total of 45 studies noted the technology as profitable (from the supply side) or cost-  
329 effective (from the demand side) and reported perceived advantages, including  
330 improved patient outcomes, increases in access to care, improvements in  
331 organizational processes or workflows, and overall effectiveness of the innovation.  
332 The following are exemplar quotes of enablers related to the Value Proposition  
333 domain reported in studies:

334 *“With automated monitoring in the specialist hospital, the accuracy of*  
335 *recording and timely data transfer is reliable. Nurses are more aware of the*  
336 *need to accomplish this task when it's automated” [27]*

337 *“Clinicians valued telehealth for the benefits they felt it afforded patients such*  
338 *as convenience and improved access to care, more so than perceived*  
339 *advantages for themselves.” [55]*

340 *“Several practical advantages were mentioned, among which saving time for*  
341 *therapists and patients because of less traveling time and replacing part of in-*  
342 *person treatment with the intervention, an increase of patients' access to care*  
343 *because they can individually work on their treatment at their own pace, and*  
344 *providing a new way of delivering treatment to patients.” [53]*

345 Factors within the Adopter System domain were also commonly reported as  
346 barriers or enablers to implementation. A total of 46 studies reported Adopter  
347 System factors as barriers, and 41 studies reported them as enablers, including staff,  
348 patients, and carers' attitudes and acceptance towards the new technology and its  
349 ease of use. Notably, staff was more frequently reported than patients as both a  
350 barrier and an enabler. The following are some exemplar quotes of barriers and  
351 enablers related to the Adopter System domain reported in studies:


352 *"A few therapists were willing to try ICBT-i, but none were initially deeply*  
353 *interested in the new method, only a few were available to take on this extra*  
354 *task, and only a few had the appropriate competence."* [28]

355 *"Lastly, providers described feelings of 'Zoom fatigue' and burnout and*  
356 *mentioned that video visits required more concentration, energy, and*  
357 *adaptations to interpret visual cues in comparison to in-person visits"* [32]

358 *"Most patient participants were interested to see their readings and described*  
359 *the technology as well-designed. They used the tablet and the peripheral*  
360 *devices without too much difficulty and saw great value in monitoring their*  
361 *condition, especially in terms of gaining reassurance and legitimising help-*  
362 *seeking when they needed clinical care."* [13]

363 Few authors reported lessons learned from applying the NASSS in their studies.  
364 Twenty-five studies commented in varying detail about their experience using  
365 NASSS. Eighteen studies [12,26,28,33,35,39,41,50,52,55–57,62,63,68,73,75,78]  
366 mentioned that NASSS was a helpful and useful tool, explicitly noting its utility in  
367 exploring complexity, facilitating an understanding of the implementation context,  
368 applicability in the health technology domain, and its flexibility to be adapted to  
369 researchers' needs. A few studies mentioned the comprehensiveness of the tool for  
370 identifying implementation determinants and its value in providing a theoretical  
371 foundation [12,27,38]. Additionally, two studies [50,78] suggested future directions  
372 for NASSS, such as the opportunity to use the NASSS-CAT tool over time and its  
373 applicability in a broader healthcare context. Lastly, two studies [62,67] commented  
374 on the limitation of NASSS, including its lack of consideration for how research  
375 design can impact intervention implementation and the need for its expansion to  
376 include medical ethics.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



**Figure 2:** Barriers and Enablers identified in included studies, organized according to NASSS domains.

## 378 Discussion

379 This scoping review identified 57 empirical studies that used the NASSS framework  
380 between its publication in August 2017 and the commencement of the search in  
381 December 2022. Most of the included studies were qualitative or mixed/multi-  
382 methods designs, which can be attributed to the purpose of NASSS in exploring  
383 determinants of implementation success. This exploration required substantial  
384 contextual information, and qualitative data could effectively provide it. The NASSS  
385 framework was commonly used to inform data collection, data analysis, and the  
386 presentation of results. Almost all included studies focused on technological  
387 innovation, such as telemedicine/virtual care, health monitoring or decision support  
388 via devices and applications, and targeted digital interventions. These innovations  
389 were designed for various health conditions (primarily cardiovascular and mental  
390 health) or supported general health promotion activities. While approximately one-  
391 third of studies reported barriers and enablers for implementation on all 7 NASSS  
392 domains, 20% did not report barriers or enablers related to the Over Time domain.  
393 The most reported barriers were found in the Organization and Adopter System  
394 domains, and the most frequently reported enablers were within the Value  
395 Proposition domain.

396 Most identified studies in this review had used the NASSS retrospectively, primarily  
397 to evaluate why an innovation was unsuccessful at becoming adopted by its  
398 intended users, got abandoned shortly thereafter, or failed at scaling to become  
399 routine within the organization, spreading to other contexts or sustaining over time.  
400 Similar findings have been reported with the i-PARiHS (Integrated Promoting Action  
401 on Research Implementation in Health Services) application in research [80]. There  
402 is a need for prospective and concurrent applications of implementation TMFs to  
403 identify potential hurdles and areas of complexity ahead of time with  
404 implementation such that mitigation strategies can be put in place [81,82]. Given the  
405 novelty of the NASSS framework, many innovations in this review have already been  
406 implemented either as small-scale demonstration projects or larger  
407 implementations that were not informed a priori by any theoretical framework and  
408 therefore required retrospective evaluation. Nevertheless, the NASSS does not offer  
409 solutions to identified areas of complexity. While some authors noted that the  
410 NASSS helped illuminate areas of focus, it remained unclear what actions they  
411 intended to take [26]. A recent companion document, [11], explicitly recommends  
412 the next steps for each domain where complexity is identified; however, only four of  
413 the included studies had used any of the NASSS-CAT tools [12,52,70,78].

414 The prevalent implementation determinants (i.e., barriers and enablers) identified  
415 in the Organization and Adopter System domains found in this review are consistent  
416 with findings in previous reviews of other tools used in implementation science. The  
417 Exploration, Preparation, Implementation, Sustainment (EPIS) [83] is a commonly  
418 used framework that highlights key phases guiding implementation as well as  
419 factors related to the outer (system) context, inner (organizational) context and the  
420 innovation itself. A review of this framework application shows that the  
421 Implementation phase was most commonly examined in research. During this

422 phase, organizational and individual adopter characteristics were the most  
423 frequently mentioned factors [84], as observed in the current NASSS review.

424 In the dynamic field of implementation science, various determinant frameworks  
425 share similarities in understanding complex factors, focusing on contextual  
426 elements that influence the successful implementation of healthcare innovations.  
427 CFIR, a popular determinant framework in implementation science, primarily  
428 identifies factors that influence implementation outcomes across the domains of  
429 Intervention Characteristics, Outer Setting, Inner Setting, Individual Characteristics,  
430 and Implementation Process [85]. CFIR serves a similar purpose as the NASSS. A  
431 recent literature review of CFIR use indicates that the most commonly used  
432 constructs in studies were “Knowledge and Beliefs about the Intervention,” followed  
433 by “Self-Efficacy,” both of which fall within the domain of Individual Characteristics  
434 [86]. This finding aligns with the NASSS’ Adopter System domain and echoes the  
435 Value Proposition domain, all commonly reported barriers and enablers in this  
436 review.

437 The i-PARiHS is another implementation determinant framework, and it has four  
438 interacting core constructs, including Evidence, Context, Recipients, and Facilitation  
439 [87,88]. The inner and outer Contexts in the i-PARiHS are like the Organization and  
440 Wider Context domains of the NASSS. A review of research using the i-PARiHS [89]  
441 identified variations in how researchers conceptualized outer Context, including  
442 specific influences from external organizations, such as guideline-producing entities,  
443 and attributions of 'contextual trust' to broader political and economic  
444 characteristics [89]. This conceptualization resonates with the Wider Context of the  
445 NASSS. Furthermore, leadership was suggested as another key sub-construct within  
446 the Context of the i-PARiHS [89], which corresponds to the 5A Capacity subdomain  
447 within the Organization domain of the NASSS.

448 Although the NASSS was initially created to implement health and care technologies,  
449 it exhibits similarities with widely used implementation determinant frameworks  
450 designed for a broader range of health innovations, encompassing health technology  
451 and evidence-based practices. As such, we found four studies included in this review  
452 that used the NASSS for non-digital innovations [45,58,63,76], demonstrating the  
453 framework’s adaptability and utility.

454 Our review found that, when used, the NASSS informed many aspects of design,  
455 including the data collection process, data analysis, and the presentation and  
456 interpretation of results. The use of the NASSS framework in data collection and  
457 analysis was usually consistently and clearly reported. However, there was a lack of  
458 consistency and clarity in using the NASSS framework to present and interpret  
459 results. Often, data were presented within the primary domains of the NASSS  
460 framework. As our team organized narrative descriptions of barriers and enablers  
461 into the NASSS subdomains, we observed several instances of overlapping domains.

462 Furthermore, we identified the potential for these barriers to be mapped onto other  
463 primary NASSS domains. This observation may indicate the intricate nature of the  
464 implementation under examination in the included studies, which could be

465 explained by the framework's underlying assumption that, in complex situations,  
466 the NASSS domains interact with one another and are interdependent [25]. In other  
467 words, when interdependencies among the domains exist, it often leads to the  
468 inability to address a singular issue without inadvertently giving rise to new  
469 challenges in other domains of the NASSS [25].

470 For studies that did not present their results using the NASSS domains, despite  
471 reporting the NASSS use for data analysis, it became challenging to determine which  
472 domain(s) the results pertained to concerning predicting or explaining  
473 implementation success or failure. This unclear use of the NASSS framework for  
474 presenting results and interpreting findings represents a notable gap in the  
475 literature. It has been previously documented in the literature that implementation  
476 studies lack reporting, leading to low-quality reporting in the field [90,91].  
477 Specifically, many implementation studies have faced criticism for providing  
478 inaccurate descriptions of the context and lacking information detail on the  
479 implementation process [91]. Poor reporting makes it difficult to synthesize  
480 evidence from relevant studies [90]. Therefore, enhancing reporting practices to  
481 facilitate more straightforward evidence synthesis is essential, aiding future  
482 empirical testing and refinement of the NASSS.

483 Additionally, some studies were unclear about how the NASSS framework was used  
484 to inform the study designs, including the presentation and/or interpretation of  
485 results. Clear reporting standards may increase the NASSS' utility by guiding  
486 researchers on correctly applying and describing its use. The need for better  
487 reporting on how TMFs are used in implementation research is a gap in the  
488 literature that has already been discussed [92]. For example, in a review of  
489 implementation TMFs, 159 different TMFs were identified, with 87% used in five or  
490 fewer studies [92]. Despite the substantial number of TMFs, there is limited  
491 evidence base describing their use [92]. This limitation restricts opportunities for  
492 advancing the science and learning from other researchers. Implementation studies  
493 should more clearly report how TMFs have been incorporated into the study design  
494 [93]. Better reporting allows for a coherent synthesis of evidence, application and  
495 scaling of the TMFs to other contexts, thereby contributing to the science of  
496 implementation [93]. We also found that not many authors shared their experience  
497 of using the NASSS or provided suggestions for the NASSS advancement. Two  
498 studies in this review mentioned the NASSS' shortcomings [62,67], including ethical  
499 principles, and this has been addressed in the Planning and Evaluating Remote  
500 Consultation Services framework in 2021[94]. It would be beneficial to conduct a  
501 review in five years to reassess the application of the NASSS, explore grey literature,  
502 and gather lessons learned for the ongoing advancement and refinement of the  
503 framework.

504 Reporting issues have led to the creation of reporting checklists in other fields, like  
505 the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) checklist for  
506 randomized controlled trials [95]. Some implementation reporting standards are  
507 available; one example is the Standards for Reporting Implementation Studies  
508 (StaRI) Statement and Checklist [91]. The StaRI checklist prompts authors to



509 describe the implementation method and the intervention [91], encouraging  
510 detailed reporting on contextual information. In addition, the StaRI checklist also  
511 prompts authors to describe the theoretical underpinnings of the study. Therefore,  
512 its use in future implementation studies is encouraged and may improve reporting  
513 of TMF applications, including the NASSS.

## 514 **Limitations**

515 Several limitations of this review must be acknowledged. First, quality appraisal was  
516 not employed to exclude studies, as scoping reviews generally do not require such  
517 assessment. In addition, our primary goal was to explore the breadth and depth of  
518 the literature and map available literature about the NASSS application. Second, the  
519 field of mHealth is rapidly evolving, and our findings may need re-evaluation.  
520 Nevertheless, our review remains relevant at the time of publication and  
521 contributes to the ongoing evolution of the NASSS. Third, this review excluded non-  
522 empirical papers, such as commentaries and opinion articles, which could offer  
523 authors insights regarding their experiences with the NASSS framework. Future  
524 reviews aiming to reassess the NASSS application can include a grey literature  
525 search to enhance comprehensiveness. Fourth, we only included studies written in  
526 English. While we did include a small number of English studies published in non-  
527 English speaking countries, our findings may not provide a comprehensive  
528 representation of the NASSS application in those regions.

## 529 **Conclusions**

530 This review outlines the characteristics of studies using the NASSS framework and  
531 examines patterns of its application. Most of the included studies employed  
532 qualitative or mixed/multi-methods designs, which align with the NASSS's purpose  
533 of exploring determinants of implementation success. This often requires qualitative  
534 exploration to assess context. Additionally, most studies retrospectively applied the  
535 NASSS, likely due to the novelty of the framework. However, this highlights the need  
536 for prospective and concurrent utilization of the NASSS during the implementation  
537 phase, revealing a gap in the current literature.

538  
539 Furthermore, nearly all included studies identified various domains as both  
540 implementation barriers and enablers, aligning with the current literature on the  
541 intricate nature of the implementation process. This underscores the importance of  
542 thorough preparation for successful implementation outcomes. Lastly, our review  
543 findings point to a need for improved reporting of NASSS utilization in research,  
544 including how it was applied and a need for more consistency in presenting results  
545 and interpreting findings using the NASSS to facilitate evidence synthesis in the  
546 future.

## 547 **Acknowledgements**

548 HDS conceptualized this review, and HDS, EH, EG, MM, LS, and RB designed the  
549 review protocol following the JBI methodology. LS and HDS wrote the review  
550 protocol and developed the search strategy with a librarian. HDS, EH, EG, MM, LS,

551 and RB participated in screening titles and abstracts and assessing full texts against  
552 the inclusion criteria. HDS, EH, EG, MM, LS, and RB participated in data extraction.  
553 HDS, EH, EG, and MM designed the data analysis plan. HDS, EH, EG, MM, LS, and RB  
554 participated in data analysis. HDS, EH, EG, MM, KET, and MB participated in data  
555 interpretation. HDS, EH, EG, and MM developed tables and figures for data  
556 presentation. HDS, EH, EG, and MM wrote the first draft of the review report. All  
557 authors critically reviewed and provided feedback on the manuscript. HDS worked  
558 on manuscript revisions. KET and MB supervised all steps of this review.

### 559 **Conflicts of Interest**

560 There are no conflicts to declare.

### 561 **Abbreviations**

562 NASSS: Non-Adoption, Abandonment, Scale-Up, Spread and Sustainability

### 563 **Supporting Information**

#### 564 **Supporting Information 1. Search strategy**

#### 565 **Supporting Information 2. Data extraction tool**

### 566 **References**

- 567 1. Ayyoubzadeh SM, Niakan Kalhori S R, Shirkhoda M, Mohammadzadeh N,  
568 Esmaeili M. Supporting colorectal cancer survivors using eHealth: a systematic  
569 review and framework suggestion. *Support Care Cancer* 2020;28: 3543–3555. doi:10.1007/s00520-020-05372-6  
570
- 571 2. Bégin M, Eggertson L, Macdonald N. A country of perpetual pilot projects. *Can*  
572 *Med Assoc J CMAJ CMAJ*. 2009;180: 1185, E88-1185. doi:10.1503/cmaj.090808
- 573 3. Christ C, Schouten MJE, Blankers M, van Schaik DJF, Beekman ATF, Wisman  
574 MA, et al. Internet and computer-based cognitive behavioral therapy for anxiety and  
575 depression in adolescents and young adults: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *J*  
576 *Med Internet Res J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22: e17831. doi:10.2196/17831
- 577 4. Lv M, Wu T, Jiang S, Chen W, Zhang J. Effects of Telemedicine and mHealth on  
578 Systolic Blood Pressure Management in Stroke Patients: Systematic Review and  
579 Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *JMIR MHealth UHealth*. 2021;9:  
580 e24116. doi:10.2196/24116
- 581 5. Pouls BPH, Vriezেকolk JE, Bekker CL, Linn AJ, Onzenoort HAW, Vervloet M, et  
582 al. Effect of Interactive eHealth Interventions on Improving Medication Adherence  
583 in Adults With Long-Term Medication: Systematic Review. *J Med Internet Res*.  
584 2021;23.
- 585 6. Schreiweis B, Pobiruchin M, Strotbaum V, Suleder J, Wiesner M, Bergh B. Barriers  
586 and Facilitators to the Implementation of eHealth Services: Systematic Literature

- 587 Analysis. *J Med Internet Res* *J Med Internet Res*. 2019;21: e14197.  
588 doi:10.2196/14197
- 589 7. Cresswell K, Sheikh A. Organizational issues in the implementation and adoption of  
590 health information technology innovations: An interpretative review. *Int J Med*  
591 *Inform Shannon Irel Int J Med Inf*. 2013;82: e73–e86.  
592 doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2012.10.007
- 593 8. Glover WJ, Nissinboim N, Naveh E. Examining innovation in hospital units: a  
594 complex adaptive systems approach. *BMC Health Serv Res BMC Health Serv Res*.  
595 2020;20: 554. doi:10.1186/s12913-020-05403-2
- 596 9. Greenhalgh T, Papoutsi C. Studying complexity in health services research:  
597 desperately seeking an overdue paradigm shift. *BMC Med BMC Med*. 2018;16: 95.  
598 doi:10.1186/s12916-018-1089-4
- 599 10. Greenhalgh T, Wherton J, Papoutsi C, Lynch J, Hughes G, A’Court C, et al. Beyond  
600 Adoption: A New Framework for Theorizing and Evaluating Nonadoption,  
601 Abandonment, and Challenges to the Scale-Up, Spread, and Sustainability of Health  
602 and Care Technologies. *J Med Internet Res J Med Internet Res*. 2017;19: e367.  
603 doi:10.2196/jmir.8775
- 604 11. Greenhalgh T, Maylor H, Shaw S, Wherton J, Papoutsi C, Betton V, et al. The  
605 NASSS-CAT Tools for Understanding, Guiding, Monitoring, and Researching  
606 Technology Implementation Projects in Health and Social Care: Protocol for an  
607 Evaluation Study in Real-World Settings. *JMIR Res Protoc JMIR Res Protoc*.  
608 2020;9: e16861. doi:10.2196/16861
- 609 12. Gremyr A, Gare BA, Greenhalgh T, Malm U, Thor J, Andersson AC. Using  
610 Complexity Assessment to Inform the Development and Deployment of a Digital  
611 Dashboard for Schizophrenia Care: Case Study. *J Med INTERNET Res*. 2020;22.  
612 doi:10.2196/15521
- 613 13. Papoutsi C, A’Court C, Wherton J, Shaw S, Greenhalgh T. Explaining the mixed  
614 findings of a randomised controlled trial of telehealth with centralised remote  
615 support for heart failure: multi-site qualitative study using the NASSS framework.  
616 *TRIALS*. 2020;21. doi:10.1186/s13063-020-04817-x
- 617 14. Gaglio B, Shoup JA, Glasgow RE. The RE-AIM framework: a systematic review of  
618 use over time. *Am J Public Health 1971 Am J Public Health*. 2013;103: e38–e46.  
619 doi:10.2105/AJPH.2013.301299
- 620 15. Glasgow RE, Harden SM, Gaglio B, Rabin B, Smith ML, Porter GC, et al. RE-AIM  
621 Planning and Evaluation Framework: Adapting to New Science and Practice With a  
622 20-Year Review. *Front Public Health Front Public Health*. 2019;7: 64.  
623 doi:10.3389/fpubh.2019.00064

- 624 16. Wickremasinghe D, Kuruvilla S, Mays N, Avan BI. Taking knowledge users'  
625 knowledge needs into account in health: an evidence synthesis framework. Health  
626 Policy Plan Health Policy Plan. 2016;31: 527–537. doi:10.1093/heapol/czv079
- 627 17. Peters M, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Baldini Soares C, Khalil H, Parker D. Chapter  
628 11: Scoping Reviews. In: Aromataris E, Munn Z, editors. Joanna Briggs Institute  
629 Reviewer's Manual. The Joanna Briggs Institute; 2017.
- 630 18. Peters MDJ, Marnie C, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Munn Z, Alexander L, et al. Updated  
631 methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. JBI Evid Synth JBI  
632 Evid Synth. 2020;18: 2119–2126. doi:10.11124/JBIES-20-00167
- 633 19. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien K K, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA  
634 Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann  
635 Intern Med Ann Intern Med. 2018;169: 467–473. doi:10.7326/M18-0850
- 636 20. Shin HD, Samawi L, Gatov J, Hamovitch E, MacKinnon M, Boateng R, et al. The  
637 NASSS (Non-Adoption, Abandonment, Scale-Up, Spread and Sustainability)  
638 framework use over time: A scoping review protocol. 2022. Available: [osf.io/74csw](https://osf.io/74csw)
- 639 21. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foerster V, Lefebvre C. PRESS  
640 Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement. J Clin  
641 Epidemiol J Clin Epidemiol. 2016;75: 40–46. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.01.021
- 642 22. Wright K, Golder S, Rodriguez-Lopez R. Citation searching: a systematic review  
643 case study of multiple risk behaviour interventions. BMC Med Res Methodol.  
644 2014;14: 73. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-14-73
- 645 23. Covidence systematic review software. Melbourne, Australia.; 2019. Available:  
646 [www.covidence.org](http://www.covidence.org)
- 647 24. Abernethy A, Adams L, Barrett M, Bechtel C, Brennan P, Butte A, et al. The  
648 Promise of Digital Health: Then, Now, and the Future. NAM Perspect NAM  
649 Perspect. 2022;2022. doi:10.31478/202206e
- 650 25. Greenhalgh T, Wherton J, Papoutsi C, Lynch J, Hughes G, A'Court C, et al.  
651 Analysing the role of complexity in explaining the fortunes of technology  
652 programmes: empirical application of the NASSS framework. BMC Med. 2018;16.  
653 doi:10.1186/s12916-018-1050-6
- 654 26. Abimbola S, Patel B, Peiris D, Patel A, Harris M, Usherwood T, et al. The NASSS  
655 framework for ex post theorisation of technology-supported change in healthcare:  
656 worked example of the TORPEDO programme. BMC Med. 2019;17.  
657 doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1463-x
- 658 27. Alhmoud B, Banerjee A, Bonnici T, Patel R, Melley D, Hicks L. Implementation of  
659 a digital early warning score (NEWS2) in a cardiac specialist and general hospital

- 660 settings in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Intensive Care Med Exp.* 2022;10.  
661 doi:10.1186/s40635-022-00469-0
- 662 28. Banck JK, Bernhardsson S. Experiences from implementation of internet-delivered  
663 cognitive behaviour therapy for insomnia in psychiatric health care: a qualitative  
664 study applying the NASSS framework. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2020;20.  
665 doi:10.1186/s12913-020-05596-6
- 666 29. Barnett A, Kelly JT, Wright C, Campbell KL. Technology-supported models of  
667 nutrition care: Perspectives of health service providers. *Digit Health.* 2022;8.  
668 doi:10.1177/20552076221104670
- 669 30. Bezuidenhout L, Joseph C, Thurston C, Rhoda A, English C, Conradsson DM.  
670 Telerehabilitation during the COVID-19 pandemic in Sweden: a survey of use and  
671 perceptions among physiotherapists treating people with neurological diseases or  
672 older adults. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2022;22. doi:10.1186/s12913-022-07968-6
- 673 31. Brown P, Waite F, Lambe S, Jones J, Jenner L, Diamond R, et al. Automated  
674 Virtual Reality Cognitive Therapy (gameChange) in Inpatient Psychiatric Wards:  
675 Qualitative Study of Staff and Patient Views Using an Implementation Framework.  
676 *JMIR Form Res.* 2022;6. doi:10.2196/34225
- 677 32. Budhwani S, Fujioka JK, Chu C, Baranek H, Pus L, Wasserman L, et al. Delivering  
678 Mental Health Care Virtually During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Qualitative  
679 Evaluation of Provider Experiences in a Scaled Context. *JMIR Form Res.* 2021;5.  
680 doi:10.2196/30280
- 681 33. Cartledge S, Rawstorn JC, Tran M, Ryan P, Howden EJ, Jackson A. Telehealth is  
682 here to stay but not without challenges: a consultation of cardiac rehabilitation  
683 clinicians during COVID-19 in Victoria, Australia. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs.* 2022;21:  
684 548–558. doi:10.1093/eurjcn/zvab118
- 685 34. Catapan S de C, Taylor A, Calvo MCM. Health professionals' views of medical  
686 teleconsultation uptake in the Brazilian Unified Health System: A description using  
687 the NASSS framework. *Int J Med Inf.* 2022;168: 104867.  
688 doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2022.104867
- 689 35. Clarkson P, Vassilev I, Rogers A, Brooks C, Wilson N, Lawson J, et al. Integrating  
690 a Web-Based Self-Management Tool (Managing Joint Pain on the Web and  
691 Through Resources) for People With Osteoarthritis-Related Joint Pain With a Web-  
692 Based Social Network Support Tool (Generating Engagement in Network  
693 Involvement): Design, Deve. *JMIR Form Res.* 2020;4. doi:10.2196/18565
- 694 36. Davies SM, Jardine J, Guttridge K, Bernard Z, Park S, Dawson T, et al. Preventive  
695 Digital Mental Health for Children in Primary Schools: Acceptability and  
696 Feasibility Study. *JMIR Form Res.* 2021;5. doi:10.2196/30668

- 697 37. Dijkstra A, Heida A, van Rheenen PF. Exploring the Challenges of Implementing a  
698 Web-Based Telemonitoring Strategy for Teenagers With Inflammatory Bowel  
699 Disease: Empirical Case Study. *J Med INTERNET Res.* 2019;21.  
700 doi:10.2196/11761
- 701 38. Dyb K, Berntsen GR, Kvam L. Adopt, adapt, or abandon technology-supported  
702 person-centred care initiatives: healthcare providers' beliefs matter. *BMC Health  
703 Serv Res.* 2021;21. doi:10.1186/s12913-021-06262-1
- 704 39. Edridge C, Deighton J, Wolpert M, Edbrooke-Childs J. The implementation of an  
705 mHealth intervention (ReZone) for the self-management of overwhelming feelings  
706 among young people. *JMIR Form Res.* 2019;3. doi:10.2196/11958
- 707 40. Fox D, Coddington R, Scarf V, Bisits A, Lainchbury A, Woodworth R, et al.  
708 Harnessing technology to enable all women mobility in labour and birth: feasibility  
709 of implementing beltless non-invasive fetal ECG applying the NASSS framework.  
710 *Pilot Feasibility Stud.* 2021;7: 214. doi:10.1186/s40814-021-00953-6
- 711 41. Franck LS, Kriz RM, Rego S, Garman K, Hobbs C, Dimmock D. Implementing  
712 Rapid Whole-Genome Sequencing in Critical Care: A Qualitative Study of  
713 Facilitators and Barriers to New Technology Adoption. *J Pediatr.* 2021;237: 237-+.  
714 doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2021.05.045
- 715 42. Gorbenko K, Mohammed A, Ezenwafor E, Phlegar S, Healy P, Solly T, et al.  
716 Innovating in a crisis: a qualitative evaluation of a hospital and Google partnership  
717 to implement a COVID-19 inpatient video monitoring program. *J Am Med Inform  
718 Assoc.* 2022;29: 1618–1630. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocac081
- 719 43. Grady A, Barnes C, Wolfenden L, Lecathelinais C, Yoong SL. Barriers and  
720 Enablers to Adoption of Digital Health Interventions to Support the Implementation  
721 of Dietary Guidelines in Early Childhood Education and Care: Cross-Sectional  
722 Study. *J Med INTERNET Res.* 2020;22. doi:10.2196/22036
- 723 44. Greenhalgh T, Shaw S, Wherton J, Vijayaraghavan S, Morris J, Bhattacharya S, et  
724 al. Real-World Implementation of Video Outpatient Consultations at Macro, Meso,  
725 and Micro Levels: Mixed-Method Study. *J Med INTERNET Res.* 2018;20.  
726 doi:10.2196/jmir.9897
- 727 45. Hall A, Ewing G, Rowland C, Grande G. A drive for structure: A longitudinal  
728 qualitative study of the implementation of the Carer Support Needs Assessment  
729 Tool (CSNAT) intervention during hospital discharge at end of life. *Palliat Med.*  
730 2020;34: 1088–1096. doi:10.1177/0269216320930935
- 731 46. Hammerton M, Benson T, Sibley A. Readiness for five digital technologies in  
732 general practice: perceptions of staff in one part of southern England. *BMJ OPEN  
733 Qual.* 2022;11. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-001865

- 734 47. Hehakaya C, Van der Voort van Zyp J, Lagendijk J, Grobbee D, Verkooijen H,  
735 Ellen M. Opportunities and challenges in the adoption and implementation of MR-  
736 Linac for prostate cancer. *Radiother Oncol.* 2020;152: S672. doi:10.1016/S0167-  
737 8140
- 738 48. Hehakaya C, van Zyp J, Lagendijk J, Grobbee DE, Verkooijen HM, Moors E.  
739 Problems and Promises of Introducing the Magnetic Resonance Imaging Linear  
740 Accelerator Into Routine Care: The Case of Prostate Cancer. *Front Oncol.* 2020;10.  
741 doi:10.3389/fonc.2020.01741
- 742 49. Hehakaya C, Sharma AM, van der Voort Van Zijp J RN, Grobbee DE, Verkooijen  
743 HM, Izaguirre EW, et al. Implementation of Magnetic Resonance Imaging-Guided  
744 Radiation Therapy in Routine Care: Opportunities and Challenges in the United  
745 States. *Adv Radiat Oncol.* 2022;7: 1. doi:10.1016/j.adro.2022.101049
- 746 50. Hollick RJ, Black AJ, Reid DM, McKee L. Shaping innovation and coordination of  
747 healthcare delivery across boundaries and borders A comparative case study. *J*  
748 *Health Organ Manag.* 2019;33: 849–868. doi:10.1108/JHOM-10-2018-0315
- 749 51. Jacobs J, Ferguson JM, Van Campen J, Yefimova M, Greene L, Heyworth L, et al.  
750 Organizational and External Factors Associated with Video Telehealth Use in the  
751 Veterans Health Administration Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic.  
752 *Telemed E-Health.* 2022;28: 199–211. doi:10.1089/tmj.2020.0530
- 753 52. Jones NL, Read J, Field B, Fegan C, Simpson E, Revitt C, et al. Remote home  
754 visits: Exploring the concept and applications of remote home visits within health  
755 and social care settings. *Br J Occup Ther.* 2022;85: 50–61.  
756 doi:10.1177/03080226211000265
- 757 53. Kip H, Sieverink F, Van Gemert-Pijnen L, Bouman Y, Kelders SM. Integrating  
758 People, Context, and Technology in the Implementation of a Web-Based  
759 Intervention in Forensic Mental Health Care: Mixed-Methods Study. *J Med*  
760 *INTERNET Res.* 2020;22. doi:10.2196/16906
- 761 54. Kozica-Olenski S, Soldatos G, Marlow L, Cooray SD, Boyle JA. Exploring the  
762 acceptability and experience of receiving diabetes and pregnancy care via telehealth  
763 during the COVID-19 pandemic: a qualitative study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.*  
764 2022;22: 932. doi:10.1186/s12884-022-05175-z
- 765 55. Kozica-Olenski S, Garth B, Boyle JA, Vincent AJ. Menopause care delivery in the  
766 time of COVID-19: evaluating the acceptability of telehealth services for women  
767 with early and usual age menopause. *Climacteric J Int Menopause Soc.* 2022; 1–13.  
768 doi:10.1080/13697137.2022.2127351
- 769 56. Liverani M, Ir P, Perel P, Khan M, Balabanova D, Wiseman V. Assessing the  
770 potential of wearable health monitors for health system strengthening in low- and  
771 middle-income countries: a prospective study of technology adoption in Cambodia.  
772 *Health Policy Plan.* 2022;37: 943–951. doi:10.1093/heapol/czac019

- 773 57. Longacre ML, Keleher C, Chwistek M, Odelberg M, Siemon M, Collins M, et al.  
774 Developing an Integrated Caregiver Patient-Portal System. *HEALTHCARE*.  
775 2021;9. doi:10.3390/healthcare9020193
- 776 58. Martindale AM, Pilbeam C, Mableson H, Tonkin-Crine S, Atkinson P, Borek A, et  
777 al. Perspectives on COVID-19 testing policies and practices: a qualitative study with  
778 scientific advisors and NHS health care workers in England. *BMC PUBLIC Health*.  
779 2021;21. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-11285-8
- 780 59. Merolli M, Marshall CJ, Pranata A, Paay J, Sterling L. User-Centered Value  
781 Specifications for Technologies Supporting Chronic Low-Back Pain Management.  
782 *MEDINFO 2019 Health WELLBEING E-Netw ALL*. 2019;264: 1288–1292.  
783 doi:10.3233/SHT1190434
- 784 60. Miller C, Christian D, Spencer J, Watkins C. Healthcare professionals perceptions  
785 of the stroke-specific education framework; what are the factors influencing  
786 effective implementation and adoption in the national stroke workforce? *Int J*  
787 *Stroke*. 2021;16: 35. doi:10.1177/17474930211059996
- 788 61. Neher M, Nygardh A, Brostrom A, Lundgren J, Johansson P. Perspectives of Policy  
789 Makers and Service Users Concerning the Implementation of eHealth in Sweden:  
790 Interview Study. *J Med INTERNET Res*. 2022;24. doi:10.2196/28870
- 791 62. Nguyen HQ, McMullen C, Haupt EC, Wang SE, Werch H, Edwards PE, et al.  
792 Findings and lessons learnt from early termination of a pragmatic comparative  
793 effectiveness trial of video consultations in home-based palliative care. *BMJ*  
794 *Support Palliat Care*. 2022;12: E432–E440.
- 795 63. Nimsakul K, Suwannaprom P, Suttajit S. Complexity of implementing Harm  
796 Reduction Services in community hospitals: A two-phase qualitative study. *Thai J*  
797 *Pharm Sci*. 2022;46: 324–334.
- 798 64. Perdacher E, Kavanagh D, Sheffield J, Healy K, Dale P, Heffernan E. Using the  
799 Stay Strong App for the Well-being of Indigenous Australian Prisoners: Feasibility  
800 Study. *JMIR Form Res*. 2022;6. doi:10.2196/32157
- 801 65. Przysucha M, Peters L, Büscher A, Schnellhammer M, Hübner U. What Went  
802 Wrong in eMedCare? Formative Evaluation of an IT Project in Primary Care in  
803 Two Rural Districts. *StudHealth TechnolInform*. 2022;296: 9.  
804 doi:10.3233/SHTI220807
- 805 66. Pumplun L, Fecho M, Islam N, Buxmann P. Machine learning systems in clinics -  
806 How mature is the adoption process in medical diagnostics? Proceedings of the  
807 Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences. 2021. pp. 6317–6326.  
808 Available: [https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-](https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85108367707&partnerID=40&md5=c0eb4c92372f9a5f0f2831bbefd17957)  
809 [85108367707&partnerID=40&md5=c0eb4c92372f9a5f0f2831bbefd17957](https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85108367707&partnerID=40&md5=c0eb4c92372f9a5f0f2831bbefd17957)



- 810 67. Pumplun L, Fecho M, Wahl N, Peters F, Buxmann P. Adoption of Machine  
811 Learning Systems for Medical Diagnostics in Clinics: Qualitative Interview Study. *J*  
812 *Med INTERNET Res.* 2021;23. doi:10.2196/29301
- 813 68. Rudin RS, Perez S, Rodriguez JA, Sousa J, Plombon S, Arcia A, et al. User-centered  
814 design of a scalable, electronic health record-integrated remote symptom monitoring  
815 intervention for patients with asthma and providers in primary care. *J Am Med*  
816 *Inform Assoc.* 2021;28: 2433–2444. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocab157
- 817 69. Schougaard L, Mejdahl CT, Christensen J, Lomborg K, Maindal HT, de Thurah A,  
818 et al. Patient-initiated versus fixed-interval patient-reported outcome-based follow-  
819 up in outpatients with epilepsy: a pragmatic randomized controlled trial. *J*  
820 *PATIENT-Rep OUTCOMES.* 2019;3. doi:10.1186/s41687-019-0151-0
- 821 70. Schultz K, Vickery H, Campbell K, Wheeldon M, Barrett-Beck L, Rushbrook E.  
822 Implementation of a virtual ward as a response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Aust*  
823 *Health Rev.* 2021;45: 433–441. doi:10.1071/AH20240
- 824 71. Strohm L, Hehakaya C, Ranschaert ER, Boon W, Moors E. Implementation of  
825 artificial intelligence (AI) applications in radiology: hindering and facilitating  
826 factors. *Eur Radiol.* 2020;30: 5525–5532. doi:10.1007/s00330-020-06946-y
- 827 72. Thomas EE, Chambers R, Phillips S, Rawstorn JC, Cartledge S. Sustaining  
828 telehealth among cardiac and pulmonary rehabilitation services: a qualitative  
829 framework study. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs.* 2022. doi:10.1093/eurjcn/zvac111
- 830 73. Tolf S, Mesterton J, Soderberg D, Amer-Wahlin I, Mazzocato P. How can  
831 technology support quality improvement? Lessons learned from the adoption of an  
832 analytics tool for advanced performance measurement in a hospital unit. *BMC*  
833 *Health Serv Res.* 2020;20. doi:10.1186/s12913-020-05622-7
- 834 74. Tompson A, Fleming S, Lee MM, Monahan M, Jowett S, McCartney D, et al.  
835 Mixed-methods feasibility study of blood pressure self-screening for hypertension  
836 detection. *BMJ OPEN.* 2019;9. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027986
- 837 75. Uribe Guajardo MG, Baillie A, Louie E, Giannopoulos V, Wood K, Riordan B, et  
838 al. The evaluation of the role of technology in the pathways to comorbidity care  
839 implementation project to improve management of comorbid substance use and  
840 mental disorders. *J Multimorb Comorbidity.* 2022;12: 26335565221096977.  
841 doi:10.1177/26335565221096977
- 842 76. Vali Y, Eijk R, Hicks T, Jones WS, Suklan J, Holleboom AG, et al. Clinicians’  
843 Perspectives on Barriers and Facilitators for the Adoption of Non-Invasive Liver  
844 Tests for NAFLD: A Mixed-Method Study. *J Clin Med J Clin Med.* 2022;11: 2707.  
845 doi:10.3390/jcm11102707

- 846 77. Weidner K, Lowman J, Fleischer A, Kosik K, Goodbread P, Chen B, et al. Twitter,  
847 Telepractice, and the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Social Media Content Analysis. *Am*  
848 *J Speech Lang Pathol.* 2021;30: 2561–2571. doi:10.1044/2021\_AJSLP-21-00034
- 849 78. Yakovchenko V, McInnes DK, Petrakis BA, Gillespie C, Lipschitz JM, McCullough  
850 MB, et al. Implementing Automated Text Messaging for Patient Self-management  
851 in the Veterans Health Administration: Qualitative Study Applying the  
852 Nonadoption, Abandonment, Scale-up, Spread, and Sustainability Framework.  
853 *JMIR MHEALTH UHEALTH.* 2021;9. doi:10.2196/31037
- 854 79. Thomas EE, Taylor ML, Ward EC, Hwang R, Cook R, Ross JA, et al. Beyond  
855 forced telehealth adoption: A framework to sustain telehealth among allied health  
856 services. *J Telemed Telecare.* 2022. doi:10.1177/1357633X221074499
- 857 80. Duan Y, Iaconi A, Wang J, Perez JS, Song Y, Chamberlain SA, et al. Conceptual  
858 and relational advances of the PARIHS and i-PARIHS frameworks over the last  
859 decade: a critical interpretive synthesis. *Implement Sci Implement Sci.* 2022;17: 78.  
860 doi:10.1186/s13012-022-01254-z
- 861 81. Ahmed S, Zidarov D, Eilayyan O, Visca R. Prospective application of  
862 implementation science theories and frameworks to inform use of PROMs in routine  
863 clinical care within an integrated pain network. *Qual Life Res Qual Life Res.*  
864 2021;30: 3035–3047. doi:10.1007/s11136-020-02600-8
- 865 82. Moullin JC, Dickson KS, Stadnick NA, Albers B, Nilsen P, Broder-Fingert S, et al.  
866 Ten recommendations for using implementation frameworks in research and  
867 practice. *Implement Sci Commun Implement Sci Commun.* 2020;1: 42.  
868 doi:10.1186/s43058-020-00023-7
- 869 83. Aarons GA, Hurlburt M, Horwitz SM. Advancing a Conceptual Model of Evidence-  
870 Based Practice Implementation in Public Service Sectors. *Adm Policy Ment Health*  
871 *Ment Health Serv Res Adm Policy Ment Health.* 2011;38: 4–23.  
872 doi:10.1007/s10488-010-0327-7
- 873 84. Moullin JC, Dickson KS, Stadnick NA, Rabin B, Aarons GA. Systematic review of  
874 the Exploration, Preparation, Implementation, Sustainment (EPIS) framework.  
875 *Implement Sci Implement Sci.* 2019;14: 1. doi:10.1186/s13012-018-0842-6
- 876 85. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC.  
877 Fostering implementation of health services research findings into practice: a  
878 consolidated framework for advancing implementation science. *Implement Sci*  
879 *Implement Sci.* 2009;4: 50. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-4-50
- 880 86. Kirk MA, Kelley C, Yankey N, Birken SA, Abadie B, Damschroder L. A systematic  
881 review of the use of the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research.  
882 *Implement Sci Implement Sci.* 2016;11: 72. doi:10.1186/s13012-016-0437-z

- 883 87. Harvey G, Kitson A. PARIHS revisited: from heuristic to integrated framework for  
884 the successful implementation of knowledge into practice. *Implement Sci IS*.  
885 2016;11: 33. doi:10.1186/s13012-016-0398-2
- 886 88. Rycroft-Malone J. The PARIHS framework—a framework for guiding the  
887 implementation of evidence-based practice. *J Nurs Care Qual*. 2004;19: 297–304.
- 888 89. Duan Y, Iaconi A, Wang J, Perez JS, Song Y, Chamberlain SA, et al. Conceptual  
889 and relational advances of the PARIHS and i-PARIHS frameworks over the last  
890 decade: a critical interpretive synthesis. *Implement Sci Implement Sci*. 2022;17: 78.  
891 doi:10.1186/s13012-022-01254-z
- 892 90. Pinnock H, Epiphaniou E, Pearce G, Parke H, Greenhalgh T, Sheikh A, et al.  
893 Implementing supported self-management for asthma: a systematic review and  
894 suggested hierarchy of evidence of implementation studies. *BMC Med BMC Med*.  
895 2015;13: 127. doi:10.1186/s12916-015-0361-0
- 896 91. Pinnock H, Barwick M, Carpenter CR, Eldridge S, Grandes G, Griffiths CJ, et al.  
897 Standards for Reporting Implementation Studies (StaRI) Statement. *BMJ Online*  
898 *BMJ*. 2017;356: i6795. doi:10.1136/bmj.i6795
- 899 92. Striffler L, Cardoso R, McGowan J, Cogo E, Nincic V, Khan PA, et al. Scoping  
900 review identifies significant number of knowledge translation theories, models, and  
901 frameworks with limited use. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2018;100: 92–102.  
902 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.04.008
- 903 93. Rycroft-Malone J, Burton CR. Is it Time for Standards for Reporting on Research  
904 about Implementation? *Worldviews Evid-Based Nurs Worldviews Evid Based*  
905 *Nurs*. 2011;8: 189–190. doi:10.1111/j.1741-6787.2011.00232.x
- 906 94. Greenhalgh T, Rosen R, Shaw SE, Byng R, Faulkner S, Finlay T, et al. Planning and  
907 Evaluating Remote Consultation Services: A New Conceptual Framework  
908 Incorporating Complexity and Practical Ethics. *Front Digit Health*. 2021;3: 726095.  
909 doi:10.3389/fdgth.2021.726095
- 910 95. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines  
911 for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *PLoS Med PLoS Med*. 2010;7:  
912 e1000251. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000251
- 913

## Supporting Information 1. Search Strategy

(Search Ran 20 December 2022)

### Medline (Ovid)

Database Ovid MEDLINE: Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Ovid MEDLINE® Daily and Ovid MEDLINE® <1946-Present>

Search strategy:

- 
- 1 NASSS.ti,ab,kf. (51)
  - 2 ((non-adoption or nonadoption) adj2 abandonment adj5 (scale-up or scaleup) adj2 spread adj2 sustainability).ti,ab,kf. (53)
  - 3 NASSS-CAT.ti,ab,kf. (2)
  - 4 (greenhalgh\* adj5 (framework\* or model\*)).ti,ab,kf. (26)
  - 5 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 (88)

### EMBASE (Ovid)

Database: Embase Classic+Embase 1947 to 2022 December 19

Search strategy:

- 
- 1 NASSS.ti,ab,kf. (54)
  - 2 ((non-adoption or nonadoption) adj2 abandonment adj5 (scale-up or scaleup) adj2 spread adj2 sustainability).ti,ab,kf. (51)
  - 3 NASSS-CAT.ti,ab,kf. (2)
  - 4 (greenhalgh\* adj5 (framework\* or model\*)).ti,ab,kf. (35)
  - 5 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 (97)

### APA PsychInfo (Ovid)

Database: APA PsycInfo 1806 to December Week 2 2022

Search strategy:

- 
- 1 NASSS.ti,ab,id. (12)

- 2 ((non-adoption or nonadoption) adj2 abandonment adj5 (scale-up or scaleup) adj2 spread adj2 sustainability).ti,ab,id. (6)
- 3 NASSS-CAT.ti,ab,id. (0)
- 4 (greenhalgh\* adj5 (framework\* or model\*)).ti,ab,id. (8)
- 5 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 (22)

## CINAHL (EBSCO)

Database: CINAHL Plus with Full Text

Search strategy:

- 
- 1 TI NASSS OR AB NASSS OR TX NASSS (34)
  - 2 TI ( ((non-adoption OR nonadoption) N2 abandonment N2 (scale-up or scaleup) N2 spread N2 sustainability) ) OR AB ( ((non-adoption OR nonadoption) N2 abandonment N2 (scale-up or scaleup) N2 spread N2 sustainability) ) OR TX ( ((non-adoption OR nonadoption) N2 abandonment N2 (scale-up or scaleup) N2 spread N2 sustainability) ) (20)
  - 3 TI NASSS-CAT OR AB NASSS-CAT OR TX NASSS-CAT (3)
  - 4 TI ( greenhalgh\* N5 (framework\* OR model\*) ) OR AB ( greenhalgh\* N5 (framework\* OR model\*) ) OR TX ( greenhalgh\* N5 (framework\* OR model\*) ) (74)
  - 5 S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 (109)

## LISTA (EBSCO)

Database: Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts

Search strategy:

- 
- 1 TI NASSS OR AB NASSS OR TX NASSS (9)
  - 2 TI ( ((non-adoption OR nonadoption) N2 abandonment N2 (scale-up or scaleup) N2 spread N2 sustainability) ) OR AB ( ((non-adoption OR nonadoption) N2 abandonment N2 (scale-up or scaleup) N2 spread N2 sustainability) ) OR TX ( ((non-adoption OR nonadoption) N2 abandonment N2 (scale-up or scaleup) N2 spread N2 sustainability) ) (9)
  - 3 TI NASSS-CAT OR AB NASSS-CAT OR TX NASSS-CAT (1)
  - 4 TI ( greenhalgh\* N5 (framework\* OR model\*) ) OR AB ( greenhalgh\* N5 (framework\* OR model\*) ) OR TX ( greenhalgh\* N5 (framework\* OR model\*) ) (1)
  - 5 S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 (12)

### Web of Science

Database: Web of Science Core Collection (1900-present)

Search strategy:

- 
- 1 TS=(NASSS) (48)
  - 2 TS=((non-adoption or nonadoption) NEAR/2 abandonment NEAR/5 (scale-up or scaleup) NEAR/2 spread NEAR/2 sustainability ) (49)
  - 3 TS=(NASSS-CAT) (2)
  - 4 TS=(greenhalgh\* NEAR/5 (framework\* OR model\*)) (30)
  - 5 #1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4 (89)

### Scopus

Database: Scopus

Search strategy:

- 
- 1 TITLE-ABS-KEY ( nasss ) (55)
  - 2 TITLE-ABS-KEY ( ( NON-ADOPTION OR NONADOPTION ) W/2 ABANDONMENT W/5 ( SCALE-UP OR SCALEUP ) W/2 SPREAD W/2 SUSTAINABILITY ) (43)
  - 3 TITLE-ABS-KEY ( nasss-cat ) (2)
  - 4 TITLE-ABS-KEY ( greenhalgh\* W/5 ( framework\* OR model\* ) ) (38)
  - 5 TITLE-ABS-KEY ( nasss ) OR ( TITLE-ABS-KEY ( ( non adoption OR nonadoption ) W/2 abandonment W/5 ( scale-up OR scaleup ) W/2 spread W/2 sustainability ) ) OR ( TITLE-ABS-KEY ( nasss-cat ) ) OR ( TITLE-ABS-KEY ( greenhalgh\* W/5 ( framework\* OR model\* ) ) ) (103)

## Supporting Information 2. Data Extraction Tool

		Value	
Citation information	Author		
	Year		
	Study title		
	Link		
	Journal		
Study characteristics	Type of study (peer-reviewed, gray lit)		
	Country (setting)		
	Study timeframe		
	Study aims		
	Study type		
	Study design (e.g., cross-sectional, retrospective cohort)		
	Data sources	Select all: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Health-admin data</li> <li>▪ Survey</li> <li>▪ Interview</li> <li>▪ Focus Group</li> <li>▪ Other : Insert text</li> </ul>	
	Setting		
	Study participants (data collected from them for the purpose of the study aim)		
	Condition/diagnosis		
	Intervention type		
	Intervention (describe)		
	Intervention targets (e.g., patients with a specific condition)		
How NASSS was applied	Timing of framework use with regards to implementation	Select: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prospective</li> <li>▪ Retrospective</li> <li>▪ Concurrently</li> </ul>	
	NASSS was used in:	Select all: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Study design</li> <li>▪ Data collection</li> <li>▪ Analysis</li> <li>▪ Presentation</li> <li>▪ Interpretation</li> </ul>	
	Were NASSS tools used?		
Barriers (NASSS domains)	Description of barriers		
		Select corresponding sub domains (can select multiple)	
	(1) The illness/condition		▪ 1A. Nature of Condition/Illness
			▪ 1B. Comorbidities
			▪ 1C. Sociocultural factors
			▪ The illness/condition: other (list)
			▪ 2A. Material properties
	(2) The technology		▪ 2B. Knowledge to use
			▪ 2C. Knowledge generated
			▪ 2D. Supply model
			▪ 2E. Who owns the IP
			▪ The technology: other (list)
	(3) The value proposition		▪ 3A. Supply-side value (to developer)
		▪ 3B. Demand-side value (to patient)	
		▪ The value proposition: other (list)	
(4) The adopters		▪ 4A. Staff (role, identity)	
		▪ 4B. Patient (passive vs. active input)	
		▪ 4C. Carers (available, type of input)	
		▪ The adopters: other (list)	
(5) The organization(s)		▪ 5A. Capacity to innovate	

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

		▪ 5B. Readiness for this technology
		▪ 5C. Nature of adoption/funding decision
		▪ 5D. Extent of changes needed to organisational routines
		▪ 5E. Work needed to implement and evaluate change
		▪ The organization: other (list)
	(6) The wider system	▪ 6A. Political/policy context
		▪ 6B. Regulatory/legal issues
		▪ 6C. Professional bodies
		▪ 6D. Socio-cultural context
		▪ 6E. Inter-organisational networking
	(7) Over time	▪ The wider system: Other (list)
		▪ 7A. Scope for adaptation over time
		▪ 7B. Organisational resilience
Enablers (NASSS domains)	Description of enablers	
	(1) The illness/condition	Select corresponding sub domains (can select multiple)
		▪ 1A. Nature of Condition/Illness
		▪ 1B. Comorbidities
		▪ 1C. Sociocultural factors
	(2) The technology	▪ The illness/condition: other (list)
		▪ 2A. Material properties
		▪ 2B. Knowledge to use
		▪ 2C. Knowledge generated
		▪ 2D. Supply model
	(3) The value proposition	▪ 2E. Who owns the IP
		▪ The technology: other (list)
		▪ 3A. Supply-side value (to developer)
(4) The adopters	▪ 3B. Demand-side value (to patient)	
	▪ The value proposition: other (list)	
	▪ 4A. Staff (role, identity)	
(5) The organization(s)	▪ 4B. Patient (passive vs. active input)	
	▪ 4C. Carers (available, type of input)	
	▪ The adopters: other (list)	
	▪ 5A. Capacity to innovate	
	▪ 5B. Readiness for this technology	
	▪ 5C. Nature of adoption/funding decision	
	▪ 5D. Extent of changes needed to organisational routines	
▪ 5E. Work needed to implement and evaluate change		
(6) The wider system	▪ The organization: other (list)	
	▪ 6A. Political/policy context	
	▪ 6B. Regulatory/legal issues	
	▪ 6C. Professional bodies	
	▪ 6D. Socio-cultural context	
(7) Over time	▪ 6E. Inter-organisational networking	
	▪ The wider system: Other (list)	
	▪ 7A. Scope for adaptation over time	
Takeaways	Next steps, based on conclusions (e.g., how to deal w identified complexity)?	
	Study conclusion using NASSS: Will the intervention get adopted, scale, spread, and/or sustain (any)? Or if retrospective, did we identify why it did not succeed?	
	Feedback regarding NASSS application (recommendations)	