

1 **Factors Influencing the Implementing Readiness of Shared Medical**
2 **Appointments in China's Primary Healthcare Institutions: A Mixed-Method**
3 **Study Utilizing Qualitative Comparative Analysis**

4 Affiliations:

- 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: lil529@mail.harvard.edu
- 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: 1434214326@qq.com
- 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

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

- 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: 3422569272@qq.com
- 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](https://orcid.org/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, Ministry of Education,
2 Guizhou Medical University, Gui'an, China, 561113. Email: caiyy316@gmail.com
3 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8845-7309>

4 Corresponding author:

5 Yiyuan Cai, Email: caiyy316@gmail.com

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: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8845-7309>

9 **Abstract**

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

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

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

8 **Results** The study engaged 70 institutional participants, including administrators,
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
11 survey. The Spearman correlation analysis highlighted a moderate correlation between
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
14 that collectively align with heightened ORC, accentuating the pivotal role of key
15 participants.

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

20 **Keywords**

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

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

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

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

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

1 **Background**

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

17 The Shared Medical Appointment (SMA) service, a patient high-level engagement
18 approach, delivers diagnosis, treatment, and health management services
19 simultaneously to a group of pre-scheduled appointments with patients with similar
20 clinical conditions^{8,9} in outpatient care settings by an interdisciplinary team of
21 healthcare professionals. The SMA services were developed based on the Chronic

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

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

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.

8 Organizational innovation in primary care practices faces a lot of challenges and
9 complexities²⁰. The Normalization Process Theory (NPT) offers a theory and
10 framework for organizing these challenges into four consecutive phases relevant to
11 innovation implementation²¹. We hypothesis that achieving the high-level ORC status
12 was dynamic and interconnected (Appendix 1-A). The readiness for implementation
13 would shaped by practitioners' initial understanding of the *SMART study*'s relevance
14 and significance (i.e., *Coherence*) when it was first introduced. Subsequently, their
15 engagement and mental investment in the program (i.e., *Cognitive participation*)
16 played a crucial role in achieving a high-level readiness for the innovation prior to its
17 actual implementation^{22 23}. This study employs the NPT to develop an interview
18 outline to identify challenges that achieve high-level ORC. Furthermore, we used
19 Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to conduct a rigorous exploration of the
20 essential factors for the implementation of the *SMART study* in primary care settings
21 in Guizhou, China. The QCA approach leverages both qualitative and quantitative

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

5 Thus, we aimed to combine qualitative and quantitative data and elucidate the
6 multifaceted relationships between various condition variables and their collective
7 impact on achieving high-level ORC, thereby facilitating the successful rollout of the
8 *SMART study*. It would provide a reference for subsequent improvement in preparing
9 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 NPT^{25 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

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

5 **NPT operationalization**

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

9 The innovation begins with participant *Coherence*, i.e., the organization's individual
10 and collective psychological readiness before innovation begins. *Cognitive*
11 *Participation* follows the implementation practitioners' preparatory stage for
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
15 the impact of the implementation of the innovation on itself. It makes corresponding
16 adjustments to better adapt to the innovation. The interview outline was presented in
17 Appendix 2-B.

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

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

11 **ORC Theory operationalization**

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

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

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

10 **Settings**

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

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
12 will be utilized to conduct the group interviews with three types of participants. The
13 interviews were conducted at the *SMART* pilot trial launching and training sessions,
14 which spanned approximately 60-90 minutes for each participant category. At the end
15 of the interview, the participants were asked how many days they would need to
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,
18 the researchers transcribed the interview text, conducted coding and analyses
19 following the standard TA approach using the Nvivo software (version 12.0)³⁵, which
20 informed the development of the Influencing Factor Quantitative questionnaire (IFQ

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.

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

8 **Data analysis**

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

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

6 **2) Variables calibration and membership calculation.** Utilizing the direct
7 calibration, we transformed the raw scores into a rescaled format ranging from 0
8 to 1 for both condition variables and outcome variables using the 90th, 50th, and
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
11 analysis. A score of 0 indicates the condition was not fully membership, while a
12 score of 1 indicates the condition was fully membership. For any variables with a
13 rescaled score of 0.5, we incrementally adjusted this score to 0.501⁴⁰, thus
14 conferring that this condition was fully met for the site.

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

20 **4) Truth table construction and configuration analyses.** We constructed a truth
21 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 QCA⁴¹, 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}.

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

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

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

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**

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

1

Table 2 The Qualitative Comparative Analysis results (n = 12 institutions)

Best Instances *	Coherence					raw consist	Best Instances	Cognitive Participation							raw consist
	Differentiation	Communal specification	Individual specification	Internalization	Cost difference			Initiation	Enrolment		Activation			External supports	
		Positive attitude	Specific tasks and responsibilities	Value of innovation				Key participants	Preliminary preparation	Audit and feedback	Professional knowledge	Work pressure	Patient medication adherence and cognition		
H	0	1	1	0	0.94	F	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0.93	
A	0	1	1	1	0.91	A	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	
C	1	1	0	0	0.71	E、H	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.91	
I	0	0	0	1	0.65	L	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.79	
B、J、K	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	I	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0.72	
D	1	0	0	0	0.57	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.70	
A: Coherence						K	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0.60	
						D	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0.57	
						C	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0.49	
						B: Cognitive participation									

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

1 Configuration analysis

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

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

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

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

13 **Figure 1 Configuration analysis**

14 **Pathway Analysis**

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

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

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

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

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

7 **Discussion**

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

16 **Different types of configurations for achieving high-level ORC**

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

1 and organizational consensus on interventions was closely related to work efficiency⁴⁷
2 ⁴⁸. Thus, participant consensus at the *Coherence* could build a team-based
3 implementation atmosphere that improves ORC, extends innovation's effectiveness,
4 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 **The pathway to achieving high-level ORC**

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

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

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

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

17 **Limitations**

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

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

11 **Conclusions**

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

17 The research highlighted the intricate and dynamic nature of achieving
18 organizational readiness, pinpointing crucial conditions that facilitate the process.
19 Employing the QCA approach allowed for a comprehensive understanding of how
20 these conditions interact with ORC status. Such insights could guide others toward
21 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

1 **Q_L**: lower quartile,

2 **Q_U**: upper quartile

3 **QCA**: Qualitative Comparative Analysis

4 **REDCap**: Research Electronic Data Capture platform

5 **SMA**: Shared Medical Appointment

6 **SMART**: Shared Medical Appointment for diabetes

7 **STROBE**: Strengthening Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology

8 **TA**: Thematic Analysis

9 **T2DM**: type 2 diabetes Mellitus

10 **THCs**: Township Health Centers

11 **WRQ**: Workplace Readiness Questionnaire

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

- 1 9. Sikon A, Bronson DL. Shared medical appointments: challenges and opportunities. *Ann Intern Med* 2010;**152**:745-6.
- 2
- 3 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.
- 4
- 5
- 6 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.
- 7
- 8 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)* 2017;**8**:263.
- 9
- 10 13. Edelman D, Gierisch JM, McDuffie JR, *et al.* Shared medical appointments for patients with diabetes mellitus: a systematic review. *JOURNAL OF GENERAL INTERNAL MEDICINE* 2015;**30**:99-106.
- 11
- 12 14. Chinese Clinical Trial Registry. The Shared Medical Appointment for diabetes (SMART) in China: an optimization trial [Z/OL]. [2023-05-28]. <https://www.chictr.org.cn/showproj.html?proj=189298> ,2023.
- 13
- 14 15. Attieh R, Gagnon MP, Estabrooks CA, *et al.* Organizational readiness for knowledge translation in chronic care: a review of theoretical components. *Implement Sci* 2013;**8**:138.
- 15
- 16 16. Laugen CM. The importance of organizational readiness for change for implementing clinical practice standards in Indonesian obstetric facilities ,2022.
- 17
- 18 17. Phillips JE. Effects of change valence and informational assessments on organizational readiness for change. 2017.
- 19
- 20 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.
- 21
- 22 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.
- 23
- 24 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.
- 25
- 26 21. Alharbi TS, Carlström E, Ekman I, *et al.* Implementation of person-centred care: management perspective. *J Hosp Admin* 2014;**3**:107.
- 27
- 28 22. Sharpe KK, Noble C, Hiremagular B, *et al.* Implementing an integrated pathway to care for the dying: is your organisation ready. *Int J Palliat Nurs* 2018;**24**:70-8.
- 29
- 30 23. Nicoll A, Maxwell M, Williams B. Achieving ‘coherence’ in routine practice: a qualitative case-based study to describe speech and language therapy interventions with implementation in mind. *Implementation Science Communications* 2021;**2**:56.
- 31
- 32 24. Östlund U, Kidd L, Wengström Y, *et al.* Combining qualitative and quantitative research within mixed method research designs: a methodological review. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2011;**48**:369-83.
- 33
- 34 25. May C, Rapley T, Mair FS, *et al.* (2015)Normalization Process Theory On-line Users' Manual, Toolkit and NoMAD instrument. Available from <http://www.normalizationprocess.org> ,2015.
- 35
- 36 26. Williams A, Lennox L, Harris M, *et al.* Supporting translation of research evidence into practice-the use of Normalisation Process Theory to assess and inform implementation within randomised controlled trials: a systematic review. *Implement Sci* 2023;**18**:55.
- 37
- 38 27. May CR, Mair F, Finch T, *et al.* Development of a theory of implementation and integration: Normalization Process Theory. *Implement Sci* 2009;**4**:1-9.
- 39
- 40 28. May CR, Cummings A, Girling M, *et al.* Using normalization process theory in feasibility studies and process evaluations of complex healthcare interventions: a systematic review. *Implement Sci* 2018;**13**:1-27.
- 41
- 42 29. Braun V, Clarke V. One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 2021;**18**:328-52.
- 43
- 44 30. Hannon PA, Helfrich CD, Chan KG, *et al.* Development and pilot test of the workplace readiness questionnaire, a theory-based instrument to measure small workplaces’ readiness to implement wellness programs. *AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HEALTH PROMOTION* 2017;**31**:67-75.
- 45
- 46 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.
- 47
- 48 32. The World Bank. GDP per capita (current US\$). [2023-11-19]. https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD?most_recent_value_desc=true ,2023.
- 49
- 50 33. Tongren Municipal People's Government. Tongren Statistic Yearbook-2022. [In Chinese](2023-06-08)[2023-11-19].https://www.tr.gov.cn/zfsj/tjnj/202306/t20230608_80112068.html ,2023.
- 51
- 52 34. Zunyi Municipal People's Government. Zunyi Statistic Yearbook-2022. [In Chinese](2023-02-10)[2023-11-19].https://tj.zunyi.gov.cn/zfxgk/fdzdgnr/tjxx_5711466/tjsj_5711470/202302/t20230213_78202927.html ,2023.
- 53
- 54 35. Dhakal K. NVivo. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2022;**110**:270-2.
- 55
- 56 36. Gao XY, Mi BB, Wu WT, *et al.* Application of electronic data acquisition system REDCap in large natural population-based cohort studies. *Zhonghua Liu Xing Bing xue za zhi= Zhonghua Liuxingbingxue Zazhi* 2020;**41**:1542-9.
- 57
- 58 37. Forman-Hoffman VL, Middleton JC, McKeeman JL, *et al.* Quality improvement, implementation, and dissemination strategies to improve mental health care for children and adolescents: a systematic review. *Implement Sci* 2017;**12**:93.
- 59
- 60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65

- 1 38. Hanckel B, Petticrew M, Thomas J, *et al.* The use of Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to address
2 causality in complex systems: a systematic review of research on public health interventions. *BMC Public*
3 *Health* 2021;**21**:1-22.
- 4 39. Cohen J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* :Academic press 2013.
- 5 40. Greckhamer T. CEO compensation in relation to worker compensation across countries: The configurational
6 impact of country - level institutions. *STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT JOURNAL* 2016;**37**:793-815.
- 7 41. Schneider CQ, Wagemann C. *Set-theoretic methods for the social sciences: A guide to qualitative*
8 *comparative analysis* :Cambridge University Press 2012.
- 9 42. Bell RG, Filatotchev I, Aguilera RV. Corporate governance and investors' perceptions of foreign IPO value:
10 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 2019;**16**:656-64.
- 14 44. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, *et al.* The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
15 Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet* 2007;**370**:1453-7.
- 16 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*
19 *MANAGEMENT* 2021;**58**:102310.
- 20 47. Schmutz JB, Meier LL, Manser T. How effective is teamwork really? The relationship between teamwork and
21 performance in healthcare teams: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2019;**9**:e028280.
- 22 48. Mazzetti G, Schaufeli WB. The impact of engaging leadership on employee engagement and team
23 effectiveness: A longitudinal, multi-level study on the mediating role of personal-and team resources. *PLoS*
24 *One* 2022;**17**:e0269433.
- 25 49. Milella F, Minelli EA, Strozzi F, *et al.* Change and Innovation in Healthcare: Findings from Literature.
26 *Clinicoecon Outcomes Res* 2021;**13**:395-408.
- 27 50. Von Treuer K, Karantzis G, McCabe M, *et al.* Organizational factors associated with readiness for change in
28 residential aged care settings. *BMC HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH* 2018;**18**:1-6.
- 29 51. Lessard S, Bareil C, Lalonde L, *et al.* External facilitators and interprofessional facilitation teams: a
30 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
32 implementation strategies: a summary of systematic reviews by the NHLBI Implementation Science Work
33 Group: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical
34 Practice Guidelines. *CIRCULATION* 2017;**135**:e122-122e137.
- 35 53. Tuti T, Nzanga J, Njoroge M, *et al.* A systematic review of electronic audit and feedback: intervention
36 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 communication, and change readiness. *Front Public Health* 2023;**11**:1089252.
- 39 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 58. Colquhoun HL, Carroll K, Eva KW, *et al.* Informing the research agenda for optimizing audit and feedback
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, Demirel I, Köberlein-Neu J, *et al.* Complex implementation mechanisms in primary care: do
51 physicians' beliefs about the effectiveness of innovation play a mediating role? Applying a realist inquiry and
52 structural equation modeling approach in a formative evaluation study. *BMC Prim Care* 2023;**24**:131.
- 53 61. Powell BJ, Waltz TJ, Chinman MJ, *et al.* A refined compilation of implementation strategies: results from the
54 Expert Recommendations for Implementing Change (ERIC) project. *Implement Sci* 2015;**10**:21.
- 55 62. Steele Gray C, Wilkinson A, Alvaro C, *et al.* Building resilience and organizational readiness during
56 healthcare facility redevelopment transitions: is it possible to thrive. *HERD: Health Environments Research &*
57 *Design Journal* 2015;**9**:10-33.
- 58 63. Stanhope V, Ross A, Choy-Brown M, *et al.* A mixed methods study of organizational readiness for change and
59 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.

1 **Authors' contributions**

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**

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

13 **Competing interests**

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

16 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

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
20 Committee of Guizhou Medical University Ethics Approval Document 2023 (4)):

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**

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

10 **Acknowledgments**

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

15

Conditions	High-level ORC		Conditions	High-level ORC		
	C1 ^a	C2		C3	C4	C5
Cost difference	⊗	●	Key participants	●	●	●
Positive attitude	●	⊗	Preliminary preparation	●	●	●
Specific tasks and responsibilities	●	●	Audit and feedback	●	⊗	●
Value of innovation	- ^b	●	Professional knowledge	●	⊗	⊗
Consistency	0.94	0.86	Work pressure	-	⊗	⊗
Raw coverage	0.39	0.26	Patient medication adherence and cognition	●	⊗	⊗
Unique coverage	0.23	0.10	Outside supports	●	⊗	⊗
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:

●/⊗ = Core conditions present/absent; ●/⊗ = 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

Conditions	High-level ORC	
	P1 ^a	P2
Specific tasks and responsibilities	●	⊗
Key participants	●	●
Preliminary preparation	●	●
Audit and feedback	⊗	●
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:

●/⊗ = Core conditions present/absent; ●/⊗ = Marginal conditions present/absent ;

a: P: The abbreviation of pathway.

Figure 2 Pathway analysis




Figure 3 The pathways to achieve high-level ORC

References

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