

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

A mixed-methods analysis of the implementation of a new community long-COVID service during the 2020 pandemic: learning from practice.

Stefanie L Williams<sup>1\*</sup>, Emily Beadle<sup>1</sup>, Paul Williams<sup>2</sup>, Harsha Master<sup>2</sup>, Annalisa Casarin<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Life and Medical Sciences, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup> Covid Assessment and Rehabilitation Service, Hertfordshire Community NHS Trust, Welwyn Garden City, United Kingdom

\*Corresponding author

Email: [s.williams35@herts.ac.uk](mailto:s.williams35@herts.ac.uk) (SW)

**Short title: Long-COVID and healthcare services**

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

32

33 **ABSTRACT:**

34 **Introduction:** The rapidly increasing prevalence of long-COVID (LC), the multisystem complexity of  
35 the condition and high patient symptom burden, necessitated an immediate need to develop new  
36 clinics for assessment and management. This article reports on the rapid implementation of a  
37 reactive and responsive LC care pathway. We mapped patients' journey through this pathway,  
38 identifying the services that were activated according to prevalent symptoms, and assessed the  
39 barriers and facilitators to its implementation and delivery, from the perspective of health care  
40 professionals (HCPs) and LC patients using the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF).

41 **Methods:** Mixed methods study, including retrospective quantitative cross-sectional analysis of  
42 patient data and semi-structured qualitative interviews. One hundred and sixteen patients who  
43 attended long-COVID clinic in Hertfordshire, UK, in the first 5 months of its existence, consented for  
44 their data to be analysed for the quantitative study. Six HCPs and five patients participated in semi-  
45 structured interviews.

46 **Results:** Patients were referred into the service an average of 5.75 months post initial COVID-19  
47 infection. 82% of patients required onward referral to other HCPs, most commonly pulmonary  
48 rehabilitation, chronic fatigue specialists, and the specialist COVID-19 Rehab general practitioner  
49 embedded within the service. Patients reported having rehabilitation needs, moderate depression  
50 and anxiety, and difficulties performing usual activities of daily living at point of care. The TDF  
51 domains most relevant to the implementation of the LC pathway were *beliefs about capabilities,*  
52 *environmental context and resources, knowledge, and reinforcement.*

53 **Discussion:** Our study provides novel insight into the development of a reactive multidisciplinary  
54 care pathway. Key drivers for successful implementation of LC services were identified, such as  
55 leadership, multidisciplinary teamwork, transferable skills, and knowledge exchange. Barriers to

56 rapid set up of the service included funding constraints and the rapid evolution of an emergency  
57 context.

## 58 **Introduction**

### 59 **Long-COVID**

60 Following recovery from acute COVID-19 infection, some patients subsequently experience a range  
61 of persistent and debilitating physical and psychological symptoms such as fatigue, breathlessness,  
62 and cognitive impairment. Such symptoms, of which over 200 have been reported, are indicative of  
63 a multiphasic, cyclical condition, which has become known by the patient-made term ‘long-COVID’  
64 (LC) [1,2]. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines LC, otherwise known as post-COVID-19  
65 syndrome and Post-Acute Sequelae of CoVID-19 (PASC), as *“the continuation or development of new*  
66 *symptoms 3 months after the initial SARS-CoV-2 infection, with these symptoms lasting for at least 2*  
67 *months with no other explanation”* [2]. The condition is estimated to affect 1.9 million people in the  
68 UK [3] and at least 65 million individuals worldwide[4].

69

### 70 **Long-COVID services**

71 Due to the rapidly increasing prevalence of LC internationally, the need for the development of new  
72 care pathways and multidisciplinary clinics to assess and manage symptomatic patients was  
73 recognised, and advocated for by patient groups, clinicians, and researchers as early as April 2020  
74 [5,6]. Furthermore, the WHO emphasised the need for multidisciplinary approaches to the  
75 assessment and management of LC, which are contextually appropriate and tailored to the specific  
76 complexities of the multisystem condition [7]. In 2021, the NHS provided £10 million for the creation  
77 of a network of clinics to help assess and treat those in the community exhibiting symptoms of LC,  
78 with the target of creating more than 60 centres across England [8]. This was subsequently followed

79 by an additional £90 million investment in specialist LC clinics in England [9]. Prior to the availability  
80 of additional resource, community services adapted their care provision in order to absorb the high  
81 demand of caring for people with LC. With very limited national guidance or research, there was an  
82 immediate need to develop new pathways in response to clinical need.

83

## 84 **Barriers to accessing care for long-COVID.**

85 Access to specific LC support can validate patients' experiences of the condition[10]. However,  
86 limited awareness, poor coverage, inconsistency, disconnect between healthcare systems and  
87 funding uncertainties have been identified as structural barriers to the provision of specialised  
88 integrated care for LC [11]. Healthcare professionals have reported a lack of existing referral  
89 pathways, service capacity pressures, lack of medical staff within LC service provision, resource  
90 issues, gaps in knowledge and lack of confidence in managing the condition as barriers to the  
91 effective implementation of community rehabilitation for LC [12]. However, these findings were  
92 reflective of the challenges of delivering adapting existing integrated services, to absorb LC patients,  
93 rather than a dedicated LC clinic. Furthermore, existing research examining the influences on the  
94 implementation of LC services, from the perspective of those involved in their delivery, is so far  
95 limited to two UK regions, and do not refer to frameworks of implementation science [11,12].  
96 Specific barriers identified by groups disproportionately affected by COVID-19, such as ethnic  
97 minorities, included mistrust in health professionals and fear [13]. A finding which may explain  
98 poorer uptake of multidisciplinary LC clinics by these groups [13,14].

99

## 100 **Implementation science**

101 The implementation, and subsequent ongoing delivery, of a new multidisciplinary healthcare service  
102 requires substantial behavioural changes at different levels within the organisation responsible for  
103 its inception. The Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) is a theory-based approach to  
104 implementation, which can be used to provide a granular understanding of the psychological  
105 capability and reflective motivational processes underpinning behaviour change within this  
106 context [15,16]. The TDF[15] consists of 14 theoretical domains relevant to behaviour change:  
107 knowledge; skills; memory; attention and decision processes; behavioural regulation;  
108 social/professional role and identity; beliefs about capabilities; optimism; beliefs about  
109 consequences; intentions; goals; reinforcement; emotion, environmental context and resources and  
110 social influences. The TDF has been used extensively across a wide range of healthcare settings to  
111 understand barriers and facilitators to the implementation of guidelines and services [17,18]. In  
112 relation to COVID-19, the TDF has been used to understand covid-19 disease prevention behaviours,  
113 including vaccine uptake [19–22], hand hygiene [19,23] and adherence to guidelines [24]. It has also  
114 been applied to the development of an intervention to support doctors’ well-being and resilience  
115 during CoVID-19 [25]. However, to our knowledge this is the first study to apply the TDF within the  
116 context of the implementation of a LC service to understand the barriers and facilitators to the  
117 effective implementation of such a service.

118

## 119 **Aims of the study**

120 The present study reports on the rapid implementation of a reactive and responsive, jointly  
121 specialist COVID-19 Rehab General Practitioner (GP) and Applied Health Professional (AHP)- led  
122 multidisciplinary pathway in a community setting, developed to help manage demands associated  
123 with the long-term complications of CoVID-19. The pathway was first set up in August 2020, prior to  
124 the National Institute for clinical Excellence (NICE) publication of case definition in November 2020  
125 and clinical guidance in December 2020 [26]. Referrals into the service came from both primary and

126 secondary care. In addition to examining the demographic and symptom characteristics of the  
127 patients accessing the pathway and mapping their journey through it, which can provide comparison  
128 with other long- COVID pathways [14], we also aimed to explore the experiences of service users and  
129 providers. In particular, we sought to assess the barriers and facilitators to the implementation of  
130 the clinic from the perspective of both LC clinic HCPs, and LC patients receiving care via, the  
131 pathway.

132

## 133 **Materials and Methods**

### 134 **Study design and setting**

135 The study took place within a Hertfordshire LC service, which began in August 2020. Covering a  
136 population of 600,000 people in East and North Hertfordshire, the multi-disciplinary team (MDT)  
137 initiated and developed a new COVID-19 pathway in response to patient need and demand  
138 underpinned by an integrated approach to care i.e. to provide coordinated, holistic care involving  
139 both medical assessment and rehabilitation. A COVID-19 rehabilitation register was developed to  
140 identify and map patients in need of support and to track patient numbers and outcomes across the  
141 NHS trust. An Allied Health Professional COVID-19 coordinator was recruited to facilitate the  
142 coordination and triage of these patients across pathways and systems from August 2020. The  
143 pathway was an entirely virtual community-based clinic jointly led by a Specialist COVID-19 Rehab  
144 General Practitioner (GP) and Occupational Therapist, with a large MDT of allied health  
145 professionals. These included Physiotherapists, Speech and Language Therapists, Dietitians,  
146 Pulmonary Rehab, Chronic Fatigue specialists, and a Clinical Psychologist. Complex patients were  
147 reviewed by the clinic's GP and referred on to secondary care specialists as needed. The team also  
148 worked closely with colleagues in the acute hospitals, social care, and the voluntary sector.

149 A mixed-methods study design was used for this evaluation. The quantitative component consisted  
150 of a retrospective cross-sectional analysis of data collected from patients admitted to the LC service  
151 between 1st August 2020 and 31st December 2020. The qualitative component consisted of semi-  
152 structured interviews with 1) a subsample of these patients, and 2) HCPs working within the service  
153 during the same time period.

154

## 155 **Participants and Data collection procedures**

156 Patients and HCPs were eligible to participate if they were referred to or worked within the service  
157 between the dates specified above. There were no limitations on eligibility to take part according to  
158 HCP type. Where possible, purposive sampling was used for participant selection for the qualitative  
159 interviews to ensure inclusion of participants with diverse characteristics. The recruitment period for  
160 this study was between 14<sup>th</sup> April 2022 and 31<sup>st</sup> July 2023.

161 Quantitative data were collected by staff within the clinic (HM) during the day-to-day running of the  
162 service and recorded (EB) using an electronic data collection form developed specifically for this  
163 study (S1 Table). Upon entering the clinic, a clinical assessment was performed, a post COVID-19  
164 rehabilitation form filled in and patients were asked to complete questionnaires including the  
165 measures detailed below. Of 218 patients referred into the clinic, 116 provided consent for their  
166 data to be analysed for research purposes. Of those, five patients agreed to participate in a semi-  
167 structured interview. Patients were approached to participate in the research via email and/or  
168 telephone. In total, six clinicians were invited to participate, and all agreed to participate in a semi-  
169 structured interview. All participants were provided with information sheets and provided written  
170 consent by signing consent forms prior to participation in the interview.

171 All qualitative interviews were conducted by the same male researcher (PW), an Academic Research  
172 Fellow (PhD) at the time of the interview. PW knew all clinicians because of working within the clinic

173 in a research capacity, PW did not have a relationship with any of the patients prior to study  
174 commencement. Participants were provided with the researcher's name and contact details in the  
175 information sheets, as well as reasons for doing the research. No other detail related to the  
176 interviewer were provided. Interviews took place online and were recorded. Only the interviewer  
177 and participants were present during the interviews. Patient and HCP interviews lasted  
178 approximately 60 minutes. Field notes were taken during the interview. No repeat interviews were  
179 undertaken. After interviewing five patients and six clinicians, the research team were satisfied that  
180 data saturation had been reached, recruitment was then ceased. Quantitative data were accessed  
181 on 14<sup>th</sup> April 2022. Quantitative data were directly accessed by EB prior to analysis to identify eligible  
182 cases, EB therefore had access to information that could identify individual participants at this stage.  
183 However, quantitative data were anonymised and encrypted by the NHS Trust Information Manager  
184 prior to analysis. Interview recordings and verbatim transcript were stored securely for analysis by  
185 the authors (AC, EB, PW, SW). Transcripts were not returned to participants for comment and/or  
186 correction.

## 187 **Measures**

188 Quantitative measures included demographic variables (i.e. age, gender, ethnicity, smoking status,  
189 BMI, deprivation status using postcode); Pre-existing comorbidities; Disability (physical, learning).  
190 Referral data included date of referral, primary reason for referral, source of referral, discharge data,  
191 intervention (rejected for referral or discharged), referrals on to individual services, and date of  
192 onwards referral. COVID-19-related test/ history data included i) hospitalisation, ii) current/past  
193 treatment, iii) onset, iv) test results, v) initial symptoms, and v) ongoing problems.

194 In addition, the following measures were used: Yorkshire Rehabilitation Screening (C19-YRS)[27,28];  
195 frailty scale; Malnutrition universal screening; UCLH Loneliness assessment; PHQ-9 [29]; GAD-7 [30];  
196 Patient functional scale and self-management plan; EuroQol five-dimension health questionnaire  
197 (EQ5D) [31]. The PHQ-9[29] and GAD-7 [30] were only completed when deemed necessary by LC



198 clinic staff, and the C19-YRS[27,28] measure was developed during the COVID-19 pandemic. EQ5D  
199 [31] data were not initially collected upon clinic set up. Thus, completion rates for these measures  
200 were lower than for the other included measures.

201 Qualitative data were collected through semi-structured interviews. Patient interview schedules  
202 developed by the authors (AC, EB) focused on; patients overall experience of the LC clinic, clarity of  
203 their assessment and treatment pathway through the clinic, interactions with staff/clinicians, clarity  
204 of communication with clinicians/staff, satisfaction with received care, potential improvements of  
205 care and pathway, preference for virtual or in-person services. HCP interview schedules included  
206 questions on their experiences of setting up a reactive LC service, of working in a multi-disciplinary  
207 team, the organisational structure of the service, issues experienced delivering care in time of a  
208 pandemic, virtual services, interactions with patients, interactions with other staff/clinicians,  
209 adaptations to service based on patient needs/wants. Topic guides for patient and HCP interviews  
210 are available as supplementary material (S2 File).

211

## 212 **Data analysis**

### 213 **Quantitative data analysis**

214 Patient demographic variables are reported using frequencies and/or percentages for categorical  
215 variables and means  $\pm$  SD for continuous variables. Descriptive data on service utilisation and  
216 referral pathways are reported using frequencies and/or percentages, including i) where patients  
217 were referred from, ii) primary reason for being referred into to the service, iii) which services were  
218 used by which patients, iv) number of services accessed by each patient, v) referrals on to other  
219 services. Pearson's chi-square/Fisher's exact was used to explore the relationships between  
220 demographic and service-related variables (e.g. sex and primary reason for referral). Data were  
221 analysed in SPSS (version 28) by EB.

222

## 223 **Qualitative data analysis**

224 Anonymised interview data were coded using NVivo (version 12). Data were analysed using thematic  
225 analysis [32]. Inductive open coding using a line-by-line process was first used to analyse the  
226 transcripts. To ensure integrity of the analysis process, two coders (PW, AC) independently coded  
227 the first two interviews. Following this, the rest of the interviews were analysed by three coders  
228 (PW, AC, EB).

229 Quotes were deductively allocated to one of 14-domains specified within the TDF [15] using a table  
230 developed for the current study. To prevent omitting important data, subdomains were added  
231 where appropriate. Discrepancies in allocating quotes to a relevant TDF domains were resolved by  
232 discussion. A framework matrix was developed to reduce and organise the data into themes, cases,  
233 and sets, and connections between categories were mapped to explore relationships and/or  
234 causality. Data triangulation was used to gain a greater understanding of multiple perspectives;  
235 similarities and differences between domains related to patients' and healthcare professionals'  
236 views were identified. Finally, codes related to barriers and/or facilitators were extracted and used  
237 to create a list (table 3). Participants did not provide feedback on the findings.

238

## 239 **Ethics approval**

240 Ethical approval for the study was obtained through Health Research Authority (HRA) and Health  
241 and Care Research Wales (HCRW) Research Ethics Committee (REC reference: 21/PR/0987). All  
242 participants provided informed consent prior to participating in the study. University of  
243 Hertfordshire and institutional ethics guidelines were followed.

244

## 245 **Patient and public involvement**

246 The project was designed to capture the efforts of the community care professionals to meet  
247 patients' expectations for LC assessment and management. We believe the aims of the study reflects  
248 patients' priorities in research. Exploring their experiences in accessing care and navigating through  
249 a newly developed pathway was discussed with members of the public who attended clinic  
250 appointments. A person responded welcoming the study and confirming the importance of research  
251 on all things related to LC. We also sought involvement from HCPs involved in delivery of the LC  
252 clinic who contributed to shaping the aims and study plan. We will seek advice from study  
253 participants on the best methods to reach the public with the study findings.

254

## 255 **Results**

256 Between August and December 2020, 218 patients were referred to the clinic, of which 116 gave  
257 consent to take part in the current study. All patients were diagnosed with LC, had suspected LC, or  
258 had COVID-19 associated rehabilitation needs.

259

## 260 **Patient characteristics**

261 Patients attending the service (n=116) were aged between 19 and 83 years (Mean = 50.68, SD =  
262 14.40) and the majority were female (70.7%). Most were classified as living in non-deprived  
263 conditions (98.3%) and were White British (76.7%). The majority were non-smokers (75%) or ex-  
264 smokers (19%), only 3.4% were current smokers. The mean number of comorbidities patients  
265 reported ranged between 0-6 (mean= 1.95). The most common were chronic pain/fatigue (21.55%),

266 unspecified respiratory illness (20.68%), heart disease (18.97%), asthma (16.37%) and hypertension  
267 (11.2%). See Table 1.

268

269 Table 1. Characteristics of patients entering the LC clinic.

|                |                          | N   | (age range) and<br>% of study population | Mean  | SD    |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----|--|-------|-------|
| Age            |                          | 116 | (19-83yo)                                | 50.68 | 14.40 |
| Sex            | Male                     | 34  | 29.31%                                   |       |       |
|                | Female                   | 82  | 70.69%                                   |       |       |
| Deprivation    | Deprived                 | 2   | 1.72%                                    |       |       |
|                | Non-Deprived             | 114 | 98.28%                                   |       |       |
| Ethnicity      | White British            | 89  | 76.72%                                   |       |       |
|                | White Irish              | 2   | 1.72%                                    |       |       |
|                | White Other              | 5   | 4.31%                                    |       |       |
|                | Indian or Indian British | 3   | 2.59%                                    |       |       |
|                | Caribbean                | 1   | 0.86%                                    |       |       |
|                | British or Mixed British | 10  | 8.62%                                    |       |       |
|                | Mixed Other              | 2   | 1.72%                                    |       |       |
|                | No Data                  | 4   | 3.45%                                    |       |       |
| Smoking-Status | Smoker                   | 4   | 3.45%                                    |       |       |
|                | Ex-smoker                | 22  | 18.97%                                   |       |       |
|                | Non-smoker               | 87  | 75%                                      |       |       |
|                | Info refused/not known   | 3   | 2.59%                                    |       |       |

|                |                                 |    |        |  |  |
|----------------|---------------------------------|----|--------|--|--|
| Co-morbidities | Unspecified respiratory illness | 24 | 20.68% |  |  |
|                | Asthma                          | 19 | 16.37% |  |  |
|                | COPD                            | 5  | 4.31%  |  |  |
|                | Diabetes                        | 8  | 6.89%  |  |  |
|                | Hypertension                    | 13 | 11.20% |  |  |
|                | Heart Disease                   | 22 | 18.97% |  |  |
|                | Hyper/Hypo-thyroidism           | 7  | 6.03%  |  |  |
|                | Cancer                          | 4  | 3.45%  |  |  |
|                | Skin condition                  | 8  | 6.89%  |  |  |
|                | Migraines/chronic headache      | 5  | 4.31%  |  |  |
|                | Sleep condition                 | 3  | 2.59%  |  |  |
|                | High BMI                        | 7  | 6.03%  |  |  |
|                | Mobility                        | 6  | 5.17%  |  |  |
|                | Chronic pain/fatigue            | 25 | 21.55% |  |  |
|                | Gastrointestinal Disease        | 11 | 9.48%  |  |  |
|                | Other                           | 24 | 20.68% |  |  |
|                |                                 |    |        |  |  |

270

271

272 Patients within the LC service reported having ongoing rehabilitation needs (C19-YRS mean 7.99, SD=  
 273 6.31). Patients also reported having moderate depression (mean= 13.21, SD= 7.22) and moderate  
 274 anxiety (mean= 9.39, SD= 6.76) associated with onset of COVID-19 and reported difficulties with  
 275 performing usual activities of daily living (mean= 1.95, SD= 1.01).

276 There were no significant differences shown between month of referral into the service and C19-  
277 YRS, PHQ-9, and GAD-7 outcomes. However, there was an increase in the average score of the C19-  
278 YRS in November 2020. Patients reporting gastro-intestinal comorbidities reported significantly  
279 lower scores on EQ5D self-care measured at access to the service (mean = 1.0), versus those without  
280 (mean = 1.30),  $t(98) = 4.10$ ,  $p < .001$ . No other significant differences observed regarding comorbidity  
281 type or frequency and EQ5D.

282

### 283 **Referrals into the service**

284 There were between 15 and 30 patients (mean=23.2) referred into the service per month, during the  
285 five-month study period. The number of patients referred into the service during August,  
286 September, October, November and December was 30, 20, 27, 24 and 15, respectively.

287 Patients were admitted to the LC clinic on average 5.75 months post initial-infection/symptoms of  
288 COVID-19. The majority of patients were admitted 7 months post-COVID (N=28), reflecting an  
289 absence of LC clinics prior to August 2020, e.g., a person being affected by the infection in the early  
290 part of the year (Jan-April) and being admitted to the clinic between Aug and Nov. One patient was  
291 admitted in the same month as they experienced COVID symptoms.

292 The majority of patients were referred to the service by their General Practitioner (GP: 72.4%). Initial  
293 symptoms of COVID-19 were treated at home by 63.8% of patients and the majority did not have a  
294 test (41.4%), or were too early for testing (18.1%), to confirm their COVID-19 status. In total, 33.6%  
295 had a positive test result confirmed on referral to the service. Most patients were referred to the  
296 service for respiratory conditions (50.9%) or chronic fatigue issues (18.1%). The journey of patients  
297 through the service pathway can be found in S3 Figure.

298

299

300

301 **COVID and Long-COVID symptoms of patients referred into the**  
302 **service.**

303 Temperature changes (increased, reduced or both; n=59, 50.86%), shortness of breath (SOB; n=76,  
304 65.5%), cough (n=59, 50.86%), and fatigue (N=51, 43.97%) were the most reported symptoms for  
305 initial acute COVID infection. There was a significant association between shortness of breath (SOB)  
306 at initial infection and smoking status, with non-smokers (never smoked) more likely to report SOB  
307 than current smokers and ex-smokers ( $p= 0.022$ ). See Fig 1.

308

309 **Fig 1. COVID and long-COVID symptoms of patients referred into the service.**

310

311 Breathing difficulties, primarily continued shortness of breath (n=74,63.79%), and fatigue (n=46,  
312 39.66%) were the most reported LC symptoms at admittance to the service.

313 Fatigue and breathing difficulties were present in both primary COVID infection and LC, while cardiac  
314 (n=16, 13.79%), concentration (n=12, 10.34%) and mental health issues (n=8, 6.89%) started only  
315 after the primary infection.

316 There was a significant difference in primary COVID infection symptoms between patients who were  
317 hospitalised and those that were not hospitalised (i.e. homecare, A&E access but not admitted, self-  
318 referral). People who were treated at home or were admitted to A&E and subsequently discharged  
319 were more likely to report pain/aches ( $p = .011$ ), headache ( $p = .043$ ), changes in smell/taste ( $p =$   
320  $.008$ ) and fatigue ( $p = .002$ ). Patients referred into the service from primary care were significantly

321 more likely to report pain/aches ( $p=.039$ ) and changes in smell/taste ( $p=.040$ ) at primary infection  
322 than patients referred to the service from secondary care.

323

## 324 Referrals out of the service

325 There was an average of 1.59 unique referrals out of the service on to other services and health  
326 professionals, per patient (range 0 to 5). In total, 82% of patients had an onward specialist referral.  
327 The majority of patients required referral on to pulmonary rehabilitation ( $n= 65, 56.03\%$ ). The other  
328 services patients were referred to were; Specialist COVID Rehab General Practitioner ( $n=44, 37.93\%$ ),  
329 Community Chronic Fatigue Specialist ( $n=21, 18.1\%$ ), Occupational Health ( $n=19, 16.37\%$ ),  
330 Psychologist ( $n=10, 8.62\%$ ), Mental Health Team ( $n=7, 6.03\%$ ), Community Nurse ( $n=5, 4.31\%$ ),  
331 Dietitian ( $n=4, 3.45\%$ ), Respiratory Nurse( $n=3, 2.59\%$ ), Cardiology ( $n=4, 3.45\%$ ), Respiratory Physician  
332 ( $n=3, 2.59\%$ ), Physiotherapy ( $n=2, 1.72\%$ ), and Neurology ( $n=1, 0.86\%$ ).

333 Patients who were hospitalised were more likely be referred to further specialist advice e.g.  
334 cardiology (dietitian, psychology), whilst patients who were not hospitalised were more likely to be  
335 referred to the specialist COVID-19 Rehab GP and pulmonary rehabilitation for further care (Fig 2).

336

### 337 Fig 2. Referrals out to other services.

338

339 Patients with higher EQ5D pain scores had significantly more outward referrals than those with less  
340 pain ( $F(5, 104) = 2.64, p = .027$ ). Patients with anxiety and/or depression symptoms, measured using  
341 EQ5D, had significantly more unique outward referrals than patients without anxiety and/or  
342 depression ( $F(5, 104) = 2.58, p = .030$ ). There was a significant association between gender and  
343 outward primary care referrals (e.g., those referred to the specialist COVID-19 Rehab GP, community  
344 nursing, community chronic fatigue syndrome specialist, and pulmonary rehab). Females were



345 significantly more likely to be referred to the specialist COVID-19 Rehab GP than males [ $X^2(1) = 5.88$ ,  
346  $p = .020$ ]. There were no association between gender and outward referrals to mental health  
347 specialists ( $p = .78$ ), allied health professionals services ( $p = .30$ ), or secondary care ( $p = .40$ ).

348

## 349 **Discharge from long COVID service**

350 In total, 90 patients (77.59%) were discharged from the service. Of these, 62% ( $n=56$ ) had  
351 significantly improved symptoms or were asymptomatic, whilst 38% ( $n=34$ ) were still symptomatic.  
352 One patient was discharged but requested to be re-admitted to the service. Twenty-five patients  
353 remained within the service. There was a significant association between long-term (LC) associated  
354 self-reported fatigue and discharge status ( $p = .002$ ), with those without fatigue significantly more  
355 likely to have significantly improved symptoms of LC and were discharged, while those with fatigue  
356 were more likely to remain in the service.

357

## 358 **Qualitative data**

359 In total, eleven qualitative interviews were conducted, with five patients and six health care  
360 professionals (HCPs); two doctors, one physiotherapist, two occupational therapists, one  
361 coordinator). TDF [15] domains indicated as most important and relevant to the implementation of a  
362 new service to address LC patient needs, based on our analysis of patient and HCP interview data,  
363 are presented in table 2. The number of participants who mentioned, and the number of references  
364 related to, a specific domain is also presented. Where appropriate, sub-domains were added to  
365 further capture important features of some TDF domains.

366 Due to the extensive list of domains and sub-themes, the most frequently referenced domains  
367 across both patients and HCPs (*beliefs about capabilities, environmental context and resources,*

368 *knowledge and reinforcement*) are presented in coding trees (S4 Text). A separate coding tree is  
 369 presented for patients and HCPs. The other domains were also referenced by study participants, and  
 370 it was found they roughly overlapped with the four dominant domains.

371

372

373

374

375 Table 2. TDF [15] domains and subdomains across patients and HCPs

| TDF ([15] domains (blue) and additional sub-domains (black). | Number of patients | Number of references | TDF domains definitions.   |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|--|
| <a href="#">Behavioural regulation</a>                       | 4                  | 18                   | Anything aimed at managing or changing objectively observed or measured actions.   |
| <a href="#">Beliefs about capabilities</a>                   | 11                 | 79*                  | Acceptance of the truth, reality or validity about an ability, talent or facility that a person can put to constructive use. |
| Trust  | 1                  | 3                    |  |
| <a href="#">Beliefs about consequences</a>                   | 9                  | 55                   | Acceptance of the truth, reality or validity about outcomes of a behaviour in a given situation.                             |
| Communication  | 3                  | 18                   |  |
| <a href="#">Emotions</a>                                     | 10                 | 78                   | A complex reaction pattern, involving experiential, behavioural and psychological elements, by                               |

|  |    |      |   |
|--|----|------|---|
|  |    |      | which individual attempts to deal with a personally significant matter or event.  |
| Environmental context and resources      | 11 | 253* | Any circumstance of a person's situation or environment that discourages or encourages the development of skills and abilities, independence, social competence and adaptive behaviour. |
| Team working                             | 2  | 19   |   |
| Expectations                             | 3  | 23   |   |
| Experience of referral and service       | 3  | 22   |   |
| Adaptation                               | 2  | 24   |   |
| Goals                                    | 6  | 32   | Mental representations of outcomes or end states that an individual wants to achieve.   |
| Intentions                               | 7  | 40   | A conscious decision to perform a behaviour or a resolve to act in a certain way.   |
| Knowledge                                | 9  | 81*  | An awareness of the existence of something.   |
| Memory, attention and decision processes | 10 | 66   | The ability to retain information, focus selectively on aspects of the environment and choose between two or more alternatives.   |
| Optimism & pessimism                     | 4  | 17   | The confidence that things will happen for the best or that desired goals will be attained.   |

|  |    |     |  |
|--|----|-----|--|
| Reinforcement                            | 11 | 88* | Increasing the probability of a response by arranging a dependent relationship, or contingency, between the response and a given stimulus. |
| Skills                                   | 8  | 46  | An ability or proficiency acquired through practice.   |
| Skills transfer _ Learning               | 2  | 7   |  |
| Social influences                        | 8  | 39  | Those interpersonal processes that can cause individuals to change their thoughts, feelings or behaviours.                                 |
| Social or professional role and identity | 6  | 67  | A coherent set of behaviours and displayed personal qualities of an individual in a social or work setting.                                |
| Social-professional role and identity    | 4  | 27  |  |
| Commitment                               | 2  | 11  |  |
| Leadership                               | 2  | 4   |  |

376 \*Most frequently identified domains. Social-professional: social behaviours and qualities of an  
 377 individual in a work setting.

378

379

380 **Themes**

381 The most dominant TDF domains for both patients and HCPs were *beliefs about capabilities* (of  
 382 staff), *environmental context and resources* (for creating a new care pathway), *knowledge* (of new  
 383 conditions, its consequences, and new pathway), and *reinforcement* (when a positive experience  
 384 creates reassurance and confidence on the system).

385

386 *Beliefs about capabilities*

387 Patients stated that the provision of a specific LC service made them feel confident they were well  
388 looked after:

389 “ I was thrilled to be honest because I just felt quite desperate at the time.” P003

390 “...you felt confident in the process of diagnosis and then subsequent treatment.” P008

391

392 Patients acknowledged the new condition was a challenge, but the new service was important, and  
393 its existence was valuable:

394 “ it was a relief to know that, actually, I wasn't just gonna be forgotten.” P005

395 “There wasn't another route I could take. Speak to somebody else about it.” P009

396

397 For staff members, the new condition represented a challenge because of the uncertainty of what  
398 they were dealing with and the new pathway to be established:

399 “ ...had to create a pathway where patients could get referred in you know having... making  
400 sure that we haven't missed anything else.” S001

401 “ ...there was the first scoping meetings, I kind of said, because I'd come from a very systems  
402 approach in my previous jobs... I said: you're gonna have to... have lots of systems involved  
403 with this patient cohort because we don't know what's needed. ... I'd kind of have that  
404 confidence of working in pathways of care, not in an organizational silo, you know which a  
405 lot of people were still very, you know, still office.” S002

406 *"... quite quickly you realize that you... you didn't feel like you were as effective in your care.*  
407 *You know, so much of the things that we can ascertain about a patient, we obviously do*  
408 *visually... when we started to see post COVID patients face to face. I remember being quite*  
409 *surprised because over the phone they would have a number of symptoms that would be*  
410 *concerning and then they would come into clinic and you would be reassured that actually*  
411 *well, no, you don't look too bad."* S004

412 *" ...there was a bit of apprehension because it's a change and it's like how is this gonna work*  
413 *from you know various team members but actually within the space of perhaps about six*  
414 *weeks then that waiting list just shrunk then."* S005

415 *"So, I think I was fairly confident that we could provide a good standard of care in terms of*  
416 *we could do a full assessment on them, and we could direct them to appropriate resources."*

417 S006

418

419 *Environmental context and resources*

420 Patients reflected on the importance of providing the necessary time for staff to assess their  
421 conditions and options:

422 *" It wasn't like just a quick 10-minute conversation. Not like I had a bit longer, you know, to*  
423 *properly go into things."* P003

424 *" there's this thing called long COVID. That's some people are still suffering with effects*  
425 *afterwards and I don't think those people would if they haven't been in hospital. I think*  
426 *they've missed. They're missed out."* P009

427 Capacity of the service was referred to as a barrier to access, and as dependent on resources during  
428 a pandemic, when many people needed it:

429 *"I feel like I was quite lucky. Actually, when I got referred when I sort of been in touch with*  
430 *my GP, I seemed to manage to get referred over quite relatively quickly. I know a lot of*  
431 *people subsequently had quite long waits just because of the sheer numbers."* P003

432 Experience and the attitude of the professionals was also mentioned as an important feature:

433 *"And the lady was just... I seem to remember, being easy to talk to, but she was also... a no-*  
434 *nonsense lady and I liked that, she was very sort of direct and to the point and she knew*  
435 *what she was doing and you felt that this was somebody... in amongst all of this craziness*  
436 *and madness, here was somebody that actually knows... what's going on because she'd*  
437 *obviously, I'm guessing, drawn on her previous backgrounds."* P008

438

439 The pandemic restrictions didn't affect the quality of the service. Moreover, according to the HCP  
440 interviewed, team working excelled. Appreciation was expressed towards leadership; the leaders  
441 were firm but approachable.

442 *"We haven't had anyone that's come back and moaned that we haven't seen them face to*  
443 *face and... and you know, again, when I was a bit confused or if I was stuck or if I was, I*  
444 *would do a video call. And then sometimes I would get like, say, calling rehab... I'd be like,*  
445 *can you see them face to face and let me know what you think."* S001

446 *"A lot of work from a therapeutic point of view is making sure that people access the right*  
447 *management."* S003

448 *"half a day, a week that they had funding for an OT, so very limited when you consider sort*  
449 *of what the need was and what the scope was... So, I was drafted into sort of say, can you*  
450 *take this on because literally there was nobody else."* S005

451 *"...had to think about everything in terms of how well we're gonna gather the data? What*  
452 *was the new system? How the template gonna look like for this service and what? What*

453 *things were we gonna need to do? And that had to change quite rapidly as we learned more*  
454 *about it because none of us knew really.” S006*

455

456 The need for integration of care was quite evident from the beginning because different patients  
457 had different care needs, so different services needed to be activated or engaged with.

458 *“when I did get into post, I was put in contact with respiratory consultant at the [redacted]...*  
459 *The COVID recovery lead. So, we what we did is near the beginning, you know when we*  
460 *started to see the patient, we started to work together a bit more and say well, let's think*  
461 *about a pathway. ... And I started doing that with cardiology. I started to do that with*  
462 *neurology. So, I started to create new pathways.” S001*

463 *“we tried to connect them to other services which were already running within the trust, but*  
464 *also try to connect them to other clinicians within the system.” S006*

465

466 *Knowledge*

467 The new condition was still unknown to patients and professionals, each patient was different, and  
468 the array of symptoms was puzzling. The service provided an opportunity to develop and  
469 disseminate knowledge, which had a reassuring impact on some patients:

470 *“ It was scary territory at the time because we did we we just didn't know enough about it*  
471 *...we needed to find out more about it. The only way we could do that was by ...developing*  
472 *these long COVID clinics that actually you can then monitor that person, post COVID.” P005*

473 *“ And I think because I have knowledge, I wasn't over worried about that.” P009*



474 *"You know, no one told you this was what's gonna happen. So you it's kind of letting you*  
475 *know in advance. What could happen. I ... I ... I was quite happy to have that. I do feel that*  
476 *it's needed."* P011

477

478 The new condition was affecting patients in several ways, but the symptoms were all recognisable  
479 and issues staff members were used to treating. The uncertainty in the early days was soon replaced  
480 with the knowledge transfer from previous roles.

481 *"I first was asked to join, it was very much like, you know, we don't, we don't really know*  
482 *what is out there..."* S001

483 *"You, kind of like most clinical jobs that you do after you've been embedded into the ward or*  
484 *the service after a few months, it all comes ...you have a confidence about what to do. But*  
485 *this job you don't. Yeah, you just... It's just 1/2 year later I still feel like a schoolgirl in this*  
486 *job."* S002

487 Knowledge by the team, regarding the condition, the care needed and as shown to the patients, was  
488 a source of reassurance in a period when media messages created confusion.

489 *" There's something about being able to reassure people in the context of the problems that*  
490 *they're having, because we all built up our knowledge about some of the symptoms that*  
491 *people were having."* S003

492 *"I think we were at the start, we were slightly... You can't know what you don't know. ... you*  
493 *were learning more about COVID, long COVID that then you'd think. ... there was quite a lot*  
494 *of stuff that was coming out in the media about long COVID as well."* S006

495

496 *Reinforcement*

497 Knowing about the service and feeling they were looked after, made an impact of patients'  
498 wellbeing:

499 *" I think we just had a chat on the phone instead of went through all of my symptoms and*  
500 *umm, just kind of talked, talked it all through everything that was going on as far as I*  
501 *remember, which I found very reassuring... Umm, so I guess it made me feel, you know,*  
502 *hopeful."*P003

503 *"...hundred, 100% satisfied like I say. Just because it was such a new virus that we knew*  
504 *nothing about, it was just nice to know. That basically I'd had probably the best MOT in my*  
505 *life."* P005

506

507 Positive feedback and patient outcomes reinforced the belief that staff members were heading in  
508 the right direction. Also, it was another source of reassurance for the patients that there was a way  
509 out of the uncertainty of their conditions. Reinforcing positive outcomes was also important to  
510 provide evidence to commissioners for more resources to be invested.

511 *"You know that initial assessment and that review that I do is so thorough that they're so*  
512 *they're really delighted that someone has actually finally taken that whole story and is*  
513 *looking at that bigger picture."* S001

514 *"You still have to, have this, you know, kind of confidence of working in unknown*  
515 *uncertainty, but also the ability to kind of you know have confidence in like what we do know*  
516 *so far and what we have done so far has had a good effect."* S002

517 *"We had to move to a more generalist type approach with then specialist input... we kind of*  
518 *developed the offer based on what the patients were telling us."* S003

519

## 520 Discussion

### 521 Statement of principal findings

522 The number of patients that accessed the long-COVID clinic during the first five months of  
523 implementation ranged between 15 and 30 per month, and patients were on average 5.75 months  
524 post initial COVID-19 infection when they were admitted. Patients attending the service were  
525 predominantly female, White British and were from non-deprived areas. The most commonly  
526 reported long-COVID symptoms reported by patients were shortness of breath and fatigue. On  
527 average there were 1.59 referrals out of the service to other specialists, with the majority of  
528 referrals going to pulmonary rehabilitation, primary care and community chronic fatigue specialists.

529 The emergence of a new virus with multiple post infective complications was one of the biggest  
530 health challenges in 2020. On a background of considerable uncertainty around pathology, optimum  
531 treatment and with very limited national guidance or research and in the face of increasing numbers  
532 of patients requiring support for LC symptoms, there was an immediate need to develop a new  
533 pathway in response to clinical need. Healthcare professionals within the NHS Trust had no  
534 preparation time or any opportunity to draw upon principles of established implementation or  
535 improvement science frameworks for creation of a pathway. Instead, staff acted rapidly according to  
536 patients' needs and feedback and the resources available, as well as their previous experience, to  
537 meet patients' needs.

538 The service went through a series of adaptations (i.e. implementation of data collection tools,  
539 inclusion of additional specialities) to deliver care based on the evolving understanding of the  
540 condition as well as patient's needs. There was a substantial time lag between initial evidence of LC  
541 diagnosis and the ability to access care via the LC pathway, with some patients required to wait  
542 seven months for care. The delay in both the identification of LC as a distinct condition and  
543 acknowledgment of the need to invest resources for delivery of LC services at that time likely

544 contributed to this. Nonetheless, the LC clinic delivered a high performing service that met patient  
545 needs during challenging times. When people entered the pathway, the journey was unpredictable  
546 and often included a reiteration of assessments and further referrals (S3 Figure). It demonstrates the  
547 cross-disciplinary collaborations that staff members established, or reinforced if already present, to  
548 provide high quality multidisciplinary care for complex LC care.

549 The establishment of a multidisciplinary team within the LC pathway, including a Specialist COVID-19  
550 Rehab General Practitioner, Occupational Therapists, Physiotherapists, Speech and Language  
551 Therapists, Dietitians, Pulmonary Rehab, Chronic Fatigue specialists, and a Clinical Psychologist,  
552 enabled knowledge exchange across specialities. This contributed to increased knowledge of the  
553 condition, effective problem solving and the provision of a holistic approach to LC care.

554 Furthermore, due to their existing skills and capabilities HCPs were able to rapidly develop and  
555 establish further pathways into secondary care for patients that required more specialised  
556 investigations and review, which included onwards referral to respiratory, cardiology, ENT and  
557 neurology. Qualitative data confirmed the importance of the implementation of the new service for  
558 the patients' physical and mental wellbeing. People felt looked after and in capable hands.

559 Professionals also felt positive about collaborative working, despite the challenging context. The  
560 pandemic gave HCPs the opportunity to work interactively with other services and deliver practical,  
561 integrated care pathways. HCPs expressed positive feelings around working in a multi-disciplinary  
562 team, collaborative working was perceived as satisfying and leadership was strong, staff members  
563 acknowledged the efforts and experience each person contributed to the creation of something new  
564 during exceptional times.

565 Patients and professionals, recalling the use and creation of the service, implied that the main areas  
566 to focus on, when implementing a new service for a novel condition, are the **capabilities of staff**  
567 **members**, specifically knowledge and expertise of health professionals delivering the service;  
568 **environmental context and resources**, to facilitate the initial implementation and ongoing delivery

569 of a new care pathway; **knowledge** and prompt dissemination of information about the new  
570 condition, its consequences, and the new service; and positive **reinforcement**, when positive  
571 experiences and good patients outcomes creates reassurance and confidence in the way the system  
572 is adapted.

573 Overall, the experience of setting up a reactive and responsive service in an emergency was  
574 exceptional for all the people involved. Nevertheless, the already established organisational  
575 structure of the service supported the new pathway implementation well.

576

## 577 **Barriers and facilitators to care provided by the long-COVID** 578 **pathway.**

579 Several barriers and facilitators to the implementation and delivery of the LC pathway, from the  
580 perspective of both patients and HCPs, were identified using the TDF [15]. See table 3. Barriers to  
581 the initial set-up of the LC pathway included budgetary constraints and the need to make a LC  
582 ‘business case’ to commissioners, lack of central face-to-face clinic location, lack of administrative  
583 and clinical processes and high workload. In addition, lack of knowledge around the disease  
584 characteristics of LC created uncertainty regarding which specialities were required within the  
585 pathway and multidisciplinary networks were created rapidly with limited prior planning. Difficulties  
586 setting up the service and subsequent access to this for patients may have contributed to the  
587 increase in average LC symptom severity in November 2020, as shown by the C19-YRS [27,28],  
588 although it is also possible that this reflected the timing of the second wave and lockdown, which  
589 created a barrier to access in-person facilities.

590

591 Table 3. Barriers and facilitators to care and care delivery according to patients and professionals.

|                           | Patients   | Staff members  |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Barriers to care          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Duration to first appointment.</li> <li>- Virtual groups not effective.</li> <li>- Preference for face-to-face appointment.</li> <li>- Clerical errors.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Virtual appointments: lack of non-verbal cues.</li> <li>- Virtual appointments: Difficult to carry out some assessments (breathing).</li> </ul>   |
| Facilitators to care      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Virtual appointments were convenient.</li> <li>- Good communication about care pathway.</li> <li>- Having longer appointments.</li> <li>- Being listened to.</li> <li>- Access to multidisciplinary specialists.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Virtual appointments enabled efficient processing of case load.</li> <li>- MDT<sup>a</sup> allowed multidisciplinary approach.</li> <li>- MDT<sup>a</sup> allowed exchange of information and problem solving.</li> </ul> |
| Barriers to clinic set up |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Acquiring finance.</li> <li>- Making a LC<sup>b</sup> "business case" to commissioners.</li> <li>- Networks created "on the fly".</li> <li>- No face-to-face central clinic location.</li> </ul>                          |

|                               |                                  |   |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
|                               |                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Unknown disease characteristics (what specialities are needed?).</li> <li>- High workload.</li> </ul>  |
| Facilitators to clinic set up |                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Experienced staff for new/evolving roles.</li> <li>- Virtual MDT<sup>a</sup> meetings: effective/holistic approach.</li> <li>- Less oversight from NHS hierarchy.</li> <li>- More autonomy.</li> <li>- Well selected clinical leads.</li> <li>- Willingness to create new networks.</li> <li>- Good mental health/wellbeing support.</li> <li>- Good internal communication about COVID-19.</li> </ul> |
| Suggestions going forward     | Physical location for LC clinic. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Physical LC<sup>b</sup> clinic.</li> <li>- Clarity around the future of the LC<sup>b</sup> clinic for all involved.</li> <li>- Support for staff.</li> </ul>   |

592 <sup>a</sup>MDT = Multi-Disciplinary Team, <sup>b</sup>LC = Long-COVID;

593 The present study has identified the value of transferable existing capabilities and expertise of

594 health professionals, beyond their experience of specifically treating LC. In particular, the leadership

595 experience from previous roles contributed to successful service implementation. Effective  
596 teamwork within the pathway and across different specialities was reported as a facilitator to both  
597 clinic set-up and delivery. The existence of a clinic tailored specifically to LC, and access to HCPs with  
598 specific knowledge of and expertise in treating the condition, provided reassurance for patients who  
599 were anxious and reported that they were “desperate”. HCPs understood patients needed dedicated  
600 time and acknowledgement of their condition, beyond that provided by usual care, and this served  
601 to validate patients’ experiences of LC. A finding which has been reported previously by patients  
602 receiving care in another multidisciplinary LC service [12]. In addition, patients reported excellent  
603 interactions with clinic staff and communication was reported as being good. Virtual delivery was  
604 well accepted by patients and perceived as a safe mode of delivery within this context. In contrast,  
605 virtual delivery presented some challenges for HCPs, including difficulties in completing necessary  
606 breathing assessments and a reduction in non-verbal cues. Nevertheless, virtual delivery did  
607 facilitate an efficient processing of heavy caseloads.

608

## 609 **Comparison with other studies**

610 Current NICE Guidance recommends that people with LC should be offered integrated and  
611 coordinated care, referral for multidisciplinary assessment or, for specific complications, referral to  
612 specialist care [26], the opportunity to learn from expert by experience and professionals who  
613 managed the condition. Recent studies have reported on the implementation of support for LC  
614 within the UK health service context [14,33]. A recent prospective study of 1325 patients attending a  
615 dedicated LC assessment and management service set up in April 2020 [14], demonstrated the  
616 significant prolonged functional impairment of patients and the extensive need for onward referral  
617 to other specialists. A study that shows the potential barriers and facilitators of implementing such  
618 services will provide guidance for stakeholders.



619 Prior studies of UK LC clinics have identified several organisational and individual-level factors  
620 influencing their implementation and uptake, including the novelty of the condition, resource and  
621 capacity-related issues, knowledge limitations and lack of existing referral pathways [10,12].  
622 However, to date there has been limited use of implementation science frameworks to explore this  
623 within this context. The Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research [34], a framework  
624 which can be used to identify contextual factors influencing successful implementation, was used to  
625 formulate interview questions for LC Leads in one recent study [12]. However, the framework wasn't  
626 used to guide analysis and was not applied to the interviews with patients. In contrast to previous  
627 research the current study employed a mixed-methods research design which has facilitated a  
628 greater depth and breadth of understanding of the context within the LC service was implemented.  
629 Although the sociodemographic characteristics of those attending the LC service reflect that of the  
630 local population [35], patients from ethnic minority groups and areas of high deprivation were  
631 underrepresented, which reflects the findings of a previous study [14]. Patients from these groups  
632 were disproportionately affected by acute CoVID-19 infection [36,37] and arguably should therefore  
633 have been seen more frequently within LC services. This finding, however, may reflect lack of trust in  
634 health services, and experiences of inequalities of access of minority ethnic groups living with LC, a  
635 key barrier to uptake of services amongst this population [13].

636

## 637 **Strengths and weaknesses of the study**

638 The current study is the first to our knowledge which includes a mixed methods analysis and has  
639 applied the TDF [15] to understand the barriers and facilitators to the implementation of a LC  
640 service. This led to evidence-based suggestions for the implementation of both future LC clinics and  
641 reactive services during critical public health emergencies. However, in the present study the  
642 TDF[15] was used retrospectively to guide analysis and was not used in the development of the  
643 qualitative topic guides, those were meant to let participants talk freely.

644 In addition, the study extends our knowledge of the lived experience of patients receiving care from  
645 multidisciplinary LC clinics as well as those involved in its delivery. The current paper reports on the  
646 implementation of one LC pathway, therefore it is likely that national and regional variations exist in  
647 the implementation and delivery of LC services within the UK health service context. As such, whilst  
648 four dominant TDF domains were identified as relevant to service implementation in the current  
649 study, there are likely to be other barriers and facilitators to the implementation of other LC  
650 pathways that haven't been yet identified here.

651 In total, 102 people didn't consent to share their data for analysis, which may have created bias in  
652 this respect. Moreover, of those eligible, very few patients agreed to participate in the interviews,  
653 which may be due to patient reluctance to recall difficult experiences related to LC or perceived  
654 additional burden at a time when they had competing demands in relation to managing their  
655 condition. Furthermore, interviews with patients and staff were conducted several months after the  
656 implementation of the service, contributing to the possibility of recall bias.

657 Quantitative data collection took time to be optimised when the LC clinic opened, the C19-YRS  
658 patient-reported outcome measure [27,28] was not yet available, and measures of anxiety and  
659 depression were initially only completed if there was perceived need to do so by clinic staff. A such,  
660 data for some measures were incomplete. However, adaptations to data collection processes later  
661 on during service delivery, further demonstrates the responsiveness of the service.

662 We were unable to collect data on the impact of the service on patients' recovery, due to pragmatic  
663 reasons. A follow-up analysis is underway as part of another project. Despite these limitations, the  
664 triangulation of both the quantitative and qualitative data, alongside the inclusion of multiple  
665 perspectives, allowed for a deep understanding of the implementation of the LC pathway. This  
666 further increases the validity and reliability of the findings[38].

667

## 668 **Implications for clinicians and policymakers**

669 The findings of the current study provide evidence-based recommendations for future practice in  
670 relation to the initial set-up, implementation, and ongoing delivery of new multidisciplinary LC  
671 clinics. Initial mapping of the ideal system of integrated care for long- COVID includes i) the  
672 identification of essential services based on patient needs' assessment, ii) identification of existing  
673 and evolving knowledge of the condition amongst health professionals, and iii) the establishment of  
674 multidisciplinary referral pathways based on context and resources available. Furthermore, an  
675 integrated care approach, including clinicians from multiple disciplines, can be enhanced by the  
676 utilisation of implementation and improvement science frameworks [15,34] as part of the service  
677 development and planning. Collaboration with academic groups with expertise in implementation  
678 science and behaviour change can provide detailed insight into factors that are likely to impede or  
679 facilitate the successful delivery of service in context, prior to its implementation. Exploring the  
680 factors influencing integrated care processes and the mechanisms underpinning patient experiences  
681 of such processes, can support the promotion of patient-centred care [39]

682 The inclusion of multiple stakeholders in the planning process, including collecting data from health  
683 service managers, healthcare professionals and patients, can ensure the needs of all groups involved  
684 in the implementation and delivery of the service are met. Involvement of expert by experience (i.e.  
685 patients) in planning and management conversations, including providing the opportunity to express  
686 their needs to commissioning board meetings, can further ensure diversity and representation from  
687 underserved groups and mitigate risks to access.

688 Flexibility within the pathway is required, in particular it is recommended that contingency plans and  
689 adaptation routes are created in case the clinical condition evolves, and patients' needs change.  
690 Additionally, identification of solutions to streamline the process (e.g., referral to multiple disciplines  
691 at the same time) is needed as soon as possible and, if the pathway seems to be effective, to  
692 consider the continuation of such process after the emergency has passed.

693 Finally, due to the requirement for multidisciplinary involvement and the need for streamlined  
694 inward and onward referral processes, the creation or adaptation of collaborative team working  
695 frameworks (e.g. communication strategies) should be embedded at the planning stage. Options for  
696 virtual interactions between patients and staff where appropriate, for instance beyond initial face to  
697 face assessments, should be explored, including homecare digital solutions. Provision of support for  
698 the wellbeing of staff members, including a physical space for breaks and opportunities for self-  
699 reflection and knowledge development can support staff wellbeing and consequently staff retention,  
700 protecting ongoing service delivery.

701

## 702 **Future research**

703 There is a need for further qualitative research on patients' lived experiences of receiving care from  
704 LC clinics, as well as an understanding of the longer-term impact on patient health and wellbeing of  
705 receiving multidisciplinary support for LC. Further research with patients discharged from the service  
706 whilst still symptomatic, of which there was a substantial proportion within the current study, would  
707 enable unmet need to be identified and would inform the provision of follow up care for these  
708 patients. Analysis of data collected from MDT LC clinics and related services across the UK is under  
709 way[40] , to provide detailed information on the symptom and demographic characteristics and  
710 support needs of those attending. Collecting this data will provide a more complete picture of care  
711 for LC nationally and regionally, enable further knowledge exchange regarding effective  
712 rehabilitation for the condition, and provide evidence of gaps in access and reach of existing  
713 support. Research with patients from groups underrepresented in current research, and those  
714 overrepresented within the LC population, should focus on understanding the barriers and  
715 facilitators to accessing support to enable services to be tailored to their needs and thus increase  
716 uptake amongst this group. For this purpose, inclusion of data from primary and secondary care

717 would be essential, to understand why some categories of patients were or not referred to services.  
718 Finally, we identified a potential theory of behavioural change that underpinned the evolution of  
719 services. An intervention could be developed using a template for process and quality improvement  
720 in community setting to evaluate its efficacy and for use in case of a public health emergency.

## 721 **Acknowledgements**

722 The authors would like to thank Mr Mark Whiting, Dr Elizabeth Kendrick, Dr Robin Christie, Dr Jenna  
723 Chadwick, Dr David Wellsted for their support on this project, and Dr Jane Fry and Dr Alex Wilkinson  
724 for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this manuscript. The authors would also like to thank  
725 the patients and healthcare professionals from the long-COVID service for their participation in this  
726 study.

727

728

729

730

731

732

733

734

735

736

737

738

739

740

741

742

743

744

745

746

747

748

749

## 750 **References**

- 751 1. Why the Patient-Made Term “Long Covid” is ... | Wellcome Open Research. [cited 5 Mar  
752 2024]. Available: <https://wellcomeopenresearch.org/articles/5-224>
- 753 2. Coronavirus disease (COVID-19): Post COVID-19 condition. [cited 5 Mar 2024]. Available:  
754 [https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-\(covid-](https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-post-covid-19-condition)  
755 [19\)-post-covid-19-condition](https://www.who.int/news-room/questions-and-answers/item/coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-post-covid-19-condition)
- 756 3. The prevalence of long COVID symptoms and COVID-19 complications - Office for National  
757 Statistics. [cited 5 Mar 2024]. Available:  
758 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/news/statementsandletters/theprevalenceoflongcovidsymptomsan](https://www.ons.gov.uk/news/statementsandletters/theprevalenceoflongcovidsymptomsandcovid19complications)  
759 [dcovid19complications](https://www.ons.gov.uk/news/statementsandletters/theprevalenceoflongcovidsymptomsandcovid19complications)
- 760 4. Lancet T. Long COVID: 3 years in. *The Lancet*. 2023;401: 795. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
761 6736(23)00493-2
- 762 5. Urgent SOS from LongCovid sufferers. [cited 30 Apr 2024]. Available:  
763 [https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScTKt3ul5S6vJoKtBp99oAyE4hwj4STLIRKEbvSOO](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScTKt3ul5S6vJoKtBp99oAyE4hwj4STLIRKEbvSOOQqAcIYMQ/viewform?pli=1)  
764 [QqAcIYMQ/viewform?pli=1](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLScTKt3ul5S6vJoKtBp99oAyE4hwj4STLIRKEbvSOOQqAcIYMQ/viewform?pli=1)
- 765 6. Wildwing T, Holt N. The neurological symptoms of COVID-19: a systematic overview of  
766 systematic reviews, comparison with other neurological conditions and implications for  
767 healthcare services. *Ther Adv Chronic Dis*. 2021;12.  
768 doi:10.1177/2040622320976979/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/10.1177\_2040622320976979-  
769 FIG1.JPEG
- 770 7. Rajan S, Khunti K, Alwan N, Steves C, Greenhalgh T, Macdermott N, et al. In the wake of the  
771 pandemic Preparing for Long COVID HEALTH SYSTEMS AND POLICY ANALYSIS. 2021 [cited 20  
772 May 2024]. Available: <http://www.euro.who.int/en/about-us/partners/>
- 773 8. Coronavirus » Long COVID: the NHS plan for 2021/22. [cited 30 Apr 2024]. Available:  
774 <https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/documents/long-covid-the-nhs-plan-for-2021-22/>
- 775 9. NHS England » NHS sets out long COVID action plan for thousands of people with persistent  
776 symptom. [cited 30 Apr 2024]. Available: [https://www.england.nhs.uk/2022/07/nhs-sets-out-](https://www.england.nhs.uk/2022/07/nhs-sets-out-long-covid-action-plan-for-thousands-of-people-with-persistent-symptom/)  
777 [long-covid-action-plan-for-thousands-of-people-with-persistent-symptom/](https://www.england.nhs.uk/2022/07/nhs-sets-out-long-covid-action-plan-for-thousands-of-people-with-persistent-symptom/)
- 778 10. Cooper K, Duncan E, Hart-Winks E, Cowie J, Shim J, Stage E, et al. Exploring the perceptions  
779 and experiences of community rehabilitation for Long COVID from the perspectives of  
780 Scottish general practitioners’ and people living with Long COVID: a qualitative study. *BMJ*  
781 *Open*. 2024;14: 82830. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2023-082830

- 782 11. Fang C, Akhtar Baz S, Sheard L, Carpentieri JD. “They seemed to be like cogs working in  
783 different directions”: a longitudinal qualitative study on Long COVID healthcare services in  
784 the United Kingdom from a person-centred lens. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2024;24: 406.  
785 doi:10.1186/s12913-024-10891-7
- 786 12. Duncan E, Alexander L, Cowie J, Love A, Morris JH, Moss R, et al. Investigating Scottish Long  
787 COVID community rehabilitation service models from the perspectives of people living with  
788 Long COVID and healthcare professionals: a qualitative descriptive study. *BMJ Open.* 2023;13:  
789 78740. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2023-078740
- 790 13. Smyth N, Ridge D, Kingstone T, Gopal DP, Alwan N, Wright A, et al. People from ethnic  
791 minorities seeking help for Long Covid: a qualitative study. *British Journal of General Practice.*  
792 2024; BJGP.2023.0631. doi:10.3399/BJGP.2023.0631
- 793 14. Banerjee A, Heightman M, Prashar J, Hillman TE, Marks M, Livingston R, et al. Post-COVID-19  
794 assessment in a specialist clinical service: a 12-month, single-centre, prospective study in  
795 1325 individuals. *BMJ Open Resp Res.* 2021;8: 1041. doi:10.1136/bmjresp-2021-001041
- 796 15. Cane J, O’Connor D, Michie S. Validation of the theoretical domains framework for use in  
797 behaviour change and implementation research. *Implementation Science.* 2012;7: 1–17.  
798 doi:10.1186/1748-5908-7-37/TABLES/3
- 799 16. Atkins L, Francis J, Islam R, O’Connor D, Patey A, Ivers N, et al. A guide to using the Theoretical  
800 Domains Framework of behaviour change to investigate implementation problems.  
801 *Implementation Science.* 2017;12: 1–18. doi:10.1186/S13012-017-0605-9/TABLES/10
- 802 17. Murphy K, O’Connor DA, Browning CJ, French SD, Michie S, Francis JJ, et al. Understanding  
803 diagnosis and management of dementia and guideline implementation in general practice: A  
804 qualitative study using the theoretical domains framework. *Implementation Science.* 2014;9:  
805 1–13. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-9-31/FIGURES/2
- 806 18. Lawton R, Heyhoe J, Louch G, Ingleson E, Glidewell L, Willis TA, et al. Using the Theoretical  
807 Domains Framework (TDF) to understand adherence to multiple evidence-based indicators in  
808 primary care: A qualitative study. *Implementation Science.* 2016;11: 1–16.  
809 doi:10.1186/S13012-016-0479-2/TABLES/10
- 810 19. Chater AM, Brook-Rowland P, Tolani F, Christopher E, Hart J, Byrne-Davis LMT, et al.  
811 Understanding a constellation of eight COVID-19 disease prevention behaviours using the  
812 COM-B model and the theoretical domains framework: a qualitative study using the  
813 behaviour change wheel. *Frontiers in Public Health* , 11 , Article 1130875 (2023) .  
814 2023;11. doi:10.3389/FPUBH.2023.1130875
- 815 20. Lohiniva AL, Pensola A, Hyökki S, Sivelä J, Härmä V, Tammi T. Identifying factors influencing  
816 COVID-19 vaccine uptake in Finland – a qualitative study using social media data. *Front Public*  
817 *Health.* 2023;11: 1138800. doi:10.3389/FPUBH.2023.1138800/BIBTEX
- 818 21. Wong CH, Yeoh EK, Zhong CC, Chung VC, Nilsen P, Wong EL. Barriers and Facilitators to  
819 Receiving the COVID-19 Vaccination and Development of Theoretically-Informed  
820 Implementation Strategies for the Public: Qualitative Study in Hong Kong. *Vaccines (Basel).*  
821 2022;10. doi:10.3390/VACCINES10050764
- 822 22. Williams L, Gallant AJ, Rasmussen S, Brown Nicholls LA, Cogan N, Deakin K, et al. Towards  
823 intervention development to increase the uptake of COVID-19 vaccination among those at

- 824 high risk: Outlining evidence-based and theoretically informed future intervention content. *Br*  
825 *J Health Psychol.* 2020;25: 1039–1054. doi:10.1111/BJHP.12468
- 826 23. Schmidtke KA, Drinkwater KG. A cross-sectional survey assessing the influence of  
827 theoretically informed behavioural factors on hand hygiene across seven countries during the  
828 COVID-19 pandemic. [cited 30 Apr 2024]. doi:10.1186/s12889-021-11491-4
- 829 24. Leather JZ, Keyworth C, Epton T, Goldthorpe J, Ulph F, Armitage CJ. “We want to live a little  
830 longer and our family want[s] us around”: A summative content analysis of adherence to  
831 COVID-19-related guidelines using the Theoretical Domains Framework. *Br J Health Psychol.*  
832 2022;27: 1119–1152. doi:10.1111/BJHP.12591
- 833 25. Gibson Smith K, Cunningham KB, Cecil JE, Laidlaw A, Cairns P, Scanlan GM, et al. Supporting  
834 doctors’ well-being and resilience during COVID-19: A framework for rapid and rigorous  
835 intervention development. *Appl Psychol Health Well Being.* 2022;14: 236–251.  
836 doi:10.1111/APHW.12300
- 837 26. Overview | COVID-19 rapid guideline: managing the long-term effects of COVID-19 |  
838 Guidance | NICE.
- 839 27. Sivan M, Halpin S, Gee J. Assessing long-term rehabilitation needs in COVID-19 survivors using  
840 a telephone screening tool (C19-YRS tool). *Advances in Clinical Neurosciences and*  
841 *Rehabilitation.* 2020;19: 14–17. doi:10.47795/nel5960
- 842 28. Home - C19-YRS. [cited 5 Mar 2024]. Available: <https://c19-yrs.com/>
- 843 29. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-9: Validity of a Brief Depression Severity  
844 Measure. *J Gen Intern Med.* 2001;16: 606. doi:10.1046/J.1525-1497.2001.016009606.X
- 845 30. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW, Löwe B. A brief measure for assessing generalized  
846 anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Arch Intern Med.* 2006;166: 1092–1097.  
847 doi:10.1001/ARCHINTE.166.10.1092
- 848 31. Herdman M, Gudex • C, Lloyd • A, Janssen MF, Kind • P, Parkin • D, et al. Development and  
849 preliminary testing of the new five-level version of EQ-5D (EQ-5D-5L). [cited 5 Mar 2024].  
850 doi:10.1007/s11136-011-9903-x
- 851 32. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol.* 2006;3: 77–101.  
852 doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- 853 33. Parkin A, Davison J, Tarrant R, Ross D, Halpin S, Simms A, et al. A Multidisciplinary NHS  
854 COVID-19 Service to Manage Post-COVID-19 Syndrome in the Community. *J Prim Care*  
855 *Community Health.* 2021;12. doi:10.1177/21501327211010994
- 856 34. Damschroder LJ, Reardon CM, Widerquist MAO, Lowery J. The updated Consolidated  
857 Framework for Implementation Research based on user feedback. *Implement Sci.* 2022;17.  
858 doi:10.1186/S13012-022-01245-0
- 859 35. Hertfordshire Census 2021. [cited 25 Jun 2024]. Available:  
860 <https://www.plumplot.co.uk/Hertfordshire-census-2021.html>
- 861 36. England PH. COVID-19: review of disparities in risks and outcomes. London: Public Health  
862 England; 2020.



- 863 37. Niedzwiedz CL, O CA, Dinesh Jani B, Demou E, Ho FK, Celis-Morales C, et al. Ethnic and  
864 socioeconomic differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection: prospective cohort study using UK  
865 Biobank. [cited 20 May 2024]. doi:10.1186/s12916-020-01640-8
- 866 38. Moon MSN RN CNS-CC CEN FAEN MD. TRIANGULATION: A METHOD TO INCREASE VALIDITY,  
867 RELIABILITY, AND LEGITIMATION IN CLINICAL RESEARCH. 2019 [cited 25 Jun 2024].  
868 doi:10.1016/j.jen.2018.11.004
- 869 39. Youssef A, Chaudhary ZK, Wiljer D, Mylopoulos M, Sockalingam S. Mapping Evidence of  
870 Patients' Experiences in Integrated Care: A Scoping Review. 2019 [cited 20 May 2024].  
871 doi:10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2019.08.004
- 872 40. Sivan M, Greenhalgh T, Darbyshire JL, Mir G, O'Connor RJ, Dawes H, et al. LOng COvid  
873 Multidisciplinary consortium Optimising Treatments and servlces acrOss the NHS  
874 (LOCOMOTION): protocol for a mixed-methods study in the UK. BMJ Open. 2022;12:  
875 e063505. doi:10.1136/BMJOPEN-2022-063505

876

877

878

879

880

881

882

883

884

885

886

887

888

889

890

891


892

893

## 894 **Supporting Information**

895


- 896 **S1 Table. COVID rehab screening form**
- 897 **S2 File. Patient and HCP Interview topic guides**
- 898 **S3 Fig. Long-COVID pathway infographic flow diagram**
- 899 **S4 Text. Coding trees for patient and HCP interviews**
- 900 **S5 Table. COREQ checklist**



|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Systemic                       |  |
| Fatigue                        |  |
| Sore throat                    |  |
| Temperature                    |  |
| Pain/aches (general)           |  |
| Insomnia                       |  |
| Joint pain                     |  |
| Chest pain                     |  |
| Respiratory                    |  |
| SOB/breathing difficulties     |  |
| Cough                          |  |
| Congestion                     |  |
| Gastroenterological            |  |
| Digestive (unspecified)        |  |
| Abdominal pain                 |  |
| Loss of appetite               |  |
| Diarrhoea                      |  |
| Nausea                         |  |
| Ear, Nose, Throat              |  |
| Loss of smell/taste            |  |
| Ear problems                   |  |
| Dermatological                 |  |
| Neurological and psychological |  |
| Headache                       |  |
| Dizziness                      |  |
| Memory & concentration         |  |
| Mental Health                  |  |
| Cardiovascular                 |  |
| Other                          |  |

Note: Inner most circle denotes the systems of symptoms. The middle ring are initial acute COVID infection symptoms. The outer ring are long-term symptoms.

Figure 1- pie chart



Made with SankeyMATIC

Figure 2- referrals to other services