1		Factors Influencing the Implementing Readiness of Shared Medical
2	1	Appointments in China's Primary Healthcare Institutions: A Mixed-Method
3		Study Utilizing Qualitative Comparative Analysis
4	Af	filiations:
5	1.	Wei Yang, 1) Department of epidemiology and health statistics, School of Public
6		Health, Guizhou Medical University, 2) The key Laboratory of Environmental
7		Pollution Monitoring and Disease Control, Ministry of Education, Guizhou
8		Medical University, Gui'an, China, 561113. Email: yangwei-59@qq.com, ORCID:
9		https://orcid.org/0009-0003-6156-0685
10	2.	Lingrui Liu, Center for Methods in Implementation and Prevention Science, Yale
11		University School of Public Health, New Haven, Connecticut, USA. 06511.
12		Email: <u>li1529@mail.harvard.edu</u>
13	3.	Jiajia Chen, 1) Department of epidemiology and health statistics, School of Public
14		Health, Guizhou Medical University, 2) The key Laboratory of Environmental
15		Pollution Monitoring and Disease Control, Ministry of Education, Guizhou
16		Medical University, Gui'an, China, 561113. Email: <u>1434214326@qq.com</u>
17	4.	Run Mao, 1) Department of epidemiology and health statistics, School of Public
18		Health, Guizhou Medical University, 2) The key Laboratory of Environmental
19		Pollution Monitoring and Disease Control, Ministry of Education, Guizhou
20		Medical University, Gui'an, China, 561113. Email: 1599611663@qq.com

1	5.	Tao Yang, 1) Department of epidemiology and health statistics, School of Public
2		Health, Guizhou Medical University, 2) The key Laboratory of Environmental
3		Pollution Monitoring and Disease Control, Ministry of Education, Guizhou
4		Medical University, Gui'an, China, 561113. Email: <u>3422569272@qq.com</u>
5	6.	Lang Linghu, 1) Department of epidemiology and health statistics, School of
6		Public Health, Guizhou Medical University, 2) The key Laboratory of
7		Environmental Pollution Monitoring and Disease Control, Ministry of Education,
8		Guizhou Medical University, Gui'an, China, 561113. Email: 3205448015@qq.com
9	7.	Lieyu Huang, 1) Department of epidemiology and health statistics, School of
10		Public Health, Guizhou Medical University, 2) The key Laboratory of
11		Environmental Pollution Monitoring and Disease Control, Ministry of Education,
12		Guizhou Medical University, Gui'an, China, 561113. Email: hly21st@gmc.edu.cn,
13		ORCID: 0000-0002-8093-1846
14	8.	Dong (Roman) Xu, 1)Acacia Lab for Implementation Science, Department of
15		Health Management, School of Health Management, 2)Center for World Health
16		Organization Studies, Southern Medical University, Guangzhou 510515, China.
17		3)Southern Medical University Institute for Global Health (SIGHT),
18		Dermatology Hospital of Southern Medical University, Guangzhou 510091,
19		China. Email: roman.xu@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-7438-632X
20	9.	Yiyuan Cai, 1) Department of epidemiology and health statistics, School of

21 Public Health, Guizhou Medical University, 2) The key Laboratory of

1 Environmental Pollution Monitoring and Disease Control, Min	inistry of Education.
---	-----------------------

- 2 Guizhou Medical University, Gui'an, China, 561113. Email: caiyy316@gmail.com
- 3 ORCID: <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8845-7309</u>
- 4 Corresponding author:
- 5 Yiyuan Cai, Email: <u>caiyy316@gmail.com</u>
- 6 Address: Ankang Avenue No.6, Gui 'an New District, Guizhou Province, Guizhou
- 7 Medical University, Gui'an, Guizhou Province, China, Code: 561113
- 8 ORCID: <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8845-7309</u>
- 9 Abstract

Background and Objective Diabetes mellitus (DM) is a mounting public health 10 11 concern in China, home to the largest number of patients with diabetes globally. A primary challenge has been the integration of high-quality chronic disease services, 12 with poor outcomes and inefficient health management intensifying the disease 13 14 burden. Shared Medical Appointments (SMAs) offer a promising solution, yet evidence of their practical application in resource-limited settings like China's 15 primary healthcare institutions is scant. This study aims to evaluate the organizational 16 17 readiness for change (ORC) in implementing SMA services in Guizhou province's primary healthcare institutions and to identify determinants of high-level ORC to 18 foster implementation success. 19

20 Methods This study employed a mixed-method approach. The validated Chinese

version of the Workplace Readiness Questionnaire (WRQ-CN) was used to assess the ORC status across 12 institutions participating in the SMART pilot trial. A Normalization Process Theory (NPT) -guided qualitative interview and quantitative survey were used to collect the conditions. Data analysis encompassed standardized descriptive statistics, Spearman correlation analysis, and qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) to discern condition variables and configurations that are favorable to high-level ORC.

Results The study engaged 70 institutional participants, including administrators, 8 9 clinicians, and public health workers. The median ORC score was 105.20 10 (101.23-107.33). We identified 12 condition variables through the interview and survey. The Spearman correlation analysis highlighted a moderate correlation between 11 12 Specific tasks and responsibilities (r=0.393, p=0.206) and Key participants (r=0.316, 13 p=0.317) with ORC. QCA also revealed these condition configurations and pathways that collectively align with heightened ORC, accentuating the pivotal role of key 14 15 participants.

Conclusions This study unveiled a spectrum of dynamic conditions and pathways affecting ORC, which are consistent with the NPT-based theoretical steps. They were essential for attaining high-level ORC in rolling out health service innovations like the SMART study, especially in resource-limited settings.

20 Keywords

21 Organizational Readiness for Change (ORC); Shared Medical Appointment (SAM);

Healthcare services innovation; Mixed-methods study; Qualitative comparative
 analysis (QCA)

3 What is already known on this topic - Organizational Readiness for Change (ORC) has been extensively evaluated within implementation research in 4 developed countries. However, there was a significant knowledge gap in 5 understanding and promoting ORC in low and middle-income countries (LMICs) 6 and resource-limited communities. Current studies primarily employ either 7 qualitative interviews or quantitative methods to analyze ORC, neglectiong the 8 9 the advantages of mixed methods in comprehensively exploring ORC and its 10 influencing factors.

• What this study adds - This study pioneers the exploration of ORC within primary healthcare settings in low-resource settings through a QCA-based mixed method. It fills a critical gap in the literature by providing insights into fostering ORC in contexts previously underexplored.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy - The
 study illuminates specific pathways to improve ORC in primary healthcare
 contexts. The mixed method significantly enhances the depth and breadth of our
 understanding, offering an NPT-based dynamic perspective on the factors
 contributing to the readiness to implement health service innovations.

5

1 Background

Diabetes mellitus (DM) represents a significant public health challenge globally, and 2 serving as a major contributor to morbidity and mortality rates, with its prevalence 3 rapidly increasing and imposing a considerable disease burden worldwide¹. The 4 prevalence of type 2 diabetes Mellitus (T2DM) has surged within Chinese 5 populations². Specifically, China has the largest number of patients with diabetes 6 (PWD), accounting for 1 in 4 of all adults living with diabetes worldwide. (140.9 7 million)³. The lack of integrated and high-quality chronic disease services has led to 8 9 poor patient outcomes and inefficient health management⁴, thereby exacerbating the 10 overall disease burden⁵. In response, China launched the "National Essential Public Health Services Program" (NEPHS Program) in 2019, aimed at offering essential, 11 12 complementary diabetes management services in communities⁶. However, many resource-limited communities encountered numerous challenges, such as inadequate 13 coordination between public health and curative services, lack of collaboration among 14 15 healthcare implementation practitioners, insufficient physician-patient communication, low healthcare quality, and a deficiency in service⁶⁷. 16

The Shared Medical Appointment (SMA) service, a patient high-level engagement approach, delivers diagnosis, treatment, and health management services simultaneously to a group of pre-scheduled appointments with patients with similar clinical conditions⁸ ⁹ in outpatient care settings by an interdisciplinary team of healthcare professionals. The SMA services were developed based on the Chronic

Care Model (CCM)¹⁰, which has been demonstrated for its positive effect on 1 integrated treatment and health management, enhanced patient health outcomes, and 2 increased service efficiency in developed countries and well-resourced settings¹¹¹². 3 However, evidence of practical experience in resource-limited communities remains 4 scarce¹³. To address this gap, the Shared Medical Appointment for patients with 5 diabetes in communities in Guizhou province in China (i.e., SMART study) was 6 undertaken to select the optimal set of SMA service components, including 7 one-on-one or group-based consultation and online or offline health education 8 9 services, an innovative service model in resource-constrained community health centers (CHCs) and township health centers (THCs) in China¹⁴. As part of this trial 10 program, this study focuses on evaluating the institution's organizational readiness of 11 12 change (ORC) before initiating the SMART study pilot trial and identifying variables for high-level ORC to enhance the implementation process. 13

An accurate assessment of ORC could provide information about staff's 14 commitment and efficacy to innovation (e.g., changing of service model), which in 15 turn predicts the likelihood of successful innovation implementation¹⁵. When an 16 17 institution's ORC was good, employees would invest more effort into innovation and be willing to overcome obstacles and setbacks¹⁶. An inadequate organizational 18 19 readiness to implement innovation will hinder the implementation following the protocol, leading to an overdue or even failed implementation¹⁷. Despite ORC's 20 importance, readiness before implementing innovation and influencing factors in 21

1 resource-limited primary care institutions have been under-researched¹⁸.

2 Current explorations of ORC have focused on developed countries¹⁹, leaving a 3 knowledge gap in understanding how to foster ORC in low- and middle-income 4 countries and resource-limited communities settings. Meanwhile, previous studies 5 have typically analyzed ORC solely using qualitative interviews or quantitative 6 surveys, and overlooking the benefits of mixed-methods in comprehensively 7 exploring the configuration of ORC and its influencing condition variables¹⁹.

Organizational innovation in primary care practices faces a lot of challenges and 8 complexities²⁰. The Normalization Process Theory (NPT) offers a theory and 9 framework for organizing these challenges into four consecutive phases relevant to 10 innovation implementation²¹. We hyphosis that achieving the high-level ORC status 11 was dynamic and interconnected (Appendix 1-A). The readiness for implementation 12 would shaped by practitioners' initial understanding of the SMART study's relevance 13 and significance (i.e., Coherence) when it was first introduced. Subsequently, their 14 15 engagement and mental investment in the program (i.e., Cognitive participation) played a crucial role in achieving a high-level readiness for the innovation prior to its 16 actual implementation²² ²³. This study employs the NPT to develop an interview 17 18 outline to identify challenges that achieve high-level ORC. Furthermore, we used Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to conduct a rigorous exploration of the 19 essential factors for the implementation of the SMART study in primary care settings 20 21 in Guizhou, China. The QCA approach leverages both qualitative and quantitative

data to analyze the interplay among various concurrent influencing factors (i.e.,
 condition variables) across multiple cases (i.e., institutions). These conditions,
 whether individually or in combination, may correlate with a high-level ORC (i.e.,
 outcome variable).

Thus, we aimed to combine qualitative and quantitative data and elucidate the multifaceted relationships between various condition variables and their collective impact on achieving high-level ORC, thereby facilitating the successful rollout of the *SMART study*. It would provide a reference for subsequent improvement in preparing for innovation implementation.

10 Methods

11 This study utilized a mixed-methods approach²⁴ to find and analyze the condition 12 variables and pathways that would be most conducive to high-level Organizational 13 Readiness for Change (ORC). This study's dual-faceted methodological design 14 enabled a comprehensive understanding of the context of high-level readiness, 15 thereby contributing to the evidence base on effective implementation strategies 16 within organizational settings.

17 Conceptual Frameworks

18 We developed an interview outline based on the NPT²⁵ ²⁶ to explore the likely 19 ORC-associated condition variables. To assess the ORC status of the organization by 20 utilizing the localized and validated Chinese version of the Workplace Readiness

Questionnaire (WRQ-CN), which was developed according to Weiner's
 Organizational Readiness for Change theory ("ORC Theory"). Detailed information
 on the validation of WRQ-CN will be published separately. Appendix 1 depicts the
 NPT-informed interview outline.

5 NPT operationalization

As shown in Appendix 1-A, the NPT encompasses four interactive constructs^{27 28}. We
regarded the four constructs as the preparation phase and implementation phase
separately, each phase including two steps. We operated them as follows:

9 The innovation begins with participant Coherence, i.e., the organization's individual and collective psychological readiness before innovation begins. Cognitive 10 Participation follows the implementation practitioners' preparatory stage for 11 12 implementing innovation; once readiness is adequate, Collective Action is taken to 13 operationalize the innovation in the organization. Finally, *Reflexive monitoring occurs*, 14 and based on the implementation experience and outcomes, the organization assesses the impact of the implementation of the innovation on itself. It makes corresponding 15 adjustments to better adapt to the innovation. The interview outline was presented in 16 Appendix 2-B. 17

The study utilized the first two constructs of NPT, *Coherence* and *Cognitive Participation*, prior to initiating the *Collective Action* phase to inform the development of an interview guide to map the likely condition variables that may associated with ORC in implementing public health interventions. The *Collective*

Action and Reflective Monitoring constructs were not employed at this stage because 1 they are more applicable in the post-implementation of the SMART study. Thematic 2 Analysis $(TA)^{29}$ was used to analyze the interview texts to identify the condition 3 variables impacting ORC ahead of the SMART pilot trial. Following a standardized 4 5 analysis approach, a set of variables was constructed. Based on the set of variables derived, we developed a quantitive-oriented questionnaire of influencing condition 6 variables (i.e., Influencing Factor Quantitative questionnaire, IFQ questionnaire). 7 Each survey question item was rated on a six-point scale: 0 = indicating no influence, 8 1 = very low, 2 = relatively low, 3 = moderate, 4 = high, and 5 = very high influence.9 Scores on the higher end of the scale indicated a greater influence of the variable. 10

11 ORC Theory operationalization

Peggy et al.^{30 31} developed the Workplace Readiness Questionnaire (WRQ) drawing from the ORC Theory. The WRQ consists of five dimensions and 32 items: *change context, change valence, information assessment, change commitment, and change efficacy*. The definition of each domain and its composed items was presented in Appendix 2.

We translated and contexted into a Chinese version, with the content validation conducted to validate the scale (The scale items achieved conceptual, linguistic, and semantic equivalence between English and Chinese. Two rounds of Delphi studies revealed that the item-content validity index (I-CVI) ranged from 0.73 to 1.00, kappa values were between 0.70 and 1.00, and Kendall's W coefficient was 0.881. The

scale-content validity index (S-CVI) was ≥ 0.97 , indicating good validity of the scale 1 items and overall content, with a high degree of consensus among experts. The results 2 3 of face validity verification showed that the importance of each item was more significant than 1.5, indicating that the scale's appearance, content, or format can 4 5 effectively measure the intended content. The detailed methods and results of the Chinese version of WRQ will be published separately). The Chinese version WRQ 6 uses both the Likert-5 scales (1=Never/Strongly Disagree, 2=Rarely/Disagree, 7 3=Sometimes/Neutral, 4=Often/Agree, 5=Always/Strongly Agree) and binary scores 8 9 (1=Yes, 0=No).

10 Settings

This study was conducted in the same settings as the SMART pilot trial¹⁴. The SMART 11 study purposely selected Bozhou and Bijiang districts as the research settings, where 12 GDP per capita was comparable to that of countries such as Bosnia and 13 Herzegovina(US\$7,585) and Dominica(US\$ 8,414) in 2022³²⁻³⁴. These include 14 15 community health centers in the urban areas and township health centers in the rural areas, encompassing both publicly and privately owned entities. These centers were 16 integrated within the local government's diabetes management program, typically 17 18 through government service contracts. Bozhou and Bijiang comprise 40 primary care or township health centers. In the pilot phase of the SMART study, we purposely 19 selected 12 centers, eight of which were from Bozhou and four from Bijiang. Six were 20 from resource-limited settings, and others were from relatively better-resourced 21

1 settings in two areas (Appendix 3).

2 **Participants**

3 The study included three types of participants. They were the institution's 4 administrators, clinical doctors responsible for patients with T2DM treatment, and 5 public health doctors responsible for the patient's health management. These 6 participants were engaged through both qualitative interviews and quantitative 7 surveys, with at least one participant from each participating primary healthcare 8 facility.

9 Data collection

10 The data collection process was separated into two continuous phases:

11 Phase 1: participant qualitative interviews. First, the NPT-based interview outline will be utilized to conduct the group interviews with three types of participants. The 12 interviews were conducted at the SMART pilot trial launching and training sessions, 13 14 which spanned approximately 60-90 minutes for each participant category. At the end of the interview, the participants were asked how many days they would need to 15 16 prepare for the conduction. A common preparation period cited by the participants 17 was 14 days. During this interval that the institutions were preparing for the launching, the researchers transcribed the interview text, conducted coding and analyses 18 following the standard TA approach using the Nvivo software (version 12.0)³⁵, which 19 informed the development of the Influencing Factor Quantitative questionnaire (IFQ 20

1 questionnaire).

2	Phase 2: Quantitative assessment of the condition variables condition variables
3	impact and readiness status. All participants of the SMART pilot trial were surveyed
4	using a quantitative investigation (i.e., a "Full-Sample" survey), including the
5	WRQ-CN, IFQ questionnaires, and participants' characteristic information.

Data were collected and administered using the Research Electronic Data Capture
 platform (REDCap)³⁶.

8 Data analysis

9 This study used thematic analysis (TA) to summarize the interview texts and statistically characterize the derived condition variables. Spearman correlation 10 11 analysis was conducted to assess the degree to which these condition variables were correlated. Additionally, recognizing the complexities in practices and the nature of 12 the primary healthcare settings, where multiple pathways (i.e., a combination of 13 multiple conditions) could lead to the optimal ORC, we employed Qualitative 14 Comparative Analysis (QCA) to examine the cross-case patterns for key condition 15 variables that would be most conducive to high-level ORC, facilitating the effective 16 implementation of the SMART intervention. We used fuzzy-sets QCA (fsQCA) to 17 address hierarchical variables without dichotomizing or multi-classifying the variables, 18 which can preserve the information and continuity of the condition and outcome 19 variables in this study^{37 38}. 20

Statistical characterization and Spearman correlation analysis. We started
 with a standardized descriptive analysis and Spearman correlation analysis to
 characterize the condition variables and their correlations. When the correlation
 value (r) was equal to or more than 0.3, it presented a moderate level of
 correlation³⁹, with the scatter diagram plots generated for visual interpretation.

6 2) Variables calibration and membership calculation. Utilizing the direct calibration, we transformed the raw scores into a rescaled format ranging from 0 7 to 1 for both condition variables and outcome variables using the 90th, 50th, and 8 9 10th percentiles, measuring the extent to which this condition (i.e., factor, or, 10 variable) was met for each primary healthcare facility site, which was the unit of analysis. A score of 0 indicates the condition was not fully membership, while a 11 12 score of 1 indicates the condition was fully membership. For any variables with a rescaled score of 0.5, we incrementally adjusted this score to 0.50140, thus 13 conferring that this condition was fully met for the site. 14

3) Necessity and coverage analysis. We first identified the necessary conditions for
 "high-level ORC" in the primary healthcare facility sites. Then we examined the
 sufficient conditions while meeting the goodness-of-fit criteria (i.e., a consistency
 score higher than 0.9, indicating a strong association between the conditions and
 outcomes⁴¹).

4) Truth table construction and configuration analyses. We constructed a truth
 table and performed configuration analyses to identify the cross-case patterns and

1	the combinations of conditions that could be most conducive to a high-level ORC.
2	Following Ragin et al.'s guidelines for selecting the number of conditions in
3	QCA ⁴¹ , we chose four to seven condition variables when the case number ranges
4	from 10 to 40. The solution consistency score of 0.8 or more was considered to be
5	a sufficient condition for achieving the ORC result.

6 5) Robustness test. We conducted robustness tests using two methods. 1) We
7 changed the consistency threshold from 0.85 or 0.90. 2) We added other variables
8 related to the results for the robustness test to ensure the rationality and accuracy
9 of the results^{42,43}.

6) Interpret result. Visualize and interpret the results of the pathways (e.g., the
 combinations of conditions) . A pathway flow between influence factors and
 high-level ORC was drawn after we further analyzed by combining frequently
 emerging conditions in different NPT domains.

This study followed the Mixed Methods Article Reporting Standards (MMARS) and the Strengthening Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)^{44,45}.

A detailed description of the operational use of QCA in this study was available in
Appendix 4 and Appendix 5.

16

1 **Results**

2 Characteristics of participants

3	In the study, 70 participants were interviewed, comprising 38.57% males (n=27) and
4	61.43% females (n=43). The majority (68.57%) were under 40 years of age, with a
5	predominant education level of a bachelor's degree (58.57%). Most participants had
6	less than ten years of work experience (64.29%). Professionally, 37.14% were
7	physician assistants or technicians, and 30% were attending physicians, primarily in
8	clinical medicine (34.29%) and nursing (17.14%) specialties (Table 1).

1

Table 1 Characteristics of participants

Categories	n	Proportion (%)
Gender		
Male	27	38.57
Female	43	61.43
Age (years)		
≤30	27	38.57
30~	21	30.00
>40	22	31.43
Educational background		
Secondary vocational school education	3	4.29
Three-year college Education	26	38.57
Bachelor degree	41	57.14
Work experience (years)		
≤10	45	62.86
10~	8	10.00
>20	17	24.29
Job title		
No	16	22.86
Physician assistants/technicians (junior)	26	37.14
Attending physician (intermediate)	21	30.00
Associate Consultant/Deputy Chief Physician (senior)	7	10.00
Specialty		
Clinical medicine ^a	26	37.14
Nursing	11	15.71
Traditional Chinese medicine	9	12.86
General Practice	9	12.86
Integrative Chinese and Western medicine	4	5.71
Public health management	3	4.29
Clinical pharmacy	3	4.29
Others ^b	5	7.14

2 *Note:* a: including internal medicine, surgery, and pediatrics;

3 b: including preventive medicine, rehabilitation therapeutics, medical imaging, medical imaging technology, and

4 medical laboratory science.

1 Statistical descriptive analysis of condition and outcome variables

2	Appendix 6 details the coding result of the variables. Analysis of the IFQ
3	questionnaire for the condition variables revealed a skewed distribution, leading to the
4	adoption of medians (M) and interquartile ranges (IQR) for statistical description
5	(Appendix 7). Among the 12 institutions, the influence levels of each condition factor
6	were generally rated as "3=fairly influential", with median scores varying between
7	2.52 to 3.31 and median scores for outcome variables at 105.20 (101.23 to 107.33).
8	Furthermore, the WRQ-CN results, segmented by dimension, indicated medians and
9	IQR as follows: Context at 34.10 (33.28 to 36.25), Change valence at 18.83 (17.92 to
10	19.99), Informational assessment at 18.71 (18.25 to 19.10), Change commitment
11	median score 17.67 (16.66 to 18.75), and Change efficacy at 14.43 (13.71 to 15.29).
12	Correlation analysis between the condition and outcome variables
13	The results from Spearman correlation analysis showed that under the Coherence
14	domain (Appendix 8a), there was a moderate correlation between the value of Specific

15 tasks and responsibilities and the WRQ-CN value, with an r-value of s 0.393 (p =

16 0.206). The correlation between Key participants and the WRQ-CN value had a

17 moderate *r*-value of 0.316 (p = 0.317) (Appendix 8b). The *r* values for the other

18 correlations were ranged from 0.025 to 0.294.

1 Exploration of pathways to a high-level of ORC

2 Truth table analysis

We chose four conditions for Coherence and seven for Cognitive Participation in 3 conducting the truth table and configuration analysis, respectively (The variable 4 calibration and necessity analysis results were presented in Appendix 9). The 5 distribution of the raw consistency shows variations ranging from 0.57-0.94 and 6 0.49-0.93, respectively, in two domains. The consistency threshold value set for this 7 study was 0.8. Thus, in Coherence and Cognitive Participation, the configuration of 8 institutions A, E, F, G, and H showed a good correlation for the outcome variable, 9 which means there was a correlation between the configuration of these institutions 10 and high levels of ORC (Table 2). 11

Table 2 The Qualitative (Comparative Anal	lysis results (n	= 12 institutions)
---------------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------------

	Coherence					Cognitive Participation								
Best	Differenti	Communal	Individual	Internaliz			Initiation Enrolmont			Activation				-
Instances	ation	specification	specification	ation	raw	raw Best	Best	Emonnent		Activation			raw	
*	Cost	Positive attitude	Specific tasks and	Value of	consist	Instances	Key	Preliminary	Audit and	Professional	Work	Patient medication adherence and	External	consist
	difference		responsibilities	innovation			participants	preparation	feedback	knowledge	pressure	cognition	supports	
Н	0	1	1	0	0.94	F	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.93
А	0	1	1	1	0.91	А	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0.92
G	1	0	1	1	0.86	G	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.92
С	1	1	0	0	0.71	E, H	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.91
Ι	0	0	0	1	0.65	L	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.79
Β、Ϳ、Κ	0	0	0	0	0.63	J	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.73
E, F, L	1	1	1	1	0.63	Ι	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0.72
D	1	0	0	0	0.57	А	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.70
		A: Cohe	erence			K	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0.60
						D	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0.57
						С	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.49

B: Cognitive participation

Note: a: The 12 institutions included in the study are denoted by A to L.

1 Configuration analysis

Under the standard analysis, The solution consistency values of different configurations were all greater than 0.8, which means there were strong correlations between different configurations and high-level ORC. The solution coverage values were 0.49 and 0.60 in *Coherence* (Figure 1A) and *Cognitive Participation* (Figure 1B), respectively, presenting the configurations that collectively explained 49% and 60% of the high-level ORC cases.

In the Coherence, two configurations could help the organization achieve 8 high-level ORC. First, the type C1 (i.e., Community-perceived type) presented the 9 interviewees were willing to participate (i.e., Positive attitude) in SMA actively, 10 understood the SMA service Specific tasks and responsibilities when implementing 11 12 SMA would help them achieve a higher level of ORC. Second, the type C2 (i.e., Well-understanding type) presented the interviewees could tell the Cost differences 13 (time, human resources, and money) between the SMA and formal service, 14 15 understood the SMA Specific tasks and responsibilities when implementing SMA, and agreed with the value of implementing the SMA (i.e., the value of innovation) would 16 help them achieve a higher level of ORC. 17

In *Cognitive participation*, configurations could help the organization achieve a high-level ORC. First, the type C3 (i.e., *Everything-was-ready type*) presented prior to initiating SMA to recruit patient participants and provide service, the presence of the following condition variables can significantly enhance the ORC: 1) *Key participants*

led the SMA pilot trial implementation; 2) the staff work together to prepare the 1 consultation room and the needed materials, reorganize the cooperation model 2 3 between each other (i.e., *Preliminary preparation*); 3) carry out *Audit and feedback*; 4)consolidate Professional knowledge; 5) Patients' medication adherence and 4 5 cognition on diabetes were high; 6) and availability of a variety of external support, including support from higher level administrative department and research teams 6 guidance. Second, type C4 (i.e., the driving force was needed type) presented Key 7 participants, and Preliminary preparation was the core of the configuration, which 8 both improved the ORC and achieved a higher level. Third, type C5 (i.e., type C4 plus) 9 was very similar to C4, and the difference was that in addition to the Key participants 10 and the *Preliminary preparation*, the *Audit and feedback* played a role as a marginal 11 12 condition to improve the ORC.

13

Figure 1 Configuration analysis

14 **Pathway Analysis**

Coherence and *Cognitive Participation* were distinct domains, but they can be seen as consecutive linked phases in the mindset shift preceding the implementing innovation²⁵. To achieve high-level ORC, we integrated the previously discovered five configurations of these two stages. Therefore, we identified and selected key conditions, both core and marginal conditions, alongside variables demonstrating moderate quantitative correlation, including *Specific tasks and responsibilities, Key participants, Preliminary preparation*, and *Audit and feedback*. Further analysis by

QCA indicated two types of configurations (i.e., combination conditions) to achieve high-level ORC (Figure 2). The solution consistency was 0.94, which means that the combination of conditions predicted the outcome in 94% of the cases. This was a relatively high level of consistency and indicates a significant correlation between the conditions and the outcome⁴⁶. The coverage was 0.39, which presented the configurations collectively explaining 39% of the high-level ORC cases.

The two configurations presented two pathways consistent with the NPT theory. In 7 P1, when participants were aware of their Specific tasks and responsibilities within 8 9 the SMART pilot trial (i.e., belonging to the Coherence domain), the Kev participants 10 enhanced the process of Preliminary preparation of the pilot trial (i.e., belonging to the Cognitive Participation domain), the high-level ORC would easily be achieved. 11 12 Conversely, in situations where the participants were unclear about their Specific tasks and responsibilities, but the Key participants assumed additional responsibilities to 13 ensure thorough Preliminary preparation and provide Audit and feedback, the 14 high-level ORC would also be achieved (P2). The pathway of the sequential and 15 concurrent condition to achieve high-level ORC was presented in Figure 3. 16

17

Figure 2 Pathway analysis

18

Figure 3 The pathways to achieve high-level ORC

19 Robustness test

20 We conducted two kinds of robustness tests by adjusting the consistency threshold

from 0.80 to 0.85 and added the variable of *Valid contribution for the innovation* as one of the condition variables related to the ORC. It was found that whether we adjusted the consistency threshold or added the variables related to the outcome, the key parameters, including the variables in different configurations, the solution consistency, and the solution coverage were only slightly different from the initial primary result, and no substantial changes occurred (Appendix 10).

7 **Discussion**

Our study investigated factors (i.e., condition variables) affecting the ORC within 8 Coherence and Cognitive Participation and identifying five concurrent configurations 9 of achieving high-level ORC, which were C1 - Community-perceived, C2 -10 Well-understanding, C3 - Everything-was-ready, C4 - Driving force was needed and 11 12 C5-Supplement of C4. Given the interconnectedness of Coherence and Cognitive *Participation* in the implementation innovation^{22 23}, we integrated prevalent factors 13 from these configurations for further QCA. This revealed two concurrent pathways to 14 15 high-level ORC, highlighting the critical role of Key participants.

16 Different types of configurations for achieving high-level ORC

In the *Coherence* domain, the Type C1 - *Community-perceived* showed that when the service providers kept a *Positive attitude* toward innovation and knew the *Specific tasks and responsibilities*, the ORC would achieve a higher level. Individuals promoted the implementation of innovation and motivated the collective responsibility of the others in their organization. Studies have shown that individual

and organizational consensus on interventions was closely related to work efficiency⁴⁷
 ⁴⁸. Thus, participant consensus at the *Coherence* could build a team-based
 implementation atmosphere that improves ORC, extends innovation's effectiveness,
 and promotes its success.

5 Type C2 – *Well-understanding* showed that the *Cost difference*, *Specific tasks and* 6 *responsibilities*, and *value of innovation* played a core role in bringing an 7 organization's ORC to its desired status. In our study, institution G resented 8 completely the same pattern as C2. Staff in Institution G were active and very willing 9 to participate in our study, so they presented an active attitude after the launching and 10 training session. When the staff understood and valued the innovation, the *Change* 11 *valence* was high, and a high-level ORC would appear⁴⁹.

In types C1 and C2 under the *Coherence* domain, understanding the *Specific tasks and responsibilities* played a core role in getting a high-level ORC. Meanwhile, correlation analyses showed that the indicator was moderately correlated with the outcome variable. These two similar results indicated that the individual's ideological change drove other staff to change their thoughts and behaviors towards the SMA to reach a high-level ORC and would facilitate the implementation of the SMA in the next step.

In the Cognitive Participation domain, the type C3 - Everything-was-ready showed that when there were Key participants, good Preliminary preparation, regular Audit and feedback, equipped Professional knowledge, high level of Patient medication

adherence and cognition, and the available Outside (environmental) support to the 1 organization, which included the most number of condition variables, the ORC will 2 3 achieve a good condition. Although previous studies have found a positive correlation between Work pressure and readiness for innovation⁵⁰, we did not find the same effect 4 of participants' Work pressure on ORC. In our study, Work pressure would no longer 5 affect the ORC status when the variables mentioned above were included. The 6 front-line workers in this study were already under relatively high stress before 7 participating in the SMART study. When the staff was motivated to work together with 8 9 the researcher to implement the SMART study in the training session and find an optimal type of SMA, the innovation could release their work pressure in daily service. 10 So, they were eager to reduce their workload through the SMA innovation. In this 11 12 situation, the Work pressure of the SMA innovation would no longer affect their preparation for implementing the SMA pilot trial. 13

In type C4 - A driving force was needed. If the institutions had Key participants to 14 15 drive the SMA innovation and conduct Preliminary preparation well, the organization would achieve a high-level ORC status. This finding was consistent with previous 16 17 studies that showed that strengthening leadership and innovation awareness through 18 training before implementing innovation could improve the ORC⁵¹. The contribution of Key participants and Preliminary preparation were dominant for high-level ORC 19 in this type. In our study, Institution G made sufficient preliminary preparations 20 21 (consultation room layout, education materials, staff cooperation, etc.), and its Key

participant was the institution's administrator, who also acted as a clinician and
 played a coordinating role in the implementation process. With these two conditions,
 the ORC level achieved a high level.

The type C5 – type C4 plus contained conditions similar to C4 and added Audit and 4 feedback. Audit and feedback effectively improved the successful implementation of 5 innovation^{52 53}. The high-level ORC would also be achieved if the administrators 6 provided audits and feedback besides the contribution of Key participants and 7 *preliminary preparation* to the staff. So, we could regard Type C5 as a Type C4 plus. 8 9 In our study, Institution A presented the same pattern as C5. In Institution A, the 10 administrator and the clinician both played the role of Key participants, leading the Preliminary preparation and providing Audits and feedback. 11

12 Sometimes, the administrator initiates an innovation without involving the staff's opinion. The preparation process and mind readiness would lag behind other 13 institutions where staff and administrators were eager for innovation⁵⁴. Although work 14 15 pressure and regular Audits and feedback can motivate employees to engage more in innovation and successfully improve the ORC, this was not the best solution to 16 improve readiness⁵⁵. Because participants' engagement was critical to arousing their 17 awareness of conducting innovation^{56 57}, involving the staff in finding the benefits of 18 implementing innovation, they would start preparing and achieving a high level of 19 innovation. 20

1 The pathway to achieving high-level ORC

In implementation research, *Coherence* and *Cognitive Participation* were sequential and interrelated phases that facilitate a mindset shift before implementing innovation . Utilizing NPT-guided interviews and data analysis, we construct an explanatory result. The results indicated that the combined essential conditions could further present two consecutive pathways that can achieve high-level ORC concurrently. This conclusion was drawn from the correlation analysis and QCA statistics and, corroborated by empirical evidence, and can be consistent with the NPT-based dynamic steps.

In our study, Institutions G and A presented a similar pattern to pathways P1 and P2 9 separately. Following the training, staff members in Institution G quickly grasped 10 their Specific tasks and responsibilities. The Key participant (i.e., their administrator) 11 expressed that he would take responsibility for preparing the pilot trial. Conversely, 12 Institution A's staff initially lacked a clear understanding of their Specific tasks and 13 responsibilities. However, their administrator and the clinician would prepare the pilot 14 15 trial in their institution, including setting up the consultation rooms and necessary materials. The administrator and the clinician provided Audits and feedback to each 16 other. Finally, they also achieved a high-level ORC. And then, the two institutions 17 implemented the pilot trial well in our study. Similar to how Audit and feedback have 18 been validated as an effective strategy for enhancing implementation innovation⁵⁸. 19 This situation could also be found in other studies^{59 60}. The Key participants (opinion 20 21 leaders, internal implementation leaders, champions, outside innovation drivers, etc.)

leading the innovation and involving participants conducting *Preliminary preparation(s)* would be essential condition variables in facilitating the innovation's
 readiness.

Our study found a moderate correlation between Key participants's involvement 4 and ORC. Key participants, typically the administrators, played a crucial role in 5 spearheading innovation, motivating and engaging staff in the process. This 6 leadership facilitated a collective understanding of roles and contributed to effective 7 preliminary preparation. We documented all these conditions before assessing their 8 ORC status. Therefore, the influence of these conditions on the ORC would be 9 10 viewed in a longitudinal relationship. We proposed that there might be causal relationships existed between these conditions and ORC. However, the precise 11 12 mechanisms underliving this relationship still need to be rigorously tested in randomized controlled trials. Furthermore, based on these relations, future studies can 13 explore implementation strategies using the Expert Recommendation for 14 Implementing Change (ERIC)⁶¹, and validate their effectivenesss in improving the 15 readiness in real-world applications. 16

17 Limitations

This study has several limitations impacting its external validity and interpretative scope within the field of implementation science. First, we chose 12 institutions by purposive sampling to present the diversity in their geographic location, medical resources, chronic disease care service capacity, and human resources. However, the

sample size was relatively limited, which may constrain the generalizability of our 1 findings. Second, we only assessed ORC prior to innovation implementation, ignoring 2 its dynamic nature and the evolving engagement of participants⁶²⁻⁶⁴, Future research 3 will examine the changes in ORC and its determinants. Third, the SMART pilot trial 4 5 was a three-factor, two-level factorial design that could predict the main effects and interaction between the condition variables in the SMA components¹⁴, leading to the 6 existence of different intervention types, which may indirectly result in uneven levels 7 of difficulties of prepare the SMA service. However, we assume that this could only 8 9 affect the visible preparation (i.e., consultation room preparation, health management preparation), other than the readiness in their mind. 10

11 Conclusions

The study revealed a constellation of conditions and two dynamic pathways that impacted the ORC, aligning with the consecutive and interactive steps proposed by the NPT. Though the processes of coherence and cognitive participation, engaging the key participants, through comprehensive preliminary preparation, and a providing audit and feedback to other participants could boost ORC.

The research highlighted the intricate and dynamic nature of achieving organizational readiness, pinpointing crucial conditions that facilitate the process. Employing the QCA approach allowed for a comprehensive understanding of how these conditions interact with ORC status. Such insights could guide others toward more efficient and scaled-up implementation of health innovations.

1 Abbreviations

- 2 CCM: Chronic Care Model
- 3 CHCs: Health Service Centers
- 4 **DM:** Diabetes mellitus
- 5 **EBP:** Evidence-Based Practice
- 6 **ERIC:** Expert Recommendation for Implementing Change
- 7 **fsQCA:** fuzzy-sets QCA
- 8 IFQ questionnaire: Influencing Factor Quantitative questionnaire
- 9 **IQR:** interquartile ranges
- 10 M: medians
- 11 MOST: Multiphase Optimization Strategy
- 12 MMARS: Mixed Methods Article Reporting Standards
- 13 NEPHS Program: National Essential Public Health Services Program
- 14 NPT: Normalization Process Theory
- 15 **ORC:** Organizational Readiness for Change
- 16 **ORC Theory:** Weiner's theory of Organizational Readiness for Change
- 17 **PWD:** patient with diabetes

- Q_L: lower quartile, 1
- Q_U: upper quartile 2
- **QCA:** Qualitative Comparative Analysis 3
- **REDCap:** Research Electronic Data Capture platform 4
- **SMA:** Shared Medical Appointment 5
- SMART: Shared Medical Appointment for diabetes 6
- **STROBE:** Strengthening Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology 7
- **TA:** Thematic Analysis 8
- 9 T2DM: type 2 diabetes Mellitus
- 10 THCs: Township Health Centers
- WRQ: Workplace Readiness Questionnaire 11
- 12 WRQ-CN: Workplace Readiness Questionnaire - Chinese

13 References

- 14 1. Ong KL, Stafford LK, McLaughlin SA, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of diabetes from 1990 to 15 2021, with projections of prevalence to 2050: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 16 2021. The Lancet 2023;402:203-34.
- 17 Ke C, Narayan K, Chan J, et al. Pathophysiology, phenotypes and management of type 2 diabetes mellitus in 2. 18 19 Indian and Chinese populations. Nat Rev Endocrinol 2022;18:413-32.
- 3. International Diabetes Federation. IDF Diabetes Atlas, 10th edn. Brussels, Belgium: 2021. Available at: https://www.diabetesatlas.org,2021.
- 4. Rejeski WJ, Ip EH, Bertoni AG, et al. Lifestyle change and mobility in obese adults with type 2 diabetes. NEW ENGLAND JOURNAL OF MEDICINE 2012;366:1209-17.
- Liu J, Bai R, Chai Z, et al. Low- and middle-income countries demonstrate rapid growth of type 2 diabetes: 5. an analysis based on Global Burden of Disease 1990-2019 data. Diabetologia 2022;65:1339-52.
- 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 6. Lili Y, Jinhong Z, Xinyue C, et al. National Essential Public Health Services Programs over the Past Decade Research Report Two: Progress and Achievements of the Implementation of National Essential Public Health Services Programs over the Past Decade. Chinese General Practice 2022;25:3209-20.
 - 7. Li X, Lu J, Hu S, et al. The primary health-care system in China. Lancet 2017;390:2584-94.
- Edelman D, Fredrickson SK, Melnyk SD, et al. Medical clinics versus usual care for patients with both 8. 30 diabetes and hypertension: a randomized trial. ANNALS OF INTERNAL MEDICINE 2010;152:689-96.

- 9. Sikon A, Bronson DL. Shared medical appointments: challenges and opportunities. Ann Intern Med 2010:152:745-6.
- 10. Kirsh S, Watts S, Pascuzzi K, et al. Shared medical appointments based on the chronic care model: a quality improvement project to address the challenges of patients with diabetes with high cardiovascular risk. Qual Saf Health Care 2007;16:349-53.
- 11. Bongaerts BWC, Müssig K, Wens J, et al. Effectiveness of chronic care models for the management of type 2 diabetes mellitus in Europe: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open 2017;7:e013076.
- 123456789 12. Menon K, Mousa A, de Courten MP, et al. Shared Medical Appointments May Be Effective for Improving Clinical and Behavioral Outcomes in Type 2 Diabetes: A Narrative Review. Front Endocrinol (Lausanne) 10 2017;8:263.
- 11 13. Edelman D, Gierisch JM, McDuffie JR, et al. Shared medical appointments for patients with diabetes mellitus: 12 a systematic review. JOURNAL OF GENERAL INTERNAL MEDICINE 2015;30:99-106.
- 13 14. Chinese Clinical Trial Registry. The Shared Medical Appointment for diabetes (SMART) in China: an 14 optimization trial [Z/OL]. [2023-05-28]. https://www.chictr.org.cn/showproj.html?proj=189298 ,2023.
- 15 15. Attieh R, Gagnon MP, Estabrooks CA, et al. Organizational readiness for knowledge translation in chronic 16 17 care: a review of theoretical components. Implement Sci 2013;8:138.
- 16. Laugen CM. The importance of organizational readiness for change for implementing clinical practice 18 19 standards in Indonesian obstetric facilities ,2022.
 - 17. Phillips JE. Effects of change valence and informational assessments on organizational readiness for change. 2017.
 - 18. Tan M, Ding J, Johnson CE, et al. Stages of readiness for advance care planning: Systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence rates and associated factors. Int J Nurs Stud 2024;151:104678.
 - 19. van den Hoed MW, Backhaus R, de Vries E, et al. Factors contributing to innovation readiness in health care organizations: a scoping review. BMC HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH 2022;22:997.
- 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 20. Spencer SA, Adipa FE, Baker T, et al. A health systems approach to critical care delivery in low-resource settings: a narrative review. Intensive Care Med 2023;49:772-84.
- 21. Alharbi TS, Carlström E, Ekman I, et al. Implementation of person-centred care: management perspective. J Hosp Admin 2014;3:107.
- 29 22. Sharpe KK, Noble C, Hiremagular B, et al. Implementing an integrated pathway to care for the dying: is your 30 organisation ready. Int J Palliat Nurs 2018;24:70-8.
- 31 23. Nicoll A, Maxwell M, Williams B. Achieving 'coherence' in routine practice: a qualitative case-based study 32 33 to describe speech and language therapy interventions with implementation in mind. Implementation Science Communications 2021;2:56.
- 34 24. Östlund U, Kidd L, Wengström Y, et al. Combining qualitative and quantitative research within mixed 35 36 method research designs: a methodological review. Int J Nurs Stud 2011;48:369-83.
- 25. May C, Rapley T, Mair FS, et al. (2015)Normalization Process Theory On-line Users' Manual, Toolkit and 37 NoMAD instrument. Available from http://www.normalizationprocess.org ,2015.
- 38 Williams A, Lennox L, Harris M, et al. Supporting translation of research evidence into practice-the use of 26. 39 Normalisation Process Theory to assess and inform implementation within randomised controlled trials: a 40 systematic review. Implement Sci 2023;18:55.
- 41 27. May CR, Mair F, Finch T, et al. Development of a theory of implementation and integration: Normalization 42 Process Theory. Implement Sci 2009;4:1-9.
- 43 28. May CR, Cummings A, Girling M, et al. Using normalization process theory in feasibility studies and process 44 evaluations of complex healthcare interventions: a systematic review. Implement Sci 2018;13:1-27.
- 45 29. Braun V, Clarke V. One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis. 46 Qualitative Research in Psychology 2021;18:328-52.
- 47 30. Hannon PA, Helfrich CD, Chan KG, et al. Development and pilot test of the workplace readiness 48 questionnaire, a theory-based instrument to measure small workplaces' readiness to implement wellness 49 programs. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HEALTH PROMOTION 2017;31:67-75.
- 50 51 31. Helfrich CD, Kohn MJ, Stapleton A. et al. Readiness to Change Over Time: Change Commitment and Change Efficacy in a Workplace Health-Promotion Trial. Front Public Health 2018;6:110.
- [2023-11-19]. 32. The World Bank. GDP per capita (curren US\$). https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD?most recent value desc=true,2023.
- 33. Tongren Municipal People's Government. Tongren Statistic Yearbook-2022. [In Chinese](2023-06-08)[2023-11-19].https://www.trs.gov.cn/zfsj/tjnj/202306/t20230608_80112068.html ,2023.
- 52 53 54 55 56 57 34. Zunyi Municipal People's Government. Zunyi Statistic Yearbook-2022. [In Chinese](2023-02-10)[2023-11-19].https://tjj.zunyi.gov.cn/zfxxgk/fdzdgknr/tjxx_5711466/tjsj_5711470/2023 58 02/t20230213 78202927.html ,2023.
- 59 35. Dhakal K. NVivo. J Med Libr Assoc 2022;110:270-2.
- 60 36. Gao XY, Mi BB, Wu WT, et al. Application of electronic data acquisition system REDCap in large natural 61 population-based cohort studies. Zhonghua liu Xing Bing xue za zhi= Zhonghua Liuxingbingxue Zazhi 62 2020:41:1542-9.
- 63 37. Forman-Hoffman VL, Middleton JC, McKeeman JL, et al. Quality improvement, implementation, and 64 dissemination strategies to improve mental health care for children and adolescents: a systematic review. 65 Implement Sci 2017;12:93.

- 38. Hanckel B, Petticrew M, Thomas J, et al. The use of Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to address causality in complex systems: a systematic review of research on public health interventions. BMC Public Health 2021;21:1-22.
- 39. Cohen J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences : Academic press 2013.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 40. Greckhamer T. CEO compensation in relation to worker compensation across countries: The configurational impact of country - level institutions. STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT JOURNAL 2016;37:793-815.
 - 41. Schneider CQ, Wagemann C. Set-theoretic methods for the social sciences: A guide to qualitative comparative analysis : Cambridge University Press 2012.
 - 42. Bell RG, Filatotchev I, Aguilera RV. Corporate governance and investors' perceptions of foreign IPO value: An institutional perspective. ACADEMY OF MANAGEMENT JOURNAL 2014;57:301-20.
- 11 43. HUANG Manli ZM, PI Shenglei LUS. Research on the Association between the Integrative Configuration of 12 Upstream Cross-Border M&A and Performance [J] [In Chinese]. Chinese Journal of Management 13 14 2019;16:656-64.
- 44. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in 15 16 Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. Lancet 2007;370:1453-7. 45. Association AP. Mixed methods article reporting standards (MMARS) ,2020.
- 17 46. Pappas IO, Woodside AG. Fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA): Guidelines for research 18 practice in Information Systems and marketing. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INFORMATION MANAGEMENT 2021;58:102310.
- 47. Schmutz JB, Meier LL, Manser T. How effective is teamwork really? The relationship between teamwork and performance in healthcare teams: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ Open 2019;9:e028280.
- 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 48. Mazzetti G, Schaufeli WB. The impact of engaging leadership on employee engagement and team effectiveness: A longitudinal, multi-level study on the mediating role of personal-and team resources. PLoS One 2022;17:e0269433.
- 49. Milella F, Minelli EA, Strozzi F, et al. Change and Innovation in Healthcare: Findings from Literature. Clinicoecon Outcomes Res 2021;13:395-408.
- 50. Von Treuer K, Karantzas G, McCabe M, et al. Organizational factors associated with readiness for change in residential aged care settings. BMC HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH 2018;18:1-6.
- 51. Lessard S, Bareil C, Lalonde L, et al. External facilitators and interprofessional facilitation teams: a qualitative study of their roles in supporting practice change. Implement Sci 2016;11:97.
- 31 52. Chan WV, Pearson TA, Bennett GC, et al. ACC/AHA special report: clinical practice guideline implementation strategies: a summary of systematic reviews by the NHLBI Implementation Science Work Group: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. CIRCULATION 2017;135:e122-122e137.
- 32 33 34 35 36 53. Tuti T, Nzinga J, Njoroge M, et al. A systematic review of electronic audit and feedback: intervention effectiveness and use of behaviour change theory. Implement Sci 2017;12:1-20.
- 37 54. Ellis LA, Tran Y, Pomare C, et al. Hospital organizational change: The importance of teamwork culture, 38 39 communication, and change readiness. Front Public Health 2023;11:1089252.
- 55. Rafique MA, Hou Y, Chudhery MAZ, et al. Investigating the impact of pandemic job stress and 40 transformational leadership on innovative work behavior: The mediating and moderating role of knowledge 41 sharing. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge 2022;7:100214.
- 42 56. Andrews DR, Richard DC, Robinson P, et al. The influence of staff nurse perception of leadership style on 43 satisfaction with leadership: a cross-sectional survey of pediatric nurses. Int J Nurs Stud 2012;49:1103-11.
- 44 57. Fakha A, Groenvynck L, de Boer B, et al. A myriad of factors influencing the implementation of transitional 45 care innovations: a scoping review. Implement Sci 2021;16:21.
- 46 Colquhoun HL, Carroll K, Eva KW, et al. Informing the research agenda for optimizing audit and feedback 58. 47 interventions: results of a prioritization exercise. BMC Med Res Methodol 2021;21:20.
- 48 59. Guerrero EG, Fenwick K, Kong Y. Advancing theory development: exploring the leadership-climate 49 relationship as a mechanism of the implementation of cultural competence. Implement Sci 2017;12:133.
- 50 60. Söling S, Demirer I, Köberlein-Neu J, et al. Complex implementation mechanisms in primary care: do physicians' beliefs about the effectiveness of innovation play a mediating role? Applying a realist inquiry and structural equation modeling approach in a formative evaluation study. BMC Prim Care 2023;24:131.
- Powell BJ, Waltz TJ, Chinman MJ, et al. A refined compilation of implementation strategies: results from the 61. Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change (ERIC) project. Implement Sci 2015;10:21.
- 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 62. Steele Gray C, Wilkinson A, Alvaro C, et al. Building resilience and organizational readiness during healthcare facility redevelopment transitions: is it possible to thrive. HERD: Health Environments Research & Design Journal 2015;9:10-33.
- 63. Stanhope V, Ross A, Choy-Brown M, et al. A mixed methods study of organizational readiness for change and leadership during a training initiative within community mental health clinics. Administration and Policy in 60 Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research 2019;46:678-87.
- 61 64. Alsadi M, Saleh A, Khalil M, et al. Readiness-Based Implementation of Electronic Health Records: A Survey 62 of Jordanian Nurses. Creative Nursing 2022;28:42-7.

Authors' contributions 1

2	YC conceptualized this study and set up a core implementation science team to
3	analyze the data. This team included the two leaders (YC and DRX), a QCA
4	methodologist (LL), two research assistants (WY and RM), and Four on-site data
5	collection coordinators (JC, TY, LhL, and LH). All had intimate knowledge of the
6	study protocol and previous quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis
7	experience, and all conducted and/or analyzed the interviews. WY collected or
8	maintained all data and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. YC refined this
9	manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

10 Funding

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China 11 12 (NNSFC) [grant 72164005].

Competing interests 13

- 14 The authors declare that this study was conducted without any business or financial
- relationships that could be perceived as a potential conflict of interest. 15

Ethics approval and consent to participate 16

- 17 This study was conducted under the National Natural Science Foundation of China 18 (NNSFC).
- 19 Shared Ethics Approval Document with NNSFC as a sub-theme of its (The Ethics
- Committee of Guizhou Medical University Ethics Approval Document 2023 (4)]: 20

- 1 https://kdocs.cn/l/cjoKKtlCBop4). The study was conducted after the participants
- 2 were informed of the cautions and had signed the informed consent form. Meanwhile,
- 3 we audio-recorded the interviews.

4 Trial registration

5 ChiCTR2300069904

6 Availability of data and materials

The study does not share the original data. If there are any special needs, the datasets
used and analyzed during the study are available from the corresponding author or the
first author's request.

10 Acknowledgments

We thank Peggy A. Hannon, the developer of the WRQ, for authorizing us to use the scale. We thank all the participants of the CHC/THC of Bozhou District, Zunyi City, and the CHC/THC of Bijiang District, Tongren City. Without your support, we could not have completed the study.

15

Gandikiana	High-level ORC		Conditions	High-level ORC			
Conditions -	C1 a	C2	- Conditions -	C3	C4	C5	
Cost difference	\otimes	•	Key participants	•	•	•	
Positive attitude	•	\otimes	Preliminary preparation	•	•	•	
Specific tasks and responsibilities	•	•	Audit and feedback	•	\otimes	•	
Value of innovation	- ^b	•	Professional knowledge	•	\otimes	\otimes	
Consistency	0.94	0.86	Work pressure	-	\otimes	\otimes	
Raw coverage	0.39	0.26	Patient medication adherence and cognition	•	\otimes	\otimes	
Unique coverage	0.23	0.10	Outside supports	•	\otimes	\otimes	
Solution Consistency	0.92		Consistency	0.83	0.92	0.92	
Solution coverage	0.49		Raw coverage	0.44	0.29	0.31	
A: Coherence			Unique coverage	0.23	0.06	0.02	
			Solution Consistency		0.86		
			Solution coverage		0.60		

B: Cognitive participation

Note:

In this study, Ragin and Fiss's variable labeling methods (1) were used:

 \bullet / \otimes = Core conditions present/absent; \bullet / \otimes = Marginal conditions present/absent ;

a: C: The abbreviation of configuration.

b: ["-"] indicates that the variable does not work in the configuration

Figure 1 Configuration analysis

1

Conditions	High-level ORC	
	P1 ^a	P2
Specific tasks and responsibilities	•	\otimes
Key participants	•	•
Preliminary preparation	•	•
Audit and feedback	\otimes	•
Consistency	0.97	0.94
Raw coverage	0.28	0.33
Unique coverage	0.06	0.12
Solution Consistency	0.94	
Solution coverage	0.39	

The combination of Coherence and Cognitive participation

Note:

In this study, Ragin and Fiss's variable labeling methods (1) were used:

 \bullet / \otimes = Core conditions present/absent; \bullet / \circ = Marginal conditions present/absent ;

a: P: The abbreviation of pathway.

Figure 2 Pathway analysis



Figure 3 The pathways to achieve high-level ORC

References

 Ragin CC, Fiss PC. Net effects analysis versus configurational analysis: An empirical demonstration. Redesigning social inquiry: Fuzzy sets and beyond 2008;240:190-212